

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS
CPED – PLANNING DIVISION
HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION STAFF REPORT**

FILE NAME: 1022 University Avenue, Florence Court Apartments
DATE OF APPLICATION: June 18, 2008
APPLICANTS: Clark Gassen, CAG Development
PUBLICATION DATE: August 5, 2008
DATE OF HEARING: August 12, 2008
END OF APPEAL PERIOD: August 22, 2008
HPC SITE/DISTRICT: Florence Court Apartments, Individual Landmark
CATEGORY: Contributing
CLASSIFICATION: Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation
STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Molly McCartney, (612) 673-5811

A. SITE DESCRIPTION & BACKGROUND:

1022 University Avenue Southeast is a multi-building site that contains six residential structures, including one large apartment building, Florence Court. Florence Court is a local historic landmark that was designated in 1983. There are five non-contributing, residential structures on this landmark property that are not the subjects of this report (see agenda items #x, x, x.). As part of a proposed redevelopment plan, these five non-contributing, freestanding residential structures, and one detached garage, are proposed to be moved or demolished to make way for a new multi-family structure. The following report details the history of the local designation, the background of the Florence Court Apartments, and an analysis of the rehabilitation request.

In addition to the Florence Court parcel, there are two other properties on this block. On the northwest corner there is a service station and on the east end of the block is a contract parking lot for the University of Minnesota.

History of the local designation

The Florence Court parcel is unique in that a historically designated structure is located on the same parcel as other structures that do not have the same protection. When Florence Court was designated in 1983, the nomination from staff recommended that all the structures on the site be designated. At that time, the City Planning Commission (CPC) reviewed designations and the CPC recommended that Heritage Preservation Commission adopt a recommendation that only the L-shaped apartment building, known as Florence Court, be designated. That recommendation was adopted by the City Council (per 599.260¹). *See attached Council resolution on page 88.*

The designation of Florence Court noted that the property was an example of one of the oldest apartment buildings in Minneapolis and that the inward focus of the development on a courtyard was a unique design associated with community planning. The designation of the Florence Court apartment building does include the landscape of the interior courtyard – without the courtyard, Florence Court would not

¹ In 1983, the corresponding ordinance section was Chapter 34.40

have the significance in which it was originally recognized for through historic designation. The other buildings on the site are considered non-contributing resources to this local historic landmark; however they have consistent building placement focusing inward to the courtyard in a “U” shaped pattern around the property.

B. PROPOSED CHANGES & ANALYSIS:

The proposed rehabilitation of Florence Court includes the following exterior features, masonry repair, wood siding, foundation repair, rear balcony replacement, new roof, and landscape.

In addition to the exterior, the following interior systems will also be updated, including heating system update, including boiler replacement and other internal building systems update, including plumbing and electrical.

Masonry

The applicant has detailed the condition of the exterior brick and how lack of care and maintenance has damaged this building. There is mortar joint failure, loose brick, and failing brick course ornaments. The repairs needed include repointing, brick replacement, and mortaring of cornices and keystone arches. The applicant would like to use salvaged brick from the building No. 1018 (if demolished) to repair the damaged brick because the color and brick patina are similar. In addition to brick repair, the applicant proposed to clean the brick exterior prior to tuckpointing and mortar repair.

Siding

In addition to brick exterior, there are parts of the building that have wood exterior, including the lap siding, fascia, and trim board. The dormers of the second and one-half story typically have a dark red painted, wood shingles or lap siding as well as the dormers and railings of the ground floor porches. The applicant proposed to repair or replace these with painted cedar or fiberboard to match existing profiles.

Foundation

The applicant has stated that the foundation is settling, thus resulting in stress on the walls above as well as flooding in the basement apartments. While the specific details of the foundation repair are not included in the report, the narrative includes information about

Roofing

The applicant is proposing to replace the roof of the apartment building with dark red, asphalt shingles. Current shingles have not been updated in 20 years and neglect of the roofing has resulted in water damage. The proposed changes include replacement shingle similar to the existing reddish-brown color and pattern.

Porches and Balconies

The interior of Florence Court has a number of open, wood porches. The applicant proposed to repair or replace material, in kind, on an as-needed basis, with either painted cedar or cement fiberboard to match the existing profile. The rear balconies are not the original materials or structure, but are needed as a means of egress. The applicant proposed to also repair or replace these on an as-needed basis.

Interior mechanicals

One of the first proposed updates to Florence Court is the replacement of the original boiler. The applicant has stated that this system is in great need to replacement and intends to have a new heating system installed prior to this fall/winter. Future updates also include electrical and plumbing updates. While these interior changes are not necessarily subject to HPC approval, the information about the overall plan for repair and maintenance is important because many of these updates are over-due.

Landscape

In addition to the proposed work to the building, the site is proposed to receive improvements, including a new courtyard design, resurfacing, and increased green space. The courtyard will retain its general shape, however, instead of the current “L” shape, the proposed work includes reconfiguring the driveway from University Avenue Southeast to a circular drive around the interior so that traffic would circulate back onto University Avenue Southeast. The “L” portion toward 11th Street Southeast would be replaced with mostly a building (to be discussed in future application). The proposed courtyard features five parking spaces, which would reduce the current 20 to 30 un-striped parking spaces on the site. The applicants are proposing to increase the green space on the site from xx sq. ft. to xx sq. ft. and retain many of the mature trees on site.

Analysis of proposed changes

The proposed rehabilitation of Florence Court is consistent for treatment to historic buildings. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation or “Standards” recommends that buildings and their significant features are preserved through sensitive ongoing maintenance and preservation.

Proposed repairs to the exterior materials of the building including repairing and replacing masonry and wood siding. The masonry repairs are consistent with the Standards that call for identifying, retaining, and preserving masonry features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as walls, joint and unit size, and color. Cleaning and repair of the masonry should employ the gentlest methods available to limit future damage. The wood repairs are consistent with the Standards that call for identifying, retaining, and preserving wood features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as siding, cornices, brackets, window architraves, and doorway pediments; and their paints, finishes, and colors. The applicant states that either cedar or a fiber cement board would be used; staff recommends that cedar is used so that wood is the consistent material, and not a substitute.

Repairs to the structure of the building include repairing the foundation and replacing the roof shingles. Both types of work are consistent with the Standards that call for identifying, retaining, and preserving structural systems and roofs. While the foundation work may not be visible from the exterior, the condition of the foundation does contribute to other exterior features, like the walls. The proposed changes include replacement shingle similar to the existing reddish-brown color and pattern.

The proposed changes to the porches and rear balconies include repairing or replacing material, in kind, on an as-needed basis, with either painted cedar or cement fiberboard to match the existing profile. The applicant states that either cedar or a fiber cement board would be used; staff recommends that cedar is used so that wood is the consistent material, and not a substitute. The rear balconies are not the original materials or structure, but are needed as a means of egress. The applicant proposed to also repair or replace these on an as-need basis.

The applicant proposed that one of the first updates to Florence Court is the replacement of the original boiler. While the interior heating system is not needed to be reviewed for preservation related issues,

this system does contribute to the overall maintenance of the building. The applicant has stated that this system is in great need to replacement and intends to have a new heating system installed prior to this fall/winter. Future updates also include electrical and plumbing updates. While these interior changes are not necessarily subject to HPC approval, the information about the overall plan for repair and maintenance is important because many of these updates are over-due.

The proposed changes to the interior courtyard are consistent with many of the Standards guidelines for site, including retaining and preserving the relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space. The proposed changes to the courtyard, including reconfiguring the “U” shaped driveway, are based on historical records, including plat maps. Removing the existing cement and dirt parking spaces with the new drive and green space does preserve the interior courtyard that the historical structure is noted for being designed around. The inclusion of the proposed 5 parking space is less obtrusive than the existing site layout that includes up to 30 parking spaces.

C. GUIDELINE CITATIONS:

There are no local guidelines for the Florence Court individual landmark, so the following Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation are used to evaluate the proposed rehabilitation. Also included in this section is the chapter from the City-adopted Marcy Holmes Neighborhood Master Plan.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (1990)

Masonry: *Brick, stone, terra cotta, concrete, adobe, stucco, and mortar*

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving masonry features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as walls, brackets, railings, cornices, window architraves, door pediments, steps, and columns; and joint and unit size, tooling and bonding patterns, coatings, and color.

Protecting and maintaining masonry by providing proper drainage so that water does not stand on flat, horizontal surfaces or accumulate in curved decorative features.

Cleaning masonry only when necessary to halt deterioration or remove heavy soiling.

Carrying out masonry surface cleaning tests after it has been determined that such cleaning is necessary. Tests should be observed over a sufficient period of time so that both the immediate effects and the long range effects are known to enable selection of the gentlest method possible.

Cleaning masonry surfaces with the gentlest method possible, such as low pressure water and detergents, using natural bristle brushes.

Inspecting painted masonry surfaces to determine whether repainting is necessary.

Removing damaged or deteriorated paint only to the next sound layer using the gentlest method possible (e.g., hand scraping) prior to repainting.

Applying compatible paint coating systems following proper surface preparation.

Repainting with colors that are historically appropriate to the building and district.

Evaluating the overall condition of the masonry to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, that is, if repairs to the masonry features will be necessary.

Repairing masonry walls and other masonry features by repointing the mortar joints where there is evidence of deterioration such as disintegrating mortar, cracks in mortar joints, loose bricks, damp walls, or damaged plasterwork.

Removing deteriorated mortar by carefully hand-raking the joints to avoid damaging the masonry.

Duplicating old mortar in strength, composition, color, and texture.

Duplicating old mortar joints in width and in joint profile.

Repairing stucco by removing the damaged material and patching with new stucco that duplicates the old in strength, composition, color, and texture.

Using mud plaster as a surface coating over unfired, unstabilized adobe because the mud plaster will bond to the adobe.

Repairing masonry features by patching, piecing-in, or consolidating the masonry using recognized preservation methods. Repair may also include the limited replacement in kind - or with compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of masonry features when there are surviving prototypes such as terra-cotta brackets or stone balusters.

Applying new or non-historic surface treatments such as water-repellent coatings to masonry only after repointing and only if masonry repairs have failed to arrest water penetration problems.

Replacing in kind an entire masonry feature that is too deteriorated to repair - if the overall form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. Examples can include large sections of a wall, a cornice, balustrade, column, or stairway. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Designing and installing a new masonry feature such as steps or a door pediment when the historic feature is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

Not Recommended:

Removing or radically changing masonry features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Replacing or rebuilding a major portion of exterior masonry walls that could be repaired so that, as a result, the building is no longer historic and is essentially new construction.

Applying paint or other coatings such as stucco to masonry that has been historically unpainted or uncoated to create a new appearance.

Removing paint from historically painted masonry.

Radically changing the type of paint or coating or its color.

Failing to evaluate and treat the various causes of mortar joint deterioration such as leaking roofs or gutters, differential settlement of the building, capillary action, or extreme weather exposure.

Cleaning masonry surfaces when they are not heavily soiled to create a new appearance, thus needlessly introducing chemicals or moisture into historic materials.

Cleaning masonry surfaces without testing or without sufficient time for the testing results to be of value.

Sandblasting brick or stone surfaces using dry or wet grit or other abrasives. These methods of cleaning permanently erode the surface of the material and accelerate deterioration.

Using a cleaning method that involves water or liquid chemical solutions when there is any possibility of freezing temperatures.

Cleaning with chemical products that will damage masonry, such as using acid on limestone or marble, or leaving chemicals on masonry surfaces.

Applying high pressure water cleaning methods that will damage historic masonry and the mortar joints.

Removing paint that is firmly adhering to, and thus protecting, masonry surfaces.

Using methods of removing paint which are destructive to masonry, such as sandblasting, application of caustic solutions, or high pressure water-blasting.

Failing to follow manufacturers' product and application instructions when repainting masonry.

Using new paint colors that are inappropriate to the historic building and district.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of masonry features.

Removing non-deteriorated mortar from sound joints, then repointing the entire building to achieve a uniform appearance.

Using electric saws and hammers rather than hand tools to remove deteriorated mortar from joints prior to repointing.

Repointing with mortar of high portland cement content (unless it is the content of the historic mortar). This can often create a bond that is stronger than the historic material and can cause damage as a result of the differing coefficient of expansion and the differing porosity of the material and the mortar.

Repointing with a synthetic caulking compound.

Using a "scrub" coating technique to repoint instead of traditional repointing methods.

Changing the width or joint profile when repointing.

Removing sound stucco; or repairing with new stucco that is stronger than the historic material or does not convey the same visual appearance.

Applying cement stucco to unfired, unstabilized adobe. Because the cement stucco will not bond properly, moisture can become entrapped between materials, resulting in accelerated deterioration of the adobe.

Replacing an entire masonry feature such as a cornice or balustrade when repair of the masonry and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

Using a substitute material for the replacement part that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the masonry feature or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Applying waterproof, water-repellent, or non-historic coatings such as stucco to masonry as a substitute for repointing and masonry repairs. Coatings are frequently unnecessary, expensive, and may change the appearance of historic masonry as well as accelerate its deterioration.

Removing a masonry feature that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature that does not convey the same visual appearance.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced masonry feature is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

Introducing a new masonry feature that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

Wood: *Clapboard, weatherboard, shingles, and other wooden siding and decorative elements*

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving wood features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as siding, cornices, brackets, window architraves, and doorway pediments; and their paints, finishes, and colors.

Protecting and maintaining wood features by providing proper drainage so that water is not allowed to stand on flat, horizontal surfaces or accumulate in decorative features.

Applying chemical preservatives to wood features such as beam ends or outriggers that are exposed to decay hazards and are traditionally unpainted.

Retaining coatings such as paint that help protect the wood from moisture and ultraviolet light. Paint removal should be considered only where there is paint surface deterioration and as part of an overall maintenance program which involves repainting or applying other appropriate protective coatings.

Inspecting painted wood surfaces to determine whether repainting is necessary or if cleaning is all that is required.

Removing damaged or deteriorated paint to the next sound layer using the gentlest method possible (hand scraping and hand sanding), then repainting.

Using with care electric hot-air guns on decorative wood features and electric heat plates on flat wood surfaces when paint is so deteriorated that total removal is necessary prior to repainting.

Using chemical strippers primarily to supplement other methods such as hand scraping, hand sanding and the above-recommended thermal devices. Detachable wooden elements such as shutters, doors, and columns may - with the proper safeguards - be chemically dip-stripped.

Applying compatible paint coating systems following proper surface preparation.

Repainting with colors that are appropriate to the historic building and district.

Evaluating the overall condition of the wood to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, that is, if repairs to wood features will be necessary.

Repairing wood features by patching, piecing-in, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the wood using recognized preservation methods. Repair may also include the limited replacement in kind - or with compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of features where there are surviving prototypes such as brackets, moldings, or sections of siding.

Replacing in kind an entire wood feature that is too deteriorated to repair - if the overall form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. Examples of wood features include a cornice, entablature or balustrade. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Designing and installing a new wood feature such as a cornice or doorway when the historic feature is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

Not Recommended:

Removing or radically changing wood features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Removing a major portion of the historic wood from a facade instead of repairing or replacing only the deteriorated wood, then reconstructing the facade with new material in order to achieve a uniform or "improved" appearance.

Radically changing the type of finish or its color or accent scheme so that the historic character of the exterior is diminished.

Stripping historically painted surfaces to bare wood, then applying clear finishes or stains in order to create a "natural look."

Stripping paint or varnish to bare wood rather than repairing or reapplying a special finish, i.e., a grained finish to an exterior wood feature such as a front door.

Failing to identify, evaluate, and treat the causes of wood deterioration, including faulty flashing, leaking gutters, cracks and holes in siding, deteriorated caulking in joints and seams, plant material growing too close to wood surfaces, or insect or fungus infestation.

Using chemical preservatives such as creosote which can change the appearance of wood features unless they were used historically.

Stripping paint or other coatings to reveal bare wood, thus exposing historically coated surfaces to the effects of accelerated weathering.

Removing paint that is firmly adhering to, and thus, protecting wood surfaces.

Using destructive paint removal methods such as a propane or butane torches, sandblasting or waterblasting. These methods can irreversibly damage historic woodwork.

Using thermal devices improperly so that the historic woodwork is scorched.

Failing to neutralize the wood thoroughly after using chemicals so that new paint does not adhere.

Allowing detachable wood features to soak too long in a caustic solution so that the wood grain is raised and the surface roughened.

Failing to follow manufacturers' product and application instructions when repainting exterior woodwork.

Using new colors that are inappropriate to the historic buildings or district.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of wood features.

Replacing an entire wood feature such as a cornice or wall when repair of the wood and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

Using substitute materials for the replacement part that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the wood feature or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Removing an entire wood feature that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature that does not convey the same visual appearance.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Creating a false historic appearance because the replaced wood feature is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

Introducing a new wood feature that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

Structural System

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving structural systems - and individual features of systems - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building, such as post and beam systems, trusses, summer beams, vigas, cast iron columns, above-grade stone foundation walls, or loadbearing brick or stone walls.

Protecting and maintaining the structural system by cleaning the roof gutters and downspouts; replacing roof flashing; keeping masonry, wood, and architectural metals in a sound condition; and assuring that structural members are free from insect infestation.

Examining and evaluating the physical condition of the structural system and its individual features using non-destructive techniques such as X-ray photography.

Repairing the structural system by augmenting or upgrading individual parts or features. For example, weakened structural members such as floor framing can be spliced, braced, or otherwise supplemented and reinforced.

Replacing in kind - or with substitute material - those portions or features of the structural system that are either extensively deteriorated or are missing when there are surviving prototypes such as cast iron columns, roof rafters or trusses, or sections of load-bearing walls. Substitute material should convey the same form, design, and overall visual appearance as the historic feature; and, at a minimum, be equal to its load-bearing capabilities.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Limiting any new excavations adjacent to historic foundations to avoid undermining the structural stability of the building or adjacent historic buildings.

Correcting structural deficiencies in preparation for the new use in a manner that preserves the structural system and individual character-defining features.

Designing and installing new mechanical or electrical systems when required for the new use which minimize the number of cutouts or holes in structural members.

Adding a new floor when required for the new use if such an alteration does not damage or destroy the structural system or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining spaces, features, or finishes.

Creating an atrium or a light well to provide natural light when required for the new use in a manner that assures the preservation of the structural system as well as character-defining interior spaces, features, and finishes.

Not Recommended:

Removing, covering, or radically changing features of structural systems which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Putting a new use into the building which could overload the existing structural system; or installing equipment or mechanical systems which could damage the structure.

Demolishing a load-bearing masonry wall that could be augmented and retained and replacing it with a new wall (i.e., brick or stone), using the historic masonry only as an exterior veneer.

Leaving known structural problems untreated such as deflection of beams, cracking and bowing of walls, or racking of structural members.

Utilizing treatments or products that accelerate the deterioration of structural materials such as introducing urea-formaldehyde foam insulation into frame walls.

Failing to provide proper building maintenance on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of the structural system results.

Utilizing destructive probing techniques that will damage or destroy structural material.

Upgrading the building structurally in a manner that diminishes the historic character of the exterior, such as installing strapping channels or removing a decorative cornice; or damages interior features or spaces.

Replacing a structural member or other feature of the structural system when it could be augmented and retained.

Installing a replacement feature that does not convey the same visual appearance, e.g., replacing an exposed wood summer beam with a steel beam.

Using substitute material that does not equal the loadbearing capabilities of the historic material and design or is otherwise physically or chemically incompatible.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Carrying out excavations or re-grading adjacent to or within a historic building which could cause the historic foundation to settle, shift, or fail; or could have a similar effect on adjacent historic buildings.

Radically changing interior spaces or damaging or destroying features or finishes that are character-defining while trying to correct structural deficiencies in preparation for the new use.

Installing new mechanical and electrical systems or equipment in a manner which results in numerous cuts, splices, or alterations to the structural members.

Inserting a new floor when such a radical change damages a structural system or obscures or destroys interior spaces, features, or finishes.

Inserting new floors or furred-down ceilings which cut across the glazed areas of windows so that the exterior form and appearance of the windows are radically changed.

Damaging the structural system or individual features; or radically changing, damaging, or destroying character-defining interior spaces, features, or finishes in order to create an atrium or a light well.

Entrances and Porches

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving entrances - and their functional and decorative features - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as doors, fanlights, sidelights, pilasters, entablatures, columns, balustrades, and stairs.

Protecting and maintaining the masonry, wood, and architectural metal that comprise entrances and porches through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems.

Evaluating the overall condition of materials to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, that is, if repairs to entrance and porch features will be necessary.

Repairing entrances and porches by reinforcing the historic materials. Repair will also generally include the limited replacement in kind - or with compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of repeated features where there are surviving prototypes such as balustrades, cornices, entablatures, columns, sidelights, and stairs.

Replacing in kind an entire entrance or porch that is too deteriorated to repair - if the form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Designing and constructing a new entrance or porch if the historic entrance or porch is completely missing. It may be a restoration based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Designing enclosures for historic porches when required by the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building. This can include using large sheets of glass and recessing the enclosure wall behind existing scrollwork, posts, and balustrades.

Designing and installing additional entrances or porches when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building, i.e., limiting such alteration to non-character-defining elevations.

Not Recommended:

Removing or radically changing entrances and porches which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Stripping entrances and porches of historic material such as wood, iron, cast iron, terra cotta, tile and brick.

Removing an entrance or porch because the building has been reoriented to accommodate a new use.

Cutting new entrances on a primary elevation.

Altering utilitarian or service entrances so they appear to be formal entrances by adding paneled doors, fanlights, and sidelights.

Failing to provide adequate protection to materials on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of entrances and porches results.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of historic entrances and porches.

Replacing an entire entrance or porch when the repair of materials and limited replacement of parts are appropriate.

Using a substitute material for the replacement parts that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the entrance and porch or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Removing an entrance or porch that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new entrance or porch that does not convey the same visual appearance.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced entrance or porch is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

Introducing a new entrance or porch that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Enclosing porches in a manner that results in a diminution or loss of historic character such as using solid materials such as wood, stucco, or masonry.

Installing secondary service entrances and porches that are incompatible in size and scale with the historic building or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.

Roofs

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs - and their functional and decorative features - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting, chimneys, and weathervanes; and roofing material such as slate, wood, clay tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning.

Protecting and maintaining a roof by cleaning the gutters and downspouts and replacing deteriorated flashing. Roof sheathing should also be checked for proper venting to prevent moisture condensation and water penetration; and to insure that materials are free from insect infestation.

Providing adequate anchorage for roofing material to guard against wind damage and moisture penetration.

Protecting a leaking roof with plywood and building paper until it can be properly repaired.

Repairing a roof by reinforcing the historic materials which comprise roof features. Repairs will also generally include the limited replacement in kind - or with compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of features when there are surviving prototypes such as cupola louvers, dentils, dormer roofing; or slates, tiles, or wood shingles on a main roof.

Replacing in kind an entire feature of the roof that is too deteriorated to repair - if the overall form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. Examples can include a

large section of roofing, or a dormer or chimney. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Designing and constructing a new feature when the historic feature is completely missing, such as a chimney or cupola. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof such as air conditioning, transformers, or solar collectors when required for the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

Not Recommended:

Radically changing, damaging, or destroying roofs which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Removing a major portion of the roof or roofing material that is repairable, then reconstructing it with new material in order to create a uniform, or “improved” appearance.

Changing the configuration of a roof by adding new features such as dormer windows, vents, or skylights so that the historic character is diminished.

Stripping the roof of sound historic material such as slate, clay tile, wood, and architectural metal.

Applying paint or other coatings to roofing material which has been historically uncoated.

Failing to clean and maintain gutters and downspouts properly so that water and debris collect and cause damage to roof fasteners, sheathing, and the underlying structure.

Allowing roof fasteners, such as nails and clips to corrode so that roofing material is subject to accelerated deterioration.

Permitting a leaking roof to remain unprotected so that accelerated deterioration of historic building materials - masonry, wood, plaster, paint, and structural members - occurs.

Replacing an entire roof feature such as a cupola or dormer when repair of the historic materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

Using a substitute material for the replacement part that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the roof or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Removing a feature of the roof that is unrepairable, such as a chimney or dormer, and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature that does not convey the same visual appearance.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced feature is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

Introducing a new roof feature that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Installing mechanical or service equipment so that it damages or obscures character-defining features; or is conspicuous from the public right-of-way.

Radically changing a character-defining roof shape or damaging or destroying character-defining roofing material as a result of incompatible design or improper installation techniques.

Building Site

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character. Site features can include driveways, walkways, lighting, fencing, signs, benches, fountains, wells, terraces, canal systems, plants and trees, berms, and drainage or irrigation ditches; and archeological features that are important in defining the history of the site.

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space.

Protecting and maintaining buildings and the site by providing proper drainage to assure that water does not erode foundation wall; drain toward the building; nor erode the historic landscape.

Minimizing disturbance of terrain around buildings or elsewhere on the site, thus reducing the possibility of destroying unknown archeological materials.

Surveying areas where major terrain alteration is likely to impact important archeological sites.

Protecting, e.g. preserving in place known archeological material whenever possible.

Planning and carrying out any necessary investigation using professional archeologists and modern archeological methods when preservation in place is not feasible.

Protecting the building and other features of the site against arson and vandalism before rehabilitation work begins, i.e., erecting protective fencing and installing alarm systems that are keyed into local protection agencies.

Providing continued protection of masonry, wood, and architectural metals which comprise building and site features through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems; and continued protection and maintenance of landscape features, including plant material.

Evaluating the overall condition of materials to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, that is, if repairs to building and site features will be necessary.

Repairing features of buildings and the site by reinforcing the historic materials. Repair will also generally include replacement in kind - with a compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of features where there are surviving prototypes such as fencing and paving.

Replacing in kind an entire feature of the building or site that is too deteriorated to repair-if the overall form and detailing are still evident-using the physical evidence to guide the new work. This could include an entrance or porch, walkway, or fountain. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Designing and constructing a new feature of a building or site when the historic feature is completely missing, such as an outbuilding, terrace, or driveway. It may be based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building and site.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Designing new onsite parking, loading docks, or ramps when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of character-defining features of the site.

Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserve the historic relationship between a building or buildings, landscape features, and open space.

Removing nonsignificant buildings, additions, or site features which detract from the historic character of the site.

Not Recommended:

Removing or radically changing buildings and their features or site features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building site so that , as a result, the character is diminished.

Removing or relocating historic buildings or landscape features, thus destroying the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space.

Removing or relocating historic buildings on a site or in a complex of related historic structures - such as a mill complex or farm - thus diminishing the historic character of the site or complex.

Moving buildings onto the site, thus creating a false historical appearance.

Lowering the grade level adjacent to a building to permit development of a formerly below-grade area such as a basement in a manner that would drastically change the historic relationship of the building to its site.

Failing to maintain site drainage so that buildings and site features are damaged or destroyed; or, alternatively, changing the site grading so that water no longer drains properly.

Introducing heavy machinery or equipment into areas where their presence may disturb archeological materials.

Failing to survey the building site prior to the beginning of rehabilitation project work so that, as a result, important archeological material is destroyed.

Leaving known archeological material unprotected and subject to vandalism, looting, and destruction by natural elements such as erosion.

Permitting unqualified project personnel to perform data recovery so that improper methodology results in the loss of important archeological material.

Permitting buildings and site features to remain unprotected so that plant materials, fencing, walkways, archeological features, etc. are damaged or destroyed.

Stripping features from buildings and the site such as wood siding, iron fencing, masonry balustrades; or removing or destroying landscape features, including plant material.

Failing to provide adequate protection of materials on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of building and site features results.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of building and site features.

Replacing an entire feature of the building or site such as a fence, walkway, or driveway when repair of materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

Using a substitute material for the replacement part that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the building or site feature or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Removing a feature of the building or site that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature that does not convey the same visual appearance.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced feature is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

Introducing a new building or site feature that is out of scale or otherwise inappropriate.

Introducing a new landscape feature or plant material that is visually incompatible with the site or that destroys site patterns or vistas.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Placing parking facilities directly adjacent to historic buildings where automobiles may cause damage to the buildings or landscape features or be intrusive to the building site.

Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys historic relationships on the site.

Removing a historic building in a complex, a building feature, or a site feature which is important in defining the historic character of the site.

Master Plan for the Marcy Holmes Neighborhood
Adopted by the City Council 2004
Chapter 9. Historic Preservation

Historic Properties

Objective: Avoid the loss of historic properties.

Policies:

1. Encourage strong compliance with HPC permit guidelines in the Street Anthony Falls and Fifth Street Historic Districts and individually designated properties in the neighborhood and the Ard Godfrey House just outside the neighborhood.
2. The neighborhood supports preservation designation studies for the following properties or areas:
 - A. The Frey house (mansion) at 1206 5th Street SE that is part of the Heart of the Earth School
 - B. The Joseph Avery Wright house at 1126 5th Street SE
 - C. The John S. Lane house near at 625 8th Avenue SE
 - D. The Southeast Community Library building at the corner of 13th Street and 4th Avenue
 - E. The old Pillsbury Library building at 100 University Avenue SE
 - F. Dinkytown
 - G. Steel Structures Building
 - H. Ninth Street industrial buildings
 - I. Star Machine – 6th Street and Second Avenue
3. The issue of historic preservation designation for the fraternity and sorority houses in the neighborhood should be more widely discussed.

Historical Character

Objective: Preserve the historical character of the area. The neighborhood is defined by narrow, tree-lined streets, large older houses, mostly low rise apartment buildings, fraternities and sororities, Dinkytown, the Mississippi River and adjacent riverbanks, and industries.

Policies:

1. Preserve such landscapes as Dinkytown, the Mississippi River area and the fraternity and sorority areas in the neighborhood.
2. Preserve the old Pillsbury library, now an art gallery, at Central Avenue and University Avenue and the newer Southeast Community library buildings.
3. Devise programs to encourage rehabilitation and conversion of multi-family dwellings to their original single-family home use in the single-family core of the neighborhood.
4. Provide information to property owners and renters about the historic character of the area and increase the general awareness and sensitivity about the historic nature of the buildings.
5. Develop grant or loan programs for property owners to repair their buildings.
6. Provide more accessible property information, including historic preservation regulations, to prospective buyers and property owners. Try to include preservation information on the Planning Department's web site.
7. There should be some flexibility with codes -- other than life safety codes -- when applied to older buildings. Codes are rigidly enforced when permits are sought. Remodeling requires updating to current code requirements. This can be very costly and discourage updating.
8. Simplify the City's permit system so that it is not so confusing and complicated and encourages reinvestment.
9. Enforce this plan's design guidelines for new developments.

D. FINDINGS:

1. The Florence Court Apartment building at 1022 University Avenue Southeast is a locally historic designated resource.
2. Florence Court is located on a parcel that includes six non-contributing structures, including five residential structures and one detached garage.
3. The proposed rehabilitation of Florence Court includes repair or replacement of exterior features such as masonry, wood siding, foundation, roofing, front porches and rear balconies, and landscape changes.
4. Proposed repairs to the exterior materials of the building including repairing and replacing masonry and wood siding. The masonry repairs are consistent with the Standards that call for identifying, retaining, and preserving masonry features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as walls, joint and unit size, and color. Cleaning and repair of the masonry should employ the gentlest methods available to limit future damage.
5. The proposed repair to the wood siding is consistent with the Standards that call for identifying, retaining, and preserving wood features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as siding, cornices, brackets, window architraves, and doorway pediments; and their paints, finishes, and colors. The applicant states that either cedar or a fiber cement board would be used; staff recommends that cedar is used so that wood is the consistent material, and not a substitute.
6. Repairs to the structure of the building includes repairing the foundation and replacing the roof shingles. Both types of work are consistent with the Standards that call for identifying, retaining, and preserving structural systems and roofs. While the foundation work may not be visible from the exterior, the condition of the foundation does contribute to other exterior features, like the walls. The proposed changes include replacement shingle similar to the existing reddish-brown color and pattern.
7. The proposed changes to the porches and rear balconies include repairing or replacing material, in kind, on an as-needed basis, with either painted cedar or cement fiberboard to match the existing profile. The applicant states that either cedar or a fiber cement board would be used; staff recommends that cedar is used so that wood is the consistent material, and not a substitute. The rear balconies are not the original materials or structure, but are needed as a means of egress. The applicant proposed to also repair or replace these on an as-needed basis.
8. The applicant proposed that one of the first updates to Florence Court is the replacement of the original boiler. While the interior heating system is not needed to be reviewed for preservation related issues, this system does contribute to the overall maintenance of the building. The applicant has stated that this system is in great need of replacement and intends to have a new heating system installed prior to this fall/winter. Future updates also include electrical and plumbing updates. While these interior changes are not necessarily subject to HPC approval, the information about the overall plan for repair and maintenance is important because many of these updates are over-due.

9. The proposed changes to the interior courtyard are consistent with many of the Standards guidelines for site, including retaining and preserving the relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space. The proposed changes to the courtyard, including reconfiguring the “U” shaped driveway, are based on historical records, including plat maps. Removing the existing cement and dirt parking spaces with the new drive and green space does preserve the interior courtyard that the historical structure is noted for being designed around. The inclusion of the proposed 5 parking space is less obtrusive than the existing site layout that includes up to 30 parking spaces.

E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the HPC adopt staff findings and **approve** a Certificate of Appropriateness for signage, subject to the following conditions:

1. Submission of a foundation repair and maintenance plan must be reviewed by the Heritage Preservation Commission prior to building permits issued for new construction onsite.
2. Any rehabilitation of the site must not develop the traditional “U” shaped interior courtyard. This includes limiting the amount of parking and paving surface to be included in the courtyard. A detailed landscape plan, including existing and proposed species shall be submitted to the Heritage Preservation Commission prior to any moving or demolition permit.
3. Final drawings including plans, elevations and details shall be reviewed and approved by the Heritage Preservation Commission.

F. ATTACHMENTS

- I. Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness and Historic Variance, pages 1-7
 - A. Rehabilitation of Florence Court, pages 8-10
 - B. New Construction, page 11
 - C. Removal/Demolition of five residential structures, pages 12-19
 - D. Historic variance to allow two principal residential structures
- II. Land Use study of Florence Court and Adjacent Property, prepared by Hess, Roise, and Company, pages 20-36
- III. Description of Rehabilitation Work of Florence Court, pages 37-57
- IV. Structural reports (including photographs) for No. 1018, pages 58-75
- V. Site plan, elevation drawings and renderings of proposed redevelopment
 - A. Existing site plan, page 76
 - B. Florence Court floor plans, pages 77-80
 - C. Florence Court elevation drawings, pages 81-82
 - D. Proposed site plan with new construction and landscape changes, page 83
 - E. Elevation drawings of the proposed new construction and renderings, pages 84-87
- VI. City Council Actions, July 15, 198, in regards to the local historic designation of Florence Court, page 88
- VII. National Register of Historic Places – Nomination Form for Florence Court, 89-105
- VIII. Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps for No. 19, No. 20, No. 25, and No. 27, 106-107
- IX. Building permit histories for No. 19, No. 20, No. 25, No. 27, and No. 1018
- X. Correspondence received, pages 108-126

XI. Map of Florence court, page 127