

# **ATTACHMENT 3**

## **CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION STAFF REPORT**

---

FILE NAME: 1700 Third Avenue South  
DATE OF APPLICATION: January 7, 2005  
APPLICANT: Scott Walters Construction  
DATE OF HEARING: February 8, 2005  
HPC SITE/DISTRICT: Amos B. Coe House, Individual Designation  
CATEGORY: Contributing  
CLASSIFICATION: Certificate of Appropriateness  
STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Greg Mathis  
DATE: February 2, 2005

---

### **A. SITE DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND:**

The Amos B. Coe House is a 2½-story, Queen Anne style brick residence built in 1884 on the corner of Third Avenue South and East 17<sup>th</sup> Street. Constructed for Minneapolis real estate developer Amos B. Coe, the house features a multi-gable roof, limestone trim, decorative brickwork and one-over-one windows. The main entrance (east) is set in a large front porch with a hip roof. A small, second story balcony is located above the main entrance. A rectangular tower anchors the northeast corner of the house, facing the intersection. An Eastlake balcony is located next to the tower on the north elevation, along with a polygonal bay and a large side porch. The south elevation is defined by a massive chimney and a rectangular bay. A two-story, brick carriage house is located behind the house.

The front (east) porch has been altered several times over the past 120 years. This porch originally had a hip roof with a flat section surrounded by a balustrade, a projected gable entry, and guard rails that swooped down between turned columns. In the 1920s or 1930s the front porch was substantially rebuilt with a new roof line, straight (horizontal) guardrails and concrete steps flanked by knee walls. At a later date, the turned columns and spindle work balustrade were replaced by square columns and tongue and groove spandrels. On September 25, 2002, staff approved a Certificate of No Change (CNC), to allow a previous contractor to repair the front porch in-kind. As the contractor started to disassemble the porch, they determined that complete replacement was needed. On December 9, 2003, the Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) approved a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow the front porch to be rebuilt in a manner that was similar to the original 1884 design, but with straight guardrails and tongue and groove spandrels in lieu of the original swooped guardrails and spindle work balustrade.

Unlike the front porch, the north side porch has remained relatively intact over time. In the summer of 2003, as the previous contractor started work on the front porch, the contractor

disassembled the north side porch. This work was done without HPC approval. When this contractor was replaced by the applicant in 2004, the north porch was still disassembled. On August 1, 2004, staff approved a CNC to allow the applicant to repair/rebuild this porch in-kind (see Attachment 1. However, instead of being rebuilt in-kind, with 28” tall guardrails and a spindle work balustrade, the porch was rebuild with 36” tall guardrails and the spindle work balustrade was replaced with solid tongue and groove spandrel panels that are similar to the front porch.

## **B. PROPOSED CHANGES:**

The applicant is applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness for work that is partially completed. The proposal calls for rebuilding the north side porch to match the front porch. As proposed, the distinctive turned columns on the porch will be replaced with turned columns that match the columns that were used on the new front porch. The applicant is also proposing replace the 28” tall guardrails and the turned spindle balustrade with 36” tall guardrails with wood, tongue and groove spandrel panels that match the new front porch. The roof and spindle work frieze will be repaired/rebuilt in-kind as needed.

## **C. GUIDELINE CITATIONS:**

### ***THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR’S STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION (1990)***

#### **Wood: *Clapboard, weather-board, 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.

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

#### **Not Recommended:**

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

-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.

#### **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.

-Replacing in kind an entire feature of the roof that is too deteriorated to repair - if the overall form and detailing are still evidence - 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.

-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.

**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.

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

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

**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.

-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.

**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.

-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.

-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.

**D. FINDINGS:**

1. The Amos B. Coe House is an individually designated landmark property.
2. The north side porch is a character defining feature of the house.
3. The north side porch, as it existed at the start of 2003, had rotted wood that was deteriorated and in need of repair or replacement.
4. A previous contractor disassembled the north side porch in 2003 without HPC approval. Prior to its disassembly in 2003, the porch retained its historic design and appearance.
5. On August 1, 2004 the HPC staff approved a Certificate of No Change to allow the applicant to repair the north porch in-kind. However, the porch was not repaired in-kind, as approved by the Certificate of No Change.

6. The proposed work does not comply with the *Standard* that recommends “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.” Additionally, the proposed work does not comply with the *Standard* that recommends “replacing in kind an entire entrance or porch that is too deteriorated to repair.”
7. The proposed work does not comply with the *Standard* that recommends against “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.”
8. The replacing a turned spindle balustrade with a tongue and groove spandrel panel does not comply with the *Standard* that recommends against “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.”
9. The proposed work and the new porch design will compromise the historic integrity and the architectural character of the property, and will convert the one-air porch into a semi-enclosed space. Moreover, the proposed design does not comply with the *Standards* that recommend against “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” and against “creating a false historical appearance because the replaced entrance or porch is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.”

**E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the HPC adopt staff findings, deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work and direct the applicant to comply with the Certificate of No Change that was approved by staff on August 1, 2004.