

City of Duluth
Duluth Historic Preservation Commission
Minutes of the June 5, 2012
City Council Chambers, Duluth City Hall

Chair David Woodward called a special meeting of the Duluth Historic Preservation Commission for June 5, 2012, in Room 303

- I. Roll Call: Ken Buehler, Drew Digby, Wayne Gannaway, Carolyn Sundquist, David Woodward

Excused: Tim Meyer

Staff: Charles Froseth, Alison Lutterman, Nathan LaCoursier

- A. Review of Process - Charles Froseth, City of Duluth

Froseth stated that this is the final public meeting for the East End Historic Survey Phase 3 to inventory and investigate significant properties in Duluth City limits. This is a continuation of this process. Froseth will give us an overview and Hutter will give some of their findings. This is to inventory and note significant historic properties and in guiding our preservation methods. This is the continuation of this process.

Froseth added that this process started on December 15th. One of the things that we needed to do was to look at our inventory forms. We have CD's available as well. A lot of people want to see if their house is historical.

- B. Findings - Renee Hutter of Summit Envirosolutions

We came back out in January for a couple of days to finish the field work. This is a very large area to do. We first looked at about 1200 parcels in the area. We then got it down to 600 houses and worked it down again to 388 houses that have historic integrity. Of those surveyed there were 275 single family residences, 6 were family residential and there was one school. There were also 7 churches. Of these structures that they surveyed, a little over 60 of them are eligible. The categories of these were: A. Event B. Person and C. Architecture.

Some of these properties were the Alver G Potting, John Legestien, Francis Fitzpatrick, and Carl E. Nystrom homes. Our findings of the survey is that of the 388 surveyed they had a little over 60 of them that are eligible. Three of those they are recommending for more research and potential for a national or local scale. These properties can be eligible but may not have enough integrity to be NRHP helpful. There were 58 potential districts and multiple properties – predominately in a middle class area and a lot of them have a great amount of integrity.

C. Commission and Public Comments / Questions on the Inventory

Gannaway asked what the NRHP is and what is the definition is of this? Hutter stated that these are properties that have a unified thread to them. These were all in the 20's and 40's and all closely related in a way. NRHP criteria (National Historic Preservation Act) helps to register properties in a city or area. Gannaway added that this is the raw data and then they would potentially be eligible for approval for this. Woodward stated that it would bring integrity with this process. They were looking at properties 60 years or older and have details of the time period and the historical context behind them. Some of those could also be considered in the bigger realm and they could also do multiple properties. The 60 properties are a starting point. The 388 would not be eligible as these were a little bit elevated.

Sundquist stated that three properties were contributing. These were the ones that were with the children's home. Of the 60 properties, these have enough merit. Integrity was there but we may need more research. The building is architecturally intact.

Sundquist added that there are 60 structures for eligibility. These could have merit on their own. They also have some with a theme with middle income families. These would be a national register. Some of the properties could be combined as contributing resources. Sundquist asked to expand on this for the properties in different places that have similarities. Duluth is significant in that they have row house structures. There are a lot of structures that have not been surveyed. It is a good way to see it in the present survey area. This would be multiple living – middle income families. There would be a lot of research of the people who live there.

Sundquist added that this is that type of building – the 4th Street Hillside Project which the HPC is concerned about this. Woodward stated that the original was where they had built it in the 1915 style class. Criteria B would be an individual note - did they find anything that would be interesting. They recommended this for more research. Sundquist asked what were the uses of the intact properties, not including properties that have window replacements? If it had replacement windows or siding, it would have been replaced.

For the multiple families, there were a few that made it. The city is looking to provide help with anyone who is interested. If it had replacement windows or siding they lost substantial historical materials that would be compromised. Sundquist asked how the survey will be conveyed for the residents in that area. Hutter stated that we had a first meeting which included where to find them. Sundquist added that this is provided to the public library and SHPO office. As a commission our job is to go to the next step to locate properties in the city. We need to do at least one a year and want to have more than that. Our next step is to see other properties and we need to do at least one a year and to nominate a property as a local landmark. We would like to use this to target other

properties - unless the owner doesn't consent (local Landmark status). We could look at this as a stepping stone. We are getting help with the city and are happy with this. That is sort of our minimum and we prefer to have more. We want to be proactive and not reactive. Woodward stated that the city will be looking at this as a stepping stone and that they can recommend a landmark status.

Karen Olson - 1924 Jefferson Street. Their property is listed as a potential landmark. It has random windows and she has added a huge garage on the property. If she was low income, she could get help to put insulation in the attic - now SHPO has to review it because it is on a list somewhere. It is not eligible for national landmark. Are all 388 properties that are not that significant needing to have a shop review? They could be potentially if it is on the national register. But because it could be on a list, we deem it that it is.

Olson added that we have a tiered process. We negotiate with SHPO and it should be reviewed. The ones that say eligible in are in larger districts but there are no new districts. It would be a great undertaking to do an eligibility study.

Gannaway added that of the 60 properties that were eligible, would any of them require a section 106 review? Sundquist stated that it depends on where it is on the list. The others, the potentially local ones, are not for national status. Gannaway stated that beyond the 60 properties, it had not been determined eligible until SHPO concurs with the report. Woodward added that one of the ways is for categorical inclusions and this would not affect the exterior and they would exclude this by SHPO review.

Sundquist stated that SHPO has determined that we don't have the staff level and would dearly like that. They would like to have someone with historical expertise for this position.

Froseth thanked Summit for being prompt and to accept the report with a few minor changes.

MOTION/Second: Woodward/Sundquist to **Accept** the Historical Resources Inventory Phase 3 with Text Revisions Clarifying the section on eligibility.

VOTE: 5-0 Unanimous

D. Next Steps

We did get an extension of Phase Three. The map shows the area. Chuck stated that he got a call from SHPO and they had some turndown dollars. He talked to Mike Koop and Renee and that the area that we picked made sense. This is Phase IV a. and there will be a IV b. for the future and this is a continuation of this. Basically we have to wait for the city council to approve this. This is an extension and it will go through City Council on

June 11th. They have an August 31 deadline. Renee already had been looking around and doing some inventory work internally and we will have a public process. Froseth stated that Renee's firm is working on this. As a commission they had talked about the next phase. We gained 5,000 for the CDBG. Sundquist added that this is phase 4a and 4b will be in the future.

IV. Phase IV a

<p>MOTION/Second: Woodward/Sundquist to Approve the East End Phase IVa as an extension of the East End Phase 3. VOTE: 5-0 Unanimous</p>
--

V. Section 106 Compliance Review of the Carter Hotel.

Woodward reviewed the letter. Alison Lutterman is working on this and she is assigned to the staff of the HPC as a separate entity. Lutterman had contacted SHPO and spoke with Mary Ann Hidelman and wanted to make sure it was red flagged. She wanted them to know that the demolition of the Carter Hotel needs to have a public process before anything more can happen. Under the Holanback decision the hotel is in the area to have national resource status. This was built in 1928 and is still in great condition.

They concluded that the demolition of the Carter Hotel needs to have a public process Under the 106 Review before anything else can happen. They should be partners with us in this. She was going to send the nomination of the commercial district because SHPO needs to have its nomination. We will get that to her and this will state why it was a contributing factor. When the Tech Village was going on, it was a contributing factor to the Holanback order. She stated that it is in pristine condition and was built in 1928. This was the Holcomb Hotel and the area was Harold Street. The roof actually was replaced in 1998. The city wanted to get a better view of the interior of the house.

Some of the other things are that it would appear that they want more gaming space. The space they did have they would put into more gaming space. The owners of the property may want to manage this. If they have band members they could rehab low-end housing for the members that live in the city of Duluth. We see a re-use potential. They will draft the letter and they might offer a unique perspective. We are inviting the commission to be a part of this.

Woodward stated that this isn't the first order but the last resort. That is not how 106 works. Sundquist added that this is a contributing building in the district because of its in-tackness. The national register should be on the planning website. This is a document for developers and citizens and that they can use tax credits- there is a marketplace to sell them. Digby added that this is important to the city. We should ask the attorney for a letter and draft with a set of reasons to weigh in on. City staff could help to draft it for us. Digby stated that they will come up with a letter that the chair can sign.

MOTION/Second: Digby/Gannaway to Empower our Chairman to **Approve and sign a letter** Opposing the Demolition of the Building which should not be demolished. **VOTE: 5-0 Unanimous**

There were 90 SRO housing units in the city and they are now lovely apartments. This was used with state and local tax credits. The EAW worksheet would have to be done if there was any demolition. Digby stated that they could ask the Attorney if the chair can go into a file and draft this based on the set of reasons to weigh in on it.

Lutterman stated that they should not have this be demolished and a there are a set of concerns for your president's review and approval. Gannaway asked if they can email to LaCoursier.

Motion/Second: Digby/Gannaway to **Approve the letter** to empower the Chair to negotiate to Oppose the demolition of the 106 Review. **VOTE: 5-0 (Unanimous)**

City council preserves the old homes and that would cut the value of the property. Digby stated that they are requiring parking on front yards and council is taking it up for a possible amendment for the rental houses. This may preserve some of the old properties and the value of the historic homes. They are doing it outside of the normal process.

Park Point was when SHPO was on the agenda. There's a disconnect and that this is another instance to have planning staff with some sort of knowledge on this. We will look for action to fill this position. City staff concurred that the expertise isn't there without the background. The annual meeting of the HPC will be in November.

The next meeting will be at 2:00 pm on the 26th of June.

LaCoursier will have 2 weeks to look over the information.

Congratulations to Keith and we would encourage them to renew the National Alliance of Historical Preservation. This is how our local HPC and Community Development work together along with the HPC, city staff and assistance from economic development, zoning and everything in between.

X. ADJOURNMENT. The meeting was adjourned at 4:55.

Respectfully,

Chuck Froseth