

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

FILE NAME: 4536 Dupont Avenue South

CATEGORY/DISTRICT: Historic Resource

CLASSIFICATION: Demolition of an Historic Resource

APPLICANT: Michael & Stacy Sullivan, (612) 282-8428

DATE OF APPLICATION: August 14, 2008

PUBLICATION DATE: September 9, 2008

DATE OF HEARING: September 16, 2008

APPEAL PERIOD EXPIRATION: September 26, 2008

STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Brian Schaffer (612) 673-2670

REQUEST: Demolition of an Historic Resource

A. BACKGROUND & DESCRIPTION:

The single family dwelling located at 4536 Dupont Avenue South was constructed in 1905 by W.O. Clark for William P. Barton for a cost of \$4,100. The two-and-a-half story structure is designed in the Prairie style. The southern and eastern facades of the structure are dominated by two enclosed one-story porches that were added in 1917. The two porches are anchored by brick columns that extend approximately three feet above the roofline of the porches. Horizontal wood siding clads the exterior walls and dormers of the building. The eaves of the structure are supported by a simple repeated bracket design.

The structure has an approximate foot print of 1,300 square feet and sits on a lot that is 98 feet wide and 257 feet deep (approximately 25,000 square feet). The site also contains a 16 by 21 foot garage that was originally constructed in 1912.

B. CONSIDERATIONS FOR POTENTIAL HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE

The Minneapolis Code of Ordinances, Title 23, Heritage Preservation, Chapter 599 Heritage Preservation Regulations states that before approving the demolition of a property determined to be an historic resource, the commission shall make findings that the demolition is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property, or that there are no reasonable alternatives to the demolition. In determining whether reasonable alternatives exist, the commission shall consider, but not be limited to, the significance of the property, the integrity of the property and the economic value or usefulness of the existing structure, including its current use, costs of renovation and feasible alternative uses. The commission may delay a final decision for a reasonable period of time to allow parties interested in preserving the historic resource a reasonable opportunity to act to protect it.

Significance of the Property as part of a Potential Historic District

A 2005 Historic Resource Inventory of Southwest Minneapolis identified an area containing the subject property as the Lynnhurst Potential Historic District:

This concentration of homes is located along the southwestern shores of Lake Harriet and is associated with the development of the Lynnhurst Addition of the city plat. The area identified is bounded by 42nd Street West on the north; 48th Street West on the south; Dupont Avenue South on the east; and Lake Harriet Boulevard East on the west. This area includes an additional two-block area south of the Lynnhurst Addition. The area was delineated to include homes that display comparable architectural styles, form, massing, and character with comparable lot sizes and set backs that provide a consistent setting.

Originally labeled the “Colony,” the area was owned by the local firm Loring and Brown in the late-nineteenth century. In an effort to promote residential development near the lakes, the firm offered to give away lots along the current Fremont Avenue South with the condition that the new residents construct homes costing at least \$3,000. In 1893, nine prominent families, including E.W. Decker, Maude Armatage, James McClanahan, Douglas Lansing, John Rickel, Frank C. Metcalf, George Tuttle, Douglas Fiske, and John Baxter, moved to the 4600-block of Fremont Avenue South. The families remained isolated for more than a decade during which time local history indicates the area acquired the name “Lynnhurst” due to the abundance of linden trees.

In 1903, the Lynnhurst Addition was platted by Clinton Morrison and was developed by David C. Bell. The addition was comprised of a tract of land bounded on the north by 42nd Street West; 46th Street West on the south; Dupont Avenue South on the east; and the shores of Lake Harriet on the west. The wide tree-lined boulevard along Dupont Avenue South and 46th Street West was renamed King’s Highway and adds character to the Lynnhurst area. Subsequent neighborhood development attracted wealthy citizens of Minneapolis that included bankers and city officials.

The Lynnhurst Potential Residential Historic District appears to be a good candidate for local landmark designation, under *Criterion 5* as a significant pattern of development and under *Criterion 4* for architecture, and/or for the National Register under *Criterion A: Community Planning and Development* and *Criterion C: Architecture*.

The structure was built for William P. Barton for \$4,100 in 1905. The value of the structure, its location and date of construction are consistent with the “Colony” and the platting of the Lynnhurst addition.

Photos of surrounding properties indicate that the potential Lynnhurst district is populated by a variety of architectural styles common to the first twenty years of the twentieth century, including the Prairie style of the subject structure. The property does exemplify the community planning principles that drove development in this community, in terms of age, setbacks, orientation, lot sizes, and cost which contribute to the eligibility of the potential Lynnhurst Historic District.

Individual Significance of Property

The Lynnhurst Potential Historic District is eligible for local designation under the following criteria:

- (4) The property embodies the distinctive characteristics of an architectural or engineering type or style, or method of construction.

- (5) The property exemplifies a landscape design or development pattern distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness or quality of design or detail.

The 2005 CLG Survey of Southwest Minneapolis does not identify the property as being individually eligible for local or national designation.

The property was built for William P. Barton, who lived in the structure between 1905 and 1916. William P. Barton had a variety of jobs during his life. In 1900 he was the Assistant State Weighmaster and in 1904 he held the positions of Superintendent of the Poor and the Secretary of the Board of Charities and Corrections in Minneapolis. In 1908 the Minneapolis City Directory has him working as a lawyer. While William P. Barton held various employment at the State of Minnesota and Minneapolis there is currently no evidence that his contributions to Minneapolis could be considered significant enough to merit designation.

This prairie style structure was constructed without the aid of an architect or designer and does not exemplify the works of a master architect. The addition of the two porches were constructed with the aid of an architect and added flair to the structure.

Physical Integrity of Property

In August 2008 the applicant had a feasibility report for the repair and rehabilitation of the structure at 4536 Dupont Avenue South. The report was prepared by Jespen Inc Construction Services and includes a description of the evaluated materials followed by a summary of necessary repairs to correct the deficiencies. The report evaluates the roof, the first and second floor areas, the basement and the exterior siding, soffit, and fascia.

Roof

The report states that the roof has experienced major settling and bowing. There is rot and visible mold due to water intrusion. Jespen Inc. recommends that the roof be replaced as they “see no way to properly repair the roof.”

First and Second Floor

The floor is buckling from moisture and there is visible mold growth. The windows appear to have been leaking and show signs of water intrusion. The report states that the kitchen appears to be added at some point and has no footing or frost footing. Jespen estimates that 50 – 60 percent of the exterior framing needs to be replaced and the stairway needs to be removed completely and reframed.

Basement

The report states that there is a large void under the concrete slab near the chimney base and that the concrete slab has heaved in many spots. There appears to be no footings under the basement walls and there are “extreme” amounts of mold on the walls. Jespen states that the concrete slab needs to be removed and footing need to be added. Jespen further states that shoring up the stone foundation may not be possible and the cost for shoring up may exceed \$25,000 and that the owners may want to consider a new foundation.

Exterior siding, soffit, and fascia

The report states that the soffit and fascia of the entire house have failed due to roof failure and neglect and that 80-90 percent of wall sheathing needs to be removed due to water intrusion and roof and window failure.

Economic Value of the Existing Structure:

The Hennepin County Assessor states the 2008 estimated market value of the parcel is \$765,500 with a land market value of \$723,700 and the building market value of \$41,800. The property was acquired by Stacy and Michael Sullivan in May 2008 for \$801,168.

The applicant has submitted a cost estimate to remove and disinfect the mold in the structure at \$47,400. This cost to remediate the mold exceeds the estimated building value of \$41,800. This estimate does not include the cost to replace the roof or the cost to shore up the foundation.

Usefulness of the Existing Structure:

The Minneapolis Assessor’s office states that the structure has 5 bedrooms, 4 bathrooms, and has a building area of 2,673 square feet. The applicant has not provided information regarding the usefulness of the structure. However, the applicant has provided an analysis of the condition of the structure and a cost estimate to remediate the mold.

C. PROPOSED CHANGES:

The applicant is proposing to demolish the structure at 4536 Dupont Avenue South and construct a new single family home on the site. The proposed structure is designed in a revival style and is much larger than the existing structure. The existing structure is 2,673 square feet and the proposed structure is 8,536 square feet with an attached garage in the rear. The proposed structure is approximately 120 feet deep, which is much larger than the existing structure or many of the adjacent structures.

Due to Zoning Ordinance requirements the structure will have a similar front yard setback as the adjacent structures. The proposed home meets the minimum requirements for Site Plan Review and receives 15 points out of an available 24 points for including the following features: a basement, having a stucco exterior, having at 10 percent windows on the interior and rear facing facades, having a roof pitch greater than 6/12 and having a deciduous tree in the front yard.

If constructed the proposed home will be noncontributing to the potential Lynnhurst Historic District, but its architectural style, orientation and front yard setback will be compatible with those found in the district.

D. APPLICABLE ORDINANCES:

Chapter 599. Heritage Preservation Regulation

ARTICLE V DESIGNATION

599.210. Designation criteria. The following criteria shall be considered in determining whether a property is worthy of designation as a landmark or historic district because of its historical, cultural, architectural, archaeological or engineering significance:

- (1) The property is associated with significant events or with periods that exemplify broad patterns of cultural, political, economic or social history.
- (2) The property is associated with the lives of significant persons or groups.
- (3) The property contains or is associated with distinctive elements of city identity.
- (4) The property embodies the distinctive characteristics of an architectural or engineering type or style, or method of construction.
- (5) The property exemplifies a landscape design or development pattern distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness or quality of design or detail.
- (6) The property exemplifies works of master builders, engineers, designers, artists, craftsmen or architects.
- (7) The property has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

599.230. Commission decision on nomination. The commission shall review all complete nomination applications. If the commission determines that a nominated property appears to meet at least one of the criteria for designation contained in section 599.210, the commission may direct the planning director to commence a designation study of the property. (2001-Or-029, § 1, 3-2-01)

599.240. Interim protection. (a) Purpose. Interim protection is established to protect a nominated property from destruction or inappropriate alteration during the designation process.

(b) *Effective date.* Interim protection shall be in effect from the date of the commission's decision to commence a designation study of a nominated property until the city council makes a decision regarding the designation of the property, or for twelve (12) months, whichever comes first. Interim protection may be extended for such additional periods as the commission may deem appropriate and necessary to protect the designation process, not exceeding a total additional period of eighteen (18) months. The commission shall hold a public hearing on a proposed extension of interim protection as provided in section 599.170.

(c) *Scope of restrictions.* During the interim protection period, no alteration or minor alteration of a nominated property shall be allowed except where authorized by a certificate of appropriateness or a certificate of no change, as provided in this chapter. (2001-Or-029, § 1, 3-2-01)

A. ARTICLE VIII. HISTORIC RESOURCES

599.440. Purpose. This article is established to protect historic resources from destruction by providing the planning director with authority to identify historic resources and to review and approve or deny all proposed demolitions of property.

599.450. Identification of historic resources The planning director shall identify properties that are believed to meet at least one of the criteria for designation contained in section 599.210, but that have not been designated. In determining whether a property is an historic resource, the planning director may refer to building permits and other property information regularly maintained by the director of inspections, property inventories prepared by or directed to be prepared by the planning director, observations of the property by the planning director or any other source of information reasonably believed to be relevant to such determination.

599.460. Review of demolition permits. The planning director shall review all applications for a demolition permit to determine whether the affected property is an historic resource. If the planning director determines that the property is not an historic resource, the demolition permit shall be approved. If the planning director determines that the property is an historic resource, the demolition permit shall not be issued without review and approval by the commission following a public hearing as provided in section 599.170.

599.470. Application for demolition of historic resource. An application for demolition of an historic resource shall be filed on a form approved by the planning director and shall be accompanied by all required supporting information, as specified in section 599.160.

599.480. Commission decision. (a) *In general.* If the commission determines that the property is not an historic resource, the commission shall approve the demolition permit. If the commission determines that the property is an historic resource, the commission shall deny the demolition permit and direct the planning director to commence a designation study of the property, as provided in section 599.230, or shall approve the demolition permit as provided in this section.

(b) *Destruction of historic resource.* Before approving the demolition of a property determined to be an historic resource, the commission shall make findings that the demolition is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property, or that there are no reasonable alternatives to the demolition. In determining whether reasonable alternatives exist, the commission shall consider, but not be limited to, the significance of the property, the integrity of the property and the economic value or usefulness of the existing structure, including its current use, costs of renovation and feasible alternative uses. The commission may delay a final decision for a reasonable period of time to allow parties interested in preserving the historic resource a reasonable opportunity to act to protect it.

(c) *Mitigation plan.* The commission may require a mitigation plan as a condition of any approval for demolition of an historic resource. Such plan may include the documentation of the property by measured drawings, photographic recording, historical research or other means appropriate to the significance of the property. Such plan also may include the salvage and preservation of specified building materials, architectural details, ornaments, fixtures and similar items for use in restoration elsewhere.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (1990)

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.

-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.

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

E. FINDINGS:

1. 4536 Dupont Avenue South was identified as part of collection of properties identified as part of the Lynnhurst Potential Historic District in the 2005 CLG Resource Study and inventory is Southwest Minneapolis.
2. The property is eligible for local designation as part of a potential historic district. The property is not individually eligible for local designation.
3. The applicant has submitted a feasibility report prepared by Jespen Inc Construction Services. The report identified roof and window deficiencies that have caused water intrusion and visible mold and structural deficiencies that need shoring and replacement. In the inspector's opinion "considering the structural liabilities, this house is not salvageable."

4. The 2008 assessed value of the parcel is \$765,500 with \$723,700 attributed to the value of the land and the \$41,800 attributed to the structure.
5. The proposed replacement structure has a revival style influence which is an architectural type that is found within the Potential Lynnhurst Historic District. The proposed structure will be substantially larger than the existing structure, but it will have setbacks and orientation similar to the surrounding structures.

F. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission adopt staff findings and **approve** the demolition application of the property at 4536 Dupont Avenue South with the following conditions:

1. A photographic recordation of the property shall be prepared and submitted to staff that is in accordance with the guidelines of the Minnesota Historic Property Record. The recordation shall include all interior and exterior spaces including outbuildings and site design.
2. The applicant shall provide the opportunity for a salvage organization to bid on the salvage of materials from the structure.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Applicant Statement and Photographs
2. Map of Potential Lynnhurst Historic District
3. Erickson Enterprises Estimate to Abate Mold
4. Jepsen Inc Construction Services Feasibility Report with Photographs
5. Plans for the proposed home