

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED)
Certificate of Appropriateness
BZH-28021

Date: December 10, 2013

Applicant: Saint Anthony Main Phase II, LLP

Address of Property: 212 2nd Street SE

Project Name: 212 2nd Street SE Event Center

Contact Person and Phone: Amy Meller, MacDonald and Mack Architects, (612) 341-4051

CPED Staff and Phone: Kimberly Holien, Senior Planner, (612) 673-2402

Date Application Deemed Complete: November 18, 2013

Appeal Period Expiration: December 20, 2013

End of 60-Day Decision Period: January 17, 2014

End of 120-Day Decision Period: March 18, 2014

Ward: 3

Neighborhood Organization: Marcy Holmes

Proposed Use: Reception/meeting hall

Concurrent Review: Not applicable for this application

Proposal:

- A 7,761 square foot rooftop deck on the west side of the building.
- Removal of an existing penthouse.
- Extension of two existing stairwells up to the roof for access.
- A 381 square foot elevator addition (187 square foot lobby plus elevator).
- A 297 square foot service bar addition.
- A 133 square foot storage addition.

Applicant: Amy Meller, MacDonald and Mack Architects, (612) 341-4051

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-28021

CLASSIFICATION:	
Historic District	Saint Anthony Falls Historic District (Non-contributing property)
Period of Significance	1848-1941
Criteria of significance	Architecture and Social Significance
Date of local designation	1971
Applicable Design Guidelines	<i>Saint Anthony Falls Historic District Guidelines, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties</i>

PROPERTY INFORMATION	
Current name	212 SE 2 nd Street Event Center
Historic Name	Salisbury and Satterlee Company
Current Address	212 2 nd Street SE
Historic Address	116-120 2 nd Avenue SE
Original Construction Date	1906
Original Contractor	August Cedarstrand
Architects	Unknown
Historic Use	Office
Current Use	Reception/meeting hall
Proposed Use	Reception/meeting hall

BACKGROUND: The falls of St. Anthony were instrumental in the development of Minnesota's largest city in all its stages of growth. In addition to its original natural beauty, the falls furnished direct power to the lumber and flour industries and electrical power for industrial and residential use. Centered on this influential landmark, the Saint Anthony Falls Historic District reveals the origins and early history of Minneapolis.

The applicant is proposing to construct a rooftop deck and three small building additions atop the building at 212 2nd Avenue SE. This two-story building, now part of the Saint Anthony Main complex, was constructed in 1906 as a factory and warehouse by the Salisbury and Satterlee Company. The building is contributing in the Saint Anthony Falls Historic District. The Salisbury and Satterlee Company, a mattress and bed factory, was built in five sections beginning in 1885. Architect Frederick Clarke designed the five-story red brick building at 221 Main Street Southeast for the Salisbury and Satterlee Company in 1892. In 1901, a 40-foot by 125-foot brick foundry was constructed along the building's west side. In 1906, a two-story brick addition stretched west to Second Street SE. This addition is the subject of the current Certificate of Appropriateness application. In 1909, Bertrand and Chamberlain designed the addition at 201-205 Main Street Southeast. In 1977, the new owners of the factory buildings, the Jefferson Company, commissioned Ben Thompson and Associates of Cambridge, Massachusetts, to devise a four-part master plan for the reuse of the buildings as retail shops and restaurants. One new infill structure was added to link the 1885 building with the 1892 building. (These are in the middle of the block.) A projecting three-story elevator pavilion was added on the Second Avenue side at the juncture of the 1906 section and the 1909 section. A one-story metal and glass entrance pavilion was added at ground level close to the Main Street front. Another metal and glass

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-28021

pavilion was added to the Second Street side of the original buildings. Decks, patios, stairs, ramps, and metal canopies sheltering the decks were added to the exteriors of the various buildings. A solarium addition was also constructed on the north side of the building in the 1980's. All the additions and infill were intended to enhance the reuse of the buildings.

The subject site is bordered by the 1980 Winslow House condo building to the west, a surface parking lot to the north, the recently constructed Phoenix Lofts building to the east and the remainder of the Saint Anthony Main complex to the south.

SUMMARY OF APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL:

The applicant is proposing to construct a 7,671 square foot roof deck above the building at 212 2nd Street SE. The deck will accommodate catered events related to the 212 2nd Street SE Event Center. Said event center is located within the 1906 addition of the Salisbury and Satterlee complex described above, and the 1980's solarium addition. The proposed roof deck would primarily be above the contributing 1906 addition. The existing roof of the building is in two sections. A flat-roof covers the west side of the building. This portion of roof contains a low penthouse with clerestory windows near the south parapet. Existing mechanical equipment is located at the transition between the two roof sections. The east section of the roof has a slightly higher parapet and is divided into two low-sloped gabled roofs. The eastern section also has a low penthouse with clerestory windows. The proposed deck will be located on the western portion of the roof.

The proposed deck will have a setback 11'3" from the north building wall and 11'3" from the west building wall. The deck will extend to the edge of the south building wall to provide access to the existing stair. The deck will be surrounded by a railing constructed of clear tempered glass panels attached to a 2-inch by 0.5-inch painted steel guardrail in dark bronze to minimize visibility. As part of the project, the existing penthouse will be removed. The deck consists of a raised concrete paver and drainage system over a new structural deck framing system. The finished floor of the deck will be even with the top of the parapet. The parapet is not proposed to be impacted by the project.

In addition to the decking system, a series of small additions are proposed to accommodate the rooftop space. Two existing stairs will be extended to provide roof access; one near the center of the roof deck on the north side and one in the southeast corner. A new elevator is proposed on the north side of the building within the solarium addition. This elevator tower will be approximately 194 square feet in area and an adjacent elevator lobby is proposed at 187 square feet in area. A 297-square foot service bar addition is proposed on the east side of the roof deck, near existing mechanical equipment, and a 133 square foot storage addition is proposed adjacent to the stair in the southeast corner of the roof. The elevator tower, service bar, storage area and southeast stair tower are proposed to be clad in brick that matches the 1980's solarium addition. The other stair tower in the center of the roof will be clad in bronze metal panels. All additions will have a dark bronze parapet cap.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Staff has not received any public comment regarding the proposed project. Any correspondence received will be forwarded to the Commission for review.

Findings as required by the Minneapolis Preservation Code:

The Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development Department has analyzed the application based on the findings required by the Minneapolis Preservation Ordinance. Before approving a certificate of appropriateness, and based upon the evidence presented in each application submitted, the commission shall make findings based upon, but not limited to, the following:

(1) The alteration is compatible with and continues to support the criteria of significance and period of significance for which the landmark or historic district was designated.

As conditioned, the proposed project is compatible with the criteria of significance and period of significance for which the historic district was designated. The Saint Anthony Falls Historic District is significant for its architecture, commerce, industry and transportation. The District's period of significance is from 1848-1941. The existing structure was built as an addition to the Salisbury and Satterlee complex during the period of significance, in 1906. The proposed roof deck will have minimal impact on surrounding properties. The applicant is proposing a transparent rail surrounding the dining space and setbacks of 11'3" from the north and west building walls. To further minimize the impact on adjacent properties, staff is recommending that the rooftop deck step back 10 feet from the south building wall from a point beginning at the east edge of the 1909 addition. A walkway that is a maximum of four feet in width will be permitted to connect the dining space to the stair in the southeast corner of the roof. The increased setback will reduce the deck's visibility from Main Street.

(2) The alteration is compatible with and supports the interior and/or exterior designation in which the property was designated.

The proposed alterations to this contributing structure will be compatible with the Saint Anthony Falls Historic District as they will maintain the character and general appearance of the existing structure. The Saint Anthony Falls Historic District is significant for its architecture, commerce, industry, and transportation. The subject building is not individually designated for its interior or exterior. The existing penthouse that is proposed for removal was constructed well after the period of significance. The proposed additions are minimal in size and located in a manner that will minimize visibility from the street. The additions are proposed to be clad in brick and metal panels that are consistent with the design of the historic building but differentiated so as to not provide a false sense of history. Staff is recommending a 10-foot setback from the south building wall for the center portion of the roof deck in order to minimize visibility from Main Street.

(3) The alteration is compatible with and will ensure continued integrity of the landmark or historic district for which the district was designated.

Both the City of Minneapolis' Heritage Preservation Regulations and the National Register of Historic Places identify integrity as the authenticity of historic properties and recognize seven aspects that define a property's integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. Based upon the evidence provided below, the proposed work would not impair the integrity of the property:

Location: The applicant is not proposing to change the contributing resource's location, thus the project will not impair the integrity of location.

Design: The overall design of the historic building will remain unchanged. Two of the three additions are clustered in the center of the building near existing mechanical equipment to minimize visibility from the street. The elevator overrun on the north side of the building is more prominent, but is located

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-28021

as proposed so that the elevator can be constructed within the non-contributing 1980's addition. The proposed work is reversible and will not impact the existing parapet.

Setting: The proposed alterations to the exterior of the building will not impact the integrity of the setting for this property or other properties within the district.

Materials: The proposed work will not result in the loss of any historic material from the building that dates from the period of significance. According to historic aerial photos, the existing penthouse on the impacted portion of the roof is not original to the building and was constructed after the period of significance. This penthouse was likely constructed as part of a series of alterations in the late 1970's when the building was converted to retail and office. As proposed, the design for the roofdeck will not impact the historic parapet. Staff has also included a condition of approval requiring that the proposed railing not impact the existing parapet. The proposed materials for the additions are compatible with the existing structure and the industrial character of the historic district. The metal panel proposed on the north stair matches the metal panel on some existing rooftop mechanical equipment. The other additions will be clad in brick that matches the 1980's solarium addition.

Workmanship: The work proposed at this time will not have any impact on the structure's integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: As conditioned, the proposed roof deck and associated additions will not impact the property's integrity of feeling. The applicant is proposing setbacks of 11'3" from the north and west elevations. Staff is further recommending a 10-foot setback from the south building wall for the center portion of the roof deck. The additional setback recommended by staff will minimize the deck's visibility from Main Street and further preserve the integrity of feeling for this contributing structure.

Association: The project will not impair the property's integrity of association. The building was originally constructed as a factory and warehouse in 1906. The subject building was first converted to retail and office space in the late 1970's.

(4) The alteration will not materially impair the significance and integrity of the landmark, historic district or nominated property under interim protection as evidenced by the consistency of alterations with the applicable design guidelines adopted by the commission.

The applicable design guidelines for this project are the *Saint Anthony Falls Historic District Design Guidelines*, which were adopted by the Heritage Preservation Commission on October 23, 2012. The guidelines have specific recommendations for roof decks and rooftop additions. The site is within the Hennepin and Central District character area. Applicable design guidelines for this project are evaluated below:

7.8 A balcony or roof deck should be visually subordinate on a historic building, as seen from public vantage points.

- a. *Installing a balcony is not allowed on a historic building's primary facade.*
- b. *Balcony additions will be considered on secondary or tertiary facades. If allowed, they should be set back a minimum one structural bay or 15' whichever is greater from the primary facade(s).*

Staff comment: The roof deck will be visually subordinate and the proposed setbacks from the north and west building walls will reduce visibility from 2nd Street SE. However, as proposed the deck would come right up to the south building edge and therefore visible from Main Street SE. Staff is recommending a setback of 10 feet from the south building wall from a point beginning at the east edge of the 1909 addition. A walkway that is a maximum of four feet in width will be permitted to connect the dining space to the stair in the southeast corner of the roof.

7.12 Minimize the visual impact of a roof deck as seen from the street.

- a. *On a commercial or industrial building, set any guard rails and other supporting elements back one structural bay or 15', whichever is greater from the facade so they are not visible from the sidewalk below.*
- b. *A roof deck on a single family residential building should be located to the rear.*

Staff comment: The applicant is proposing a setback of 11'3" from the west building wall and the majority of the north building wall. While this setback is less than the 15 feet recommended, the guardrails will primarily consist of clear tempered glass with a thin metal frame to further minimize visibility. However, as noted above, the roof deck is proposed to extend to the south edge of the roof on this 1906 addition. The center of the roof abuts a single story building, making this portion of the roof deck highly visible from Main Street. As such, staff is recommending that the center of the roof deck step back 10 feet from the south building wall. The 10-foot setback will be required from a point starting on the east edge of the 1909 building addition. The portion of the deck west of this point will have reduced visibility due to the height of the 1909 addition and penthouses located on that building. A walkway that is a maximum of four feet in width will be permitted to connect the dining space to the stair in the southeast corner of the roof. This condition of approval will reduce the overall size of the roof deck by approximately 550 square feet.

8.42 A parapet wall should not be altered on a highly visible facade.

- a. *The profile of the parapet is often important to the style of the building, and should be preserved in its historic configuration.*
- b. *The height of a parapet wall contributes to the scale of the building and the function of a roof, and should not be altered.*
 - ⇒⇒ *Inspect parapets on a regular basis. They are exposed to the weather more than other parts of the building, so watch for deterioration such as missing mortar or excessive moisture retention.*
- c. *Historic parapet caps, such as metal, stone, and terra cotta should be retained.*

Staff comment: According to the attached plans, the parapet wall will not be impacted by the roof deck or proposed additions. Staff is including a condition of approval to provide further assurances that the parapet wall will not be impacted as part of the project.

8.50 Creating an accessibility solution that does not alter the historic characteristics of a building is best.

- a. *Identify a historic building's character-defining spaces, features and finishes so accessibility code required work will not result in their damage or loss.*

b. Alterations to historic properties that are designed to improve access for persons with disabilities should minimize negative effects on the historic character or materials of a building and site.

c. Provide barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.

Staff comment: The addition of a rooftop deck requires elevator access to said space to meet accessibility requirements. The elevator is proposed to be constructed within the 1980's solarium addition with an elevator lobby constructed on the roof of the 1906 addition. The total addition will be 381 square feet in area. While the proposed addition will be visible from the street, it will not impact any of the building's character-defining features. The elevator itself will be located within a non-contributing portion of the property, in the 1980's solarium addition.

8.56 An addition to the roof of a building will be considered if it does the following:

a. It is set back from primary and secondary character-defining walls.

Staff comment: The proposed elevator addition and lobby will be located directly up to the west wall of the solarium addition and the north wall of the 1906 addition. However, as stated above, this location has been chosen as it will have the least impact on historic building materials. The center stair overrun will be setback 17'1" from the north building wall, in compliance with the design guidelines. The storage addition and second stair overrun are located in the southeast corner of the building, where the addition abuts another building within the Saint Anthony Main complex. The addition for the service bar is located approximately 9.5 feet from the south building wall. This addition is pushed as far north as possible due to the location of existing mechanical equipment. This addition will be obscured by adjacent buildings within the Saint Anthony Main complex from various vantage points. As such, the proposed location is consistent with the design guidelines.

b. The maximum height of an addition should not exceed 14 feet as measured from the structural roof deck to the existing building.

Staff comment: The maximum height of the storage addition, service bar addition and stair overruns is 12.5 feet above the roof (9.5 feet above the parapet wall), in compliance with the design guidelines. The proposed railing will be 3'5" feet above the parapet wall. The proposed height of the elevator addition is 15 feet. The proposed height includes the necessary overrun for elevator service.

c. It preserves the perception of the historic scale of the building.

Staff comment: The proposed roof deck and associated additions will not impact the perception of the historic scale of the building. The proposed exterior materials for the additions will complement the existing building but differentiate the new additions from the historic building by using brick that matches the 1980's solarium addition and metal panels.

d. It is not visible from the street as evidenced by a site line study.

Staff comment: As noted above, the additions will be visible from certain vantage points on 2nd Street SE and Main Street. However, the additions have been located in a manner that minimizes visibility

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-28021

where possible and preserves historic building materials. Staff is recommending a 10-foot setback from the south building wall for the roof deck to reduce its visibility from Main Street.

e. Its design does not detract attention from the historic facade.

Staff comment: The proposed designs of the additions do not detract attention from the historic façade. The existing building is part of the historic Salisbury and Satterlee complex that underwent a series of additions and other modifications both during and after the period of significance. The historic façade of the building will not be impacted as part of the project.

f. The addition is distinguishable as new and is compatible in material and shape.

Staff comment: The proposed exterior materials for the additions will complement the existing building but distinguish the new additions from the historic building by using brick that matches the 1980's solarium addition and metal panels. Each of the additions is designed to be rectangular, consistent with the shape of the existing building.

g. The existing structural supports can support the proposed addition; a green roof will be considered, for example.

Staff comment: The applicant submitted a letter from Clark Engineering Corporation regarding the structure's ability to support the proposed roof deck. Said letter states that the existing building construction is heavy timber, specifically timber columns, beams, and purlins. It was determined the best option for a roof top deck was to build a new deck structure above the existing roof structure of the building. This would allow for minimal disturbance of the existing roofing material and roof drainage. The proposed deck structure will be supported off of the existing building column. Additional analysis will be conducted to determine if reinforcements are necessary. Said letter has been attached for review.

(5) The alteration will not materially impair the significance and integrity of the landmark, historic district or nominated property under interim protection as evidenced by the consistency of alterations with the recommendations contained in The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

As conditioned, the project will not materially impair the significance and integrity of the historic district as evidenced by the consistency of alterations with the recommendations contained in The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation recommends the following: *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.* The proposed alterations will not remove any historic building materials. The existing penthouse was installed after the period of significance and the parapet is not proposed to be impacted by the roof deck. As conditioned below, the proposed deck and associated additions will not impact the setting of the property.

(6) The certificate of appropriateness conforms to all applicable regulations of this preservation ordinance and is consistent with the applicable policies of the comprehensive plan and applicable preservation policies in small area plans adopted by the city council.

The proposed work is consistent with the *Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth*, the City's Comprehensive Plan. Comprehensive plan policy 8.1 states that the City will, "Preserve, maintain, and designate districts, landmarks, and historic resources which serve as reminders of the city's architecture, history, and culture." The proposed work allows the property to be adaptively reused as an event center while respecting its historical significance.

Implementation Step 8.1.1 of the comprehensive plan indicates that the City shall protect historic resources from modifications that are not sensitive to their historic significance. As conditioned, the project will be sensitive to its historical character.

(7) Destruction of any property. Before approving a certificate of appropriateness that involves the destruction, in whole or in part, of any landmark, property in an historic district or nominated property under interim protection, the commission shall make findings that the destruction is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property, or that there are no reasonable alternatives to the destruction. 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 property a reasonable opportunity to act to protect it.

The project does not involve the destruction of the property. As noted above, the penthouse with clerestory windows on the impacted portion of the roof was installed after the period of significance. No other features of the building are proposed for removal. Staff has added a condition of approval to provide further assurances that the historic parapet wall will not be impacted by the installation of the roof deck or construction of additions.

Before approving a certificate of appropriateness, and based upon the evidence presented in each application submitted, the commission shall make findings that alterations are proposed in a manner that demonstrates that the Applicant has made adequate consideration of the following documents and regulations:

(8) Adequate consideration of the description and statement of significance in the original nomination upon which designation of the landmark or historic district was based.

The applicant has demonstrated adequate consideration for the statement of significance in the original nomination upon which the historic district was based, per the attached statement of findings. The structure is a contributing building that was originally constructed for the Salisbury and Satterlee Company, a mattress manufacturer in 1906.

(9) Where applicable, Adequate consideration of Title 20 of the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances, Zoning Code, Chapter 530, Site Plan Review.

The scope of work in this application does not require site plan review under Title 20 of the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances, Zoning Code, Chapter 530, as the portions of the additions that count toward the floor area do not exceed 1,000 square feet. As proposed, the alterations and additions would meet all other zoning code standards.

(10) The typology of treatments delineated in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and the associated guidelines for preserving, rehabilitating, reconstructing, and restoring historic buildings.

The proposed work falls under the scope of rehabilitation. The application, as conditioned, complies with the rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. The alterations and additions proposed will allow for adaptive reuse of the historic building without impacting any of the building's character-defining features or historic materials.

CPED RECOMMENDATION

The Department of Community Planning and Economic Development recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission adopt the above findings and **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness to allow alterations to the structure at 212 2nd Street SE, in the Saint Anthony Falls Historic District, subject to the following conditions:

1. Community Planning and Economic Development staff shall review and approve the final site plan, floor plans, and elevations prior to building permit issuance.
2. The roof deck shall step back 10 feet from the south building wall from a point beginning at the east edge of the 1909 addition. A walkway that is a maximum of four feet in width will be permitted to connect the dining space to the stair in the southeast corner of the roof.
3. The roof deck and railing shall be constructed in a manner that does not impact the historic parapet.
4. By ordinance, approvals are valid for a period of two years from the date of the decision unless required permits are obtained and the action approval is substantially begun and proceeds in a continuous basis toward completion. Upon written request and for good cause, the planning director may grant up to a one year extension if the request is made in writing no later than December 12, 2015.
5. By ordinance, all approvals granted in this Certificate of Appropriateness shall remain in effect as long as all of the conditions and guarantees of such approvals are observed. Failure to comply with such conditions and guarantees shall constitute a violation of this Certificate of Appropriateness and may result in termination of the approval.

Attachments:

- Project description and findings
- Neighborhood and City Council Letters
- Letter from Clark Engineering Corporation dated November 27, 2013
- Zoning Context Map
- Site Plan

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development
BZH-28021

- Floor Plans
- Elevations
- Window specifications
- Photos