



City of Duluth
Planning Division

411 West First Street • Room 208 • Duluth, Minnesota 55802-1197
218-730-5580 • Fax: 218-730-5904 • www.duluthmn.gov

An Equal Opportunity Employer

Duluth Historic Preservation Commission
Minutes of January 25, 2010
Room 303, City Hall

I. Call to Order: Chair Carolyn Sundquist called the meeting in order at 2:00 pm, Tuesday, January 25, 2011, in Room 303.

II. Roll Call

Members Present: Donald Dass, Drew Digby, Wayne Gannaway, Tim Meyer, Carolyn Sundquist, and David Woodward

Members Excused: None

Members Absent: None

Vacant Member Position: One (St. Louis County Historical Society)

III. Public Hearings

A. Proposed Programmatic Agreement between SHPO and the City of Duluth for Community Development Funds.

Hamre had the corrected copies the Programmatic Agreement. Page 4, Section 4 is the Historic Preservation Ordinance in Chapter 50. Hamre explained how the properties are designated, the review process and council oversight. The State Historic Office wants the HPC to be in concurrence with the Programmatic Agreement. When we encounter a building more than 50 years old, we look to see if this is an historic property and follow the process. Woodward stated that extenuating circumstances may be followed even if the property is not old enough.

Sundquist was looking at page 2-B1 which Identifies the Survey and asked how these are addressed in the UDC. Hamre stated that there is an historic resource section overlay, and said he is not sure how it is flagged for being an historic property. Sundquist stated that there should be some consistency with this. Meyer said that properties over 50 years old are historic properties and Under 106 everything would be considered. Hamre stated that this is being consistent and we are using the same resources. Meyer asked if they would differentiate between National and District properties that would be considered as historic properties. Hamre explained that when they looking at CLG grant applications, they are setting it up with the data in the permitting system so that it flags it as an historic site or another significant structure. The purpose of the HPC discussion in the future should be what the HPC can help with and assist with historic properties. Meyer asked what kind of assistance can they provide to the City? Hamre stated that they will be setting up the process and procedures so that data is in the permitting system and comes up with properties that may be significant properties.

Sundquist asked Hamre if he could get them a corrected copy of the Agreement. Hamre has it with him and he stated that the changes were in the UDC. Chapter 50-36.3 is the designation of historic heritage preservation site and districts, the next would be the design review process outlined in 50-37.8 and the historic resource designation in 50-37.8. Sundquist asked if a project has been reviewed under the Design Review process, would they come from the Community Development Department? Hamre said that the applications will go through the Planning Division. Sundquist clarified that someone in Community Development would complete the application and route it to the Planning Division. She asked how many would be expected per year and Hamre stated about 2 to 3, sometimes they may not have any for a couple of years. Sundquist stated that anything under Sec106 would be eligible for the Property Register.

Sundquist said that anything deemed eligible needs to be reviewed and that they can substitute HPC for review. Hamre stated that we would not replace SHPO. When a property becomes a part of a rehab project, it must be approved by the HPC. With federal funded projects, if they are on our local designated list, we do not need to send this to SHPO. Wayne is the only one qualified as our Historic member and would this also be for nominations? Wayne stated it still would need to go to SHPO. He would be accountable for filling out the required documentation. Sundquist said that under the UDC process there may be more enforcement on these properties. Woodward said that under this document it would be followed correctly. Hamre stated that the purpose of the Programmatic Agreement helps us in going through the applications. He wants to be a part of the agreements along with the HPC. Should Wayne leave, would we have someone with the same credentials? Hamre said at that point they would go to the SHPO Office. Wayne said the actual applications under review would be fairly small.

Digby said that the ones that come in agreement would come from Community Development. Woodward said that we can bump up our evaluations; being that we don't have professional staff for the documents, they could use Hamre's staff. Hamre stated that SHPO wants to see that we would fund at least one CLG grant per year for a survey. Under the legal agreement, there is a commitment from the city for on-going survey work. Digby stated that nominations still need to go to SHPO. This is a new process under the UDC, in the past they came to the HPC. Sundquist asked for Edna to Redistribute the HPC Review & Implementation Procedures. Digby said that we should review this and get ready to implement the Programmatic Agreement.

Vote: Motion/Second to accept the Programmatic Agreement. Unanimous

Request made to move the Annual Report after the CLG Grant and Survey. All agreed.

C. Survey/CLG Grant Status

Pre-Applications are due on February 11. Hamre stated that there is \$95,000 total CLG Grant funds available. We want to put in an application for 18,750 and the match requirement is 6,250, which \$4000 of that would be CDBG funds. The rest would probably be staff time. This is for existing properties and two areas to focus on would be to fill in the survey gap from the western edge of the about 21st Ave East back to about the Downtown District. This would go from London Road to Skyline Parkway. \$25,000 of this is for an area and an archilological survey in the Fond du Lac area. Woodward said these grants would be helpful to be funded which would show that we are going beyond the traditional historic building surveys. We could get a phase one survey. \$22,750 would be for the consultant. Hamre stated that once the pre-ap is done, we then would know how much it would be. We need enough to afford the quality of the consultant that we use; \$22,000 does not go too far. Hamre said that it could be 4-6 years and they can take it by chunks. Sundquist stated that Woodward will talk to Mike Koop at SHPO and break it down. Woodward thinks we should build in money for non-traditional properties. Woodward wants to see the two East End Surveys and Hamre said he will get it to him. He would also like to

question Mike to see what he would like and if he has a preference for a specific geographical area. Woodward will get a written statement and work with Gannaway.

Motion/Second to approve that the City of Duluth apply for a CLG Grant to do historic survey work. Unanimous. (Hamre left at 2:50).

B. Annual Report

Sundquist received a reminder letter from SHPO asking us to send in the Annual Report. We are missing two years and she has been in contact with Mike Koop. We will not be able to come up with the annual report for federal fiscal year 2009. She will be able to send in the report for 2010, but the City will not be able to sign the Compliance Certification document. This needs to be signed by a local government official. Since the HPC lost professional staffing, any planning files may be spotty at best and no meeting minutes were done.

We are required a hard copy of the City's current HPC Ordinance. They had asked Petkac to please give them a consolidated document that pertains to the HPC. Keith found two sections (supposedly everything from the old ordinance 28A has moved into the new UDC.) Hopefully we will get a consolidated report. SHPO also asked for the contact information for the HPC.

D. St. Peters Church

Woodward has a contact that had submitted forms to make this one of the 10 most endangered properties. Digby stated that we should send a letter to the Diocese. We need to get an awareness of the situation to bring attention to the property. Sundquist asked if this is an advocacy type of thing that is best left to the Duluth Preservation Alliance or should we get involved? The letter could state that it "appears" that St. Peters Church is eligible for National Register and local and landmark designations. Digby will draft a letter and circulate it to the others. The HPC would like to see what the diocese has planned for this property.

E. Lincoln Park Carnegie Library.

The Duluth Art Institute (DAI) is on landmark status. The DAI has some concerns about what it means to be a local Landmark. Sundquist stated that they have some significant building repair issues and have concerns on what it means to have this status and the process of having work done. She suggested SHPO and the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota as resources for repair. Digby stated that we should get her into a conversation to look at what her options are. Sundquist will give her a call.

Meyer asked if we could invite her to our next meeting. He stated that there are local people who could be helpful on the financial side and have a list of approved contractors.

F. Duluth Armory and YWCA National Register Nominations

Sundquist said we have two nominations for the national register, the Duluth Armory and the YWCA. Both are very comprehensive. Motion/Second to send a letter to SHPO with copy to the Mayor that the Duluth HPC supports the nomination of the Duluth Armory. Dass/Meyer. Unanimous.

YWCA Nomination. Both nominations show the power of the new State Historic tax credit. Both the Armory and the YWCA Building will receive federal and state Historic tax credits for the rehabilitation projects.

Motion/Second to send a letter to SHPO with a copy to the Mayor that the Duluth HPC supports the nomination. Meyer/Woodward. Unanimous.

IV. Consideration of Minutes – Unanimous.

V. Communications

A. Sacred Heart Situation

Duluth HPC was copies on a letter from SHPO. Meyer said that they always had moisture in this building. Sundquist said that this is related to the construction next door, per the SHPO letter.

VI. Old Business

A. Review UDC Ordinance as pertains to the HPC

VII. Reports of Officers and Committees

Sundquist reported that the SLCHS has a candidate and the Board may make an appointment at their Thursday Board meeting.

VIII. New Business

Sundquist stated that the Tiffany Windows are a local landmark status. The City has issued an RFP for a long term loan. The RFP stated that the city reserves the right to not select any selections. Any purposed change in the placement and/or display conditions of the windows must receive a certificate of appropriateness (COA) from the HPC.

IX. Other Business

X. Adjournment. Meeting was adjourned at 3:25

Respectfully,



Carolyn Sundquist *en*