**Request for City Council Committee Action**
**From the Department of Community Planning & Economic Development**

Date: July 28, 2005

To: Council Member Gary Schiff, Chair of Zoning and Planning Committee

Prepared by: Amy Lucas, Senior Planner, CPED-Planning (612-673-2422)

Presenter(s) in Committee: Amy Lucas

Approved by: Barbara Sporlein, Director, Planning _____

Subject: Appeal from the June 28, 2005 Heritage Preservation Commission Hearing

**RECOMMENDATION**: To adopt Heritage Preservation Commission findings and deny the appeal to add thirty additional windows to the north (river) elevation (floors 2 through 6) of the Standard Mill property located at 150 Portland Avenue in the St. Anthony Falls Historic District.

**Previous Directives**: N/A

**Financial Impact** (Check those that apply)
_X_ No financial impact

**Community Impact**
Ward: 2
Neighborhood Notification: Downtown East Neighborhood Assoc.
City Goals: Consistent with "Preserve and enhance our natural and historic environment and promote a clean, sustainable Minneapolis."
Comprehensive Plan: Consistent
Zoning Code: Section 599.120 authorizes the Heritage Preservation Commission to hear and decide applications for certificate of appropriateness" and Section 599.350 requires "the commission make findings that the alteration will not materially impair the integrity of the landmark, historic district."

**Background/Supporting Information:**
The attached report summarizes the actions taken at the Heritage Preservation Commission meeting held on June 28, 2005. The staff report, findings, public hearing

testimony and recommendations are respectfully submitted for the consideration of your Committee.

Attachments:

1. Appeal of the Decision of the HPC Application, 7-8-05
2. HPC Staff Report, 6-1-05, amended 6-28-05
3. Application for C of A with plans and report “Whitney Rehabilitation Project: Property History and Analysis”, 5-24-05
4. Application for C of A by Julie Snow Architects, 7-16-03
5. HPC Staff Report, 8-9-03
6. Letters received at HPC public hearing of 6-14-05
7. Revised plans submitted at HPC public hearing of 6-28-05

# CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS
## HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

FILE NAME: 150 Portland Avenue South
DATE OF APPLICATION: July 16, 2003
APPLICANT: Julie Snow Architects, Inc.
DATE OF HEARING: August 9, 2003
HPC SITE/DISTRICT: St. Anthony Falls Historic District
CATEGORY: contributing
CLASSIFICATION: Certificate of Appropriateness
STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Amy Lucas
DATE: July 31, 2003

## A. SITE DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND:

The building located at 150 Portland Avenue is a five-story buff colored brick mill constructed in 1879. Historically known as the Standard Mill, the building is a contributing property to the St. Anthony Falls Historic District. In 1986, the HPC approved the rehabilitation of the building as a hotel. During the conversion, a non-contributing two-story brick building located at the corner of Second and Portland was demolished and replaced by a new addition to the mill. The addition features a two-story brick and glass building and an eight-story tower that is crowned by metal louvers that conceal the building's HVAC/elevator equipment.

## B. PROPOSED CHANGES:

The applicant is proposing to convert the 96-unit hotel into a 34 unit condominium building. The major proposed alterations to the property include:

North elevation (facing river): All new windows replacing the non-historic double-hung windows. 25 enlarged openings will allow for inset balconies and glass railings. These openings will feature French doors with a transom. (see plans) These openings will measure approximately 6' by 11' high and they will have a haphazard placement throughout the elevation. A cantilevered balcony will run along the length of the second floor and will have a clear glass railing. The penthouse level exists in its 1986 version and will be renovated with a metal panel and all enlarged openings.

East elevation (facing Portland and North Star building): All new windows. Two enlarged openings on the second floor to match other French door openings with recessed balcony.

Non-historic addition (corner of Portland and Second): This section of the building will receive an additional third floor. The blue metal paneling will be removed throughout building. The buff brick used on this building still exists and will be installed on the third floor. All new

windows and glazing will be applied to this addition. New windows and window openings are proposed for the eight-story tower.

See attached plans for details.

**B. GUIDELINE CITATIONS:**

***ST. ANTHONY FALLS HISTORIC DISTRICT GUIDELINES* recommend:**

E. Right (West) Bank Milling

This area is bounded by the Mississippi River, Third Avenue South, South Second Street and Tenth Avenue South.

1. Siting: New buildings shall have their exterior walls in the same axial orientation as the existing buildings.

2. Height: New buildings to be no higher than that of existing silo-mills in the area.

3. Rhythm of Projections: There shall be no major projections on the principal facades.

4. Directional Emphasis: New buildings shall have a generally vertical emphasis, at least above the first floor.

5. Materials: The exterior surface of new buildings shall be constructed of brick, concrete or stone.

6. Nature of Openings: Openings should appear in a consistent and repeated pattern across the principal facades. Window openings should be approximately 1-1/2 to 2-1/2 times as tall as they are wide. Doors and windows should be set toward the front of the openings but should not be flush with the masonry surface.

7. Roof Shapes: New buildings should have flat or nearly flat roofs.

8. Details: New buildings should have some emphasis given to the upper termination of the building. Surface treatment should divide the building into vertical bays. Where other surface treatment is used, it should reflect details from other buildings in the area.

9. Color: The primary surfaces of new buildings should be deep red, brown, or buff. Trim should be subdued earth tones or flat black, and new buildings should allow this same general pattern.

***The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* recommend:**

## E. New Additions to Historic Buildings

-Placing functions and services required for the new use in non-character defining interior spaces rather than installing a new addition.

-Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

-Locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an inconspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

-Designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.

-Considering the attached exterior addition both in terms of the new use and the appearance of other buildings in the historic district or neighborhood. Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building. In either case, it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.

-Placing new additions such as balconies and greenhouses on non-character-defining elevations and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

-Designing additional stories, when required for the new use, that are set back from the wall plane and are as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.

## F. Windows

-Identifying, retaining, and preserving windows - and their functional and decorative features - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. Such features can include frames, sash, muntins, glazing, sills, heads, hoodmolds, paneled or decorated jambs and moldings, and interior and exterior shutters and blinds.

-Protecting and maintaining the wood and architectural metal which comprise the window frame, sash, muntins, and surrounds through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems.

-Making windows weather tight by recaulking and replacing or installing weather-stripping. These actions also improve thermal efficiency.

-Evaluating the overall condition of materials to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, i.e. if repairs to windows and window features will be required.

-Repairing window frames and sash by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing. Such repair may also include replacement in kind of those parts that are either extensively deteriorated or are missing when there are surviving prototypes such as architraves, hoodmolds, sash, sills, and interior or exterior shutters and blinds.

-Replacing in kind an entire window that is too deteriorated to repair - if the overall form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. If using the same kind of materials is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

**Design for Missing Historic Features**
-Designing and installing new windows when the historic windows (frame, sash and glazing) are completely missing. The replacement windows may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the window openings and the historic character of the building.

**Alterations/Additions for the New Use**
-Designing and installing additional windows on rear on other-non character-defining elevations if required by the new use. New windows openings may also be cut into exposed party walls. Such design should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not duplicate the fenestration pattern and detailing of a character-defining elevation.

-Providing a setback in the design of dropped ceilings when they are required for the new use to allow for the full height of the window openings.

**The General Standards for Rehabilitation (from the Secretary of the Interior):**

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

4. Changes to as property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

9. 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.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

## D. FINDINGS:

1. The building is a contributing structure to the St. Anthony Falls Historic District.

2. The proposed alterations follow the recommendations of the *St. Anthony Falls Historic District Guidelines* for siting, height, materials and color.

3. The proposed alterations do not follow the *St. Anthony Falls Historic District Guidelines* for openings which state "openings should appear in a consistent and repeated pattern across the principal facades." In the proposal, the applicant provides a lengthy history of the continuous change and haphazard placement of the window openings in the Standard Mill. The current consistent pattern is a product of the 1986 renovation. The proposed larger openings for balconies is not inconsistent with the historical window pattern of haphazard placement along the Standard Mill elevations.

4. *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* recommend distinguishing between historic and new. The proposed enlarged openings and the glass railings clearly delineate what is new and do not create a false sense of history.

5. Alterations to the non-original two story addition and the eight-story tower follow the recommendations of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* by maintaining the essential form and integrity of the historic property.

## E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the HPC adopt staff findings and **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions:

1. Lighting specifications must be approved by staff.

2. All signage must be approved by staff.

**F. HPC RECOMMENDATION:**

**MOTION** by Commissioner Koski to **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions: 1) lighting specifications must be approved by staff. 2) all signage must be approved by staff 3) railings and glass within the railings be approved by staff. **SECOND** by Commissioner Glancy.

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

---

FILE NAME: 150 Portland Avenue South (Standard Mill, a.k.a Whitney Hotel)

DATE OF APPLICATION: 5-24-05

APPLICANT: Whitney Partners, LLC; architect Ken Piper of Tanek Inc.

DATE OF HEARING: 6-14-05, continued to 6-28-05

HPC SITE/DISTRICT: St. Anthony Falls Historic District

CATEGORY: contributing

CLASSIFICATION: Certificate of Appropriateness

STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Amy Lucas
DATE: 6-1-05, amended 6-28-05

---

## C. SITE DESCRIPTION:

The building located at 150 Portland Avenue is a five-story buff colored brick mill constructed in 1879. Historically known as the Standard Mill, the building is a contributing property to the St. Anthony Falls Historic District. As part of this application, the consultant, The 106 Group, submitted a report entitled "The Whitney Rehabilitation Project: Property History and Analysis" (May 2005). The report notes that the mill was "considered at the time of its construction to be a "handsome" and "elegant" mill building and a respected component of the Minneapolis milling industry." The consultant notes the alterations through time that have affected the exterior of the property; they include window changes, train trestle removal, additional story and monitor changes. These changes are explained through historic photographs in the report.

Two mills, Model Flour Mill and Dakota Mill, once sat on the adjacent Whitney Mill Quarter Plaza site. The archaeological remains of the headraces, tailraces and tunnels related to these mills were determined to be contributing elements to the St. Anthony Falls Historic District as part of Scott Anfinson's report, "Archaeology of the Central Minneapolis Riverfront (1990)."

In 1986, the HPC approved the rehabilitation and hotel conversion of the building. At this time, a non-contributing two-story brick building located at the corner of Second and Portland was demolished and replaced by a new addition to the mill. The addition features a two-story brick and glass building and an eight-story tower that is crowned by metal louvers that conceal the building's HVAC/elevator equipment. Windows were added to the north (river) elevation of the mill that mimicked the size and shape of the existing historic windows; this alteration provided a more symmetrical design to the north elevation. The penthouse is also a result of the hotel conversion. This project was reviewed by the National Park Service and, though the additional windows were disputed, the project ultimately received tax credits for the rehabilitation.

## B. BACKGROUND:

**Previous Approval:** At the public hearing of August 12, 2003, the HPC approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for the conversion of the 96-unit Whitney Hotel into 34 condominiums. This proposal included the addition of 25 enlarged openings (6' wide x 11' tall) on the north (river) elevation with inset balconies and inset glass railings. This proposal also included a second story balcony at the site of the original train trestle. The non-contributing two-story section along Second Street would receive one additional floor and the penthouse level changes included enlarged openings. The period of approval for this proposal was extended until August 12, 2006. See attached:1) staff report for August 9, 2003; 2) Application for August 9, 2003; 3) August 9, 2003 minutes

**Pre-Permit Discussion and tour:** The current applicant presented a different plan for the Whitney Hotel to the HPC on April 12, 2005. Detailed minutes of this discussion were not transcribed by the Planning division. The HPC was invited to tour the building on April 14, 2005.

**Previous Approvals to contributing buildings in West Side Milling District**:
North Star Blanket Factory (North Star Lofts) 109 Portland Ave S: This project (condo conversion) was approved by the HPC on July 8, 1997. At this time, the 1864 portion of the building was restored and the double-hung windows were replaced to match the original. The developer proposed more alterations to the larger 1925 section of the building. Approved alterations to the 1925 building included projecting balconies on the north and south elevations (balconies on the west side were denied) and enlarged openings. The width of the windows was generally maintained but the windows were lowered. Double-hung windows were approved and an increased number of panes per window was demanded to maintain the industrial character. Windows were not lowered to feed onto the balconies; instead interior stairs in the units walk up to the window sill level. Balconies on this project 4' and are generally 12' wide.

Utility Building (Washburn Lofts) 700 Second St. S.: This project (condo conversion) was approved by the HPC on April 11, 2000. Alterations included opening the ground floor level for a storefront and rear parking entrance. The applicant was allowed to open the central bay of windows on the south elevation by five brick courses with the condition that the decorative brickwork be retained. All windows on the north elevation were lengthened at the bottom by 3 brick courses and one window was added on the top floor. Projecting balconies were not proposed for this project, but the applicant did receive approval for inset balconies on the west elevation.

Washburn "A" Mill (Offices and Mill City Museum) 706-8 Second St. S.: This project (offices, museum) was approved by the HPC on March 13, 2001; the project received tax credits and the rehab was approved by the National Park Service. Alterations included a new museum and office building within the open shell of the mill ruin. The south elevation along Second Street remained intact and the applicant did not change window openings on this elevation. North elevation wall no longer existed; wall was tuckpointed and new building built within the shell.

Humboldt Mill (Humboldt Lofts) 730 Second St. S.: This project (condo conversion) was approved by the HPC on September 18, 2001. Alterations included restoration of the five-story

1878 building which was an open burned shell. The window sizes were not changed and balconies were not added to this building. The application approval also included the new construction of a nine-story loft building next to the historic mill; the east wall of the mill was covered at that time.

## C. PROPOSED CHANGES:

The applicant is proposing to convert the 96-unit hotel into "approximately" 50 condominium units. This conversion will include alterations to the contributing Standard Mill building, three additional floors to the two-story 1986 building on Second Street, and a parking deck on the Whitney Mill Quarter Plaza.

1. Standard Mill Building Alterations:

    a. Portland Avenue (east elevation): The applicant is proposing minor changes to this elevation. They include new windows in the same openings (specifications were not provided) and new doors at grade level (location and specifications were not provided). The written material proposes a new cornice on this elevation, but there are no drawings to support this proposal.

    b. River (north elevation): The applicant is proposing to open all of the windows on this elevation to 6' wide by 11'5" tall, but will leave the single bays of windows on each side to the original 3' by 7' opening. The applicant is also proposing the recreate an arched window on the top floor of windows, but all other openings will be square in shape. The current windows have arched headers and replicate the original double-hung appearance with two over two pane configuration. The applicant is proposing to add 30 hanging balconies to the larger openings. The balconies will measure 6' deep by 8' wide and will have a wire mesh railing. The balcony openings will have double doors and a fixed transom above the doors. The remaining 30 enlarged openings will also measure 6' by 11'5". These windows are open to the condo floors and are arranged with two side by side double-hung windows with fixed transoms above and below the window pairs. The ground floor units will not have the transom below the window pairs. The windows will be dark aluminum. Sample color provided.

    c. Applicant did not submit drawings/elevations for the west elevation or the interior courtyard elevations.

2. 1986 Building:

    a. Portland Avenue (east elevation): The three additional stories will be added to the two-story brick building. This addition will be approximately 2' taller than the height of the Standard Mill building. The drawings do not include any rooftop equipment or penthouses. The new addition will be setback 2' from the building wall below. The paired double-hung windows of the two-story building will be replaced with openings measuring 9' wide by 10' tall and 9' wide by 6' tall. The

proposed windows of the three story addition do not match the two-story building windows in size or pane configuration. These windows measure 12' by 12'. There are also slit windows on this elevation measuring 2' wide and 12' tall. One central balcony will be placed on this elevation; railings have horizontal bars and are different from those on Standard Mill. (Concrete and brick material samples and railing details were not provided.) A new garage door (specifications were not provided) will be added between the Standard Mill building and the 1986 two-story addition. This entrance will access the 7 parking spaces that will be provided in the basement level of the two-story addition.

b. First Street (south elevation): On the south elevation, the three additional stories will be stepped back from the wall of the two-story addition to allow for decks which measure 23' wide. The upper floors of this building also propose larger window openings with larger panes. The porte cochere is left open, but the applicant did not provide details of the entrance changes.

c. Applicant did not provide elevations of the interior courtyard elevation facing north.

3. Parking Deck: The current plaza will be demolished and the applicant is proposing to lower the level of the plaza by four feet and build a covered one story parking deck that will rise 11 feet above the current level. This ramp will be accessed off West River Parkway and will be clad in concrete and brick. (Material samples have not been provided) The 43 space parking deck will obscure the ground floor units along the north elevation and will be set back from the Standard Mill by 11 feet. The parking deck rooftop will have a star design in the pavement and will be surrounded by a decorative railing. Railing details were not provided. The electric transformer in the park will be elevated and surrounded by a brick building.

4. Changes to the tower clad in blue metal were not proposed.

5. Changes to the rooftop (monitor) penthouse of the Standard Mill building were not proposed.

## D. GUIDELINE CITATIONS:

***ST. ANTHONY FALLS HISTORIC DISTRICT GUIDELINES* recommend:**

Right (West) Bank Milling

This area is bounded by the Mississippi River, Third Avenue South, South Second Street and Tenth Avenue South.

1. Siting: New buildings shall have their exterior walls in the same axial orientation as the existing buildings.

2. Height: New buildings to be no higher than that of existing silo-mills in the area.

3. Rhythm of Projections: There shall be no major projections on the principal facades.

4. Directional Emphasis: New buildings shall have a generally vertical emphasis, at least above the first floor.

5. Materials: The exterior surface of new buildings shall be constructed of brick, concrete or stone.

6. Nature of Openings: Openings should appear in a consistent and repeated pattern across the principal facades. Window openings should be approximately 1-1/2 to 2-1/2 times as tall as they are wide. Doors and windows should be set toward the front of the openings but should not be flush with the masonry surface.

7. Roof Shapes: New buildings should have flat or nearly flat roofs.

8. Details: New buildings should have some emphasis given to the upper termination of the building. Surface treatment should divide the building into vertical bays. Where other surface treatment is used, it should reflect details from other buildings in the area.

9. Color: The primary surfaces of new buildings should be deep red, brown, or buff. Trim should be subdued earth tones or flat black, and new buildings should allow this same general pattern.

***The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* recommend:**

**District/Neighborhood**

-Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings, and streetscape, and landscape features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the district or neighborhood. Such features can include streets, alleys, paving, walkways, street lights, signs, benches, parks and gardens, and trees.

-Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, and streetscape and landscape features such as a town square comprised of row houses and stores surrounding a communal park or open space.

-Protecting and maintaining the historic masonry, wood, and architectural metals which comprise building and streetscape features, through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and reapplication of protective coating systems; and protecting and maintaining landscape features, including plant material.

-Protecting buildings, paving, iron fencing, etc. against arson and vandalism before rehabilitation work begins by erecting protective fencing and installing alarm systems that are keyed into local protection agencies.

-Evaluating the overall condition of building, streetscape and landscape materials to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, that is, if repairs to features will be necessary.

-Repairing features of the building, streetscape, or landscape by reinforcing the historic materials. Repair will also generally include the replacement in kind - or with a compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of features when there are surviving prototypes such as porch balustrades, paving materials, or streetlight standards.

-Replacing in kind an entire feature of the building, streetscape, or landscape that is too deteriorated to repair - when the overall form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. This could include a storefront, a walkway, or a garden. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

**Design for Missing Historic Features**
-Designing and constructing a new feature of the building streetscape, or landscape when the historic feature is completely missing, such as row house steps, a porch, streetlight, or terrace. 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 district or neighborhood.

**Alterations/Additions for the New Use**
-Designing required new parking so that it is as unobtrusive as possible, i.e., on side streets or at the rear of buildings. "Shared" parking should also be planned so that several business' can utilize one parking area as opposed to introducing random, multiple lots.

-Designing and constructing new additions to historic buildings when required by the new use. New work should be compatible with the historic character of the district or neighborhood in terms of size, scale, design, material, color, and texture.

-Removing nonsignificant buildings, additions, or streetscape and landscape features which detract from the historic character of the district or the neighborhood.

G. New Additions to Historic Buildings

-Placing functions and services required for the new use in non-character defining interior spaces rather than installing a new addition.

-Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

-Locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an inconspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

-Designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.

-Considering the attached exterior addition both in terms of the new use and the appearance of other buildings in the historic district or neighborhood. Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building. In either case, it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.

-Placing new additions such as balconies and greenhouses on non-character-defining elevations and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

-Designing additional stories, when required for the new use, that are set back from the wall plane and are as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.

H. Windows

-Identifying, retaining, and preserving windows - and their functional and decorative features - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. Such features can include frames, sash, muntins, glazing, sills, heads, hoodmolds, paneled or decorated jambs and moldings, and interior and exterior shutters and blinds.

-Protecting and maintaining the wood and architectural metal which comprise the window frame, sash, muntins, and surrounds through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems.

-Making windows weather tight by recaulking and replacing or installing weather-stripping. These actions also improve thermal efficiency.

-Evaluating the overall condition of materials to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, i.e. if repairs to windows and window features will be required.

-Repairing window frames and sash by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing. Such repair may also include replacement in kind of those parts that are either extensively deteriorated or are missing when there are surviving prototypes such as architraves, hoodmolds, sash, sills, and interior or exterior shutters and blinds.

-Replacing in kind an entire window that is too deteriorated to repair - if the overall form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. If using the same kind of materials is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

**Design for Missing Historic Features**

-Designing and installing new windows when the historic windows (frame, sash and glazing) are completely missing. The replacement windows may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the window openings and the historic character of the building.

**Alterations/Additions for the New Use**

-Designing and installing additional windows on rear on other-non character-defining elevations if required by the new use. New windows openings may also be cut into exposed party walls. Such design should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not duplicate the fenestration pattern and detailing of a character-defining elevation.

-Providing a setback in the design of dropped ceilings when they are required for the new use to allow for the full height of the window openings.

## 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.

-Protecting and maintaining a roof by cleaning the gutters and downspouts and replacing deteriorated flashing. Roof sheathing should also be checked for proper venting to prevent moisture condensation and water penetration; and to insure that materials are free from insect infestation.

-Providing adequate anchorage for roofing material to guard against wind damage and moisture penetration.

-Protecting a leaking roof with plywood and building paper until it can be properly repaired.

-Repairing a roof by reinforcing the historic materials which comprise roof features. Repairs will also generally include the limited replacement in kind - or with compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of features when there are surviving prototypes such as cupola louvers, dentils, dormer roofing; or slates, tiles, or wood shingles on a main roof.

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

**Design for Missing Historic Features**
-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.

**Alterations/Additions for the New Use**
-Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof such as air conditioning, transformers, or solar collectors when required for the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

-Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

**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.

-Removing a major portion of the roof or roofing material that is repairable, then reconstructing it with new material in order to create a uniform, or "improved" appearance.

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

-Stripping the roof of sound historic material such as slate, clay tile, wood, and architectural metal.

-Applying paint or other coatings to roofing material which has been historically uncoated.

-Failing to clean and maintain gutters and downspouts properly so that water and debris collect and cause damage to roof fasteners, sheathing, and the underlying structure.

-Allowing roof fasteners, such as nails and clips to corrode so that roofing material is subject to accelerated deterioration.

-Permitting a leaking roof to remain unprotected so that accelerated deterioration of historic building materials - masonry, wood, plaster, paint, and structural members - occurs.

-Replacing an entire roof feature such as a cupola or dormer when repair of the historic materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

-Using a substitute material for the replacement part that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the roof or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

-Removing a feature of the roof that is unrepairable, such as a chimney or dormer, and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature that does not convey the same visual appearance.

**Design for Missing Historic Features**
-Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced feature is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

-Introducing a new roof feature that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

**Alterations/Additions for the New Use**
-Installing mechanical or service equipment so that it damages or obscures character-defining features; or is conspicuous from the public right-of-way.

-Radically changing a character-defining roof shape or damaging or destroying character-defining roofing material as a result of incompatible design or improper installation techniques.

**The General Standards for Rehabilitation from the Secretary of the Interior:**

11. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

12. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

13. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

14. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

15. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

16. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

17. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

18. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

19. 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.

20. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

**E. FINDINGS:**

1. The Standard Mill building is a contributing structure to the St. Anthony Falls Historic District. The two-story addition, plaza and tower are considered non-contributing elements in the district.

2. The three-story addition and the parking deck designs meet the *St. Anthony Falls Historic District Design Guidelines* for siting which state that "new buildings have their exterior wall in the same axial orientation as the existing buildings."

3. The proposal also meets the St. *Anthony Falls Historic District Design Guidelines* for height and roof shapes.

4. The proposal does not meet the *St. Anthony Falls Historic District Design Guidelines* for rhythm of projections which state that "there shall be no major projections on the principal facades." There are a number of principal elevations to this development proposal; balconies are proposed to the new addition and the north elevation of the Standard Mill. The balconies on the addition project 4' on the Second Street elevation. Parts/bays of the new addition on Portland Avenue project over the lower two-story building. The balconies on the north (river) elevation project 6'. In past approvals, the HPC has noted that balconies do not meet the design guideline standards but are key to marketing condominium units on the river and therefore balconies have been approved in the West Side Milling District. The windows would need to be opened to allow for balcony access. While allowing balconies on some elevations of the mills have previously been approved, a drastic window enlargement system that eliminates the historic character and style of the windows has not previously been approved.

5. The proposal does not follow the *St. Anthony Falls Historic District Design Guidelines* recommendation for directional emphasis which states that "new buildings shall have a generally vertical emphasis." The new addition has a strong horizontal emphasis with square windows and horizontal banding and balconies.

6. It is unclear if the proposal meets the *St. Anthony Falls Historic District Design Guidelines* for materials and colors which recommend brick, stone and concrete in earth tones. The applicant is proposing a brick addition and parking deck, aluminum cornice and "decorative bands" of unknown materials. Color and materials sample should be provided for final approval.

7. The proposal does not meet the *St. Anthony Falls Historic District Design Guidelines* for nature of openings which state that "window openings should be approximately 1 ½ to 2 ½ times as tall as they are wide." The windows on the proposed addition are square. The proposed window alterations to the north (river) elevation are more square than vertical. Many of the historic windows in the West Side Milling District of the St. Anthony Falls Historic District are square. The 1925 addition of the neighboring North Star Blanket Factory has industrial square and horizontal windows. The earlier 1864 section of the North Star Blanket Factory has vertical Italianate double-hung windows which were maintained. The Standard Mill dates to the era of the 1864 section of the North Star Blanket Factory with its vertical double-hung Italianate curved windows. The proposed window shape of the Standard Mill will damage the historic character of the building. The 1986 two-story addition and the proposed three-story addition are non-contributing additions to the district and square windows are appropriate to the later industrial styles of the historic district.

8. The proposal does not meet the *St. Anthony Falls Historic District Design Guidelines* for details which state that the surface treatment of new buildings should divide the building into vertical bays. The Second Street elevation of the new addition has a heavy horizontal emphasis with the 23' wide horizontal balconies and horizontal decorative bands.

9. The proposal generally follows *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards* recommendations for historic districts which state that required new parking should be unobtrusive. The proposed parking deck is raised one story, but does not greatly obscure the historic features of the neighboring buildings. The electric transformer building on top of the parking deck is obtrusive.

10. The proposed three-story addition and the parking deck follow *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards* recommendations for new additions by not obscuring the character-defining features and placement over a non-contributing addition. The scale does not overwhelm the neighboring historic building and the new design is clearly differentiated.

11. The proposal does not follow *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards* recommendation of "identifying, retaining, and preserving windows - and their functional and decorative features - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. Such features can include frames, sash, muntins, glazing, sills, heads, hoodmolds, paneled or decorated jambs and moldings, and interior and exterior shutters and blinds." This development proposal recommends enlarging 60 of the 70 windows on the north (river) elevation (floors 2-6) to twice their size and removes the historic curved arch and double-hung window appearance. The 106 Group report discusses percentages of

changes throughout the history of the Standard Mill, but while the north (river) elevation received numerous window openings throughout the years of use these windows were always simple, Italianate double-hung windows. Most importantly, the stringent review system of the tax credit process of the National Park Service approved the additional window openings of the Whitney Hotel. Enlarging all of the windows on the north (river) elevation would completely eliminate the original architectural intent and character of the early 1870s Standard Mill building. Not only are the openings doubling in size, but the design introduces a modern window muntin pattern not seen in historic buildings of this era. The guidelines recommend that the decorative features of the historic windows also be maintained which includes the pane design and the curved arched opening.

12. *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards* recommend that "archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken." The applicant has not proposed mitigation measures to protect or preserve the identified archaeological resources under the plaza.

13. The proposed rooftop railing presented at the June 28, 2005 hearing is obtrusive and distracts from the historic roofline. *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards* recommend against "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." This railing does not follow the guideline as proposed.

14. The proposed metal cornice wrapping the roofline of the Portland Avenue (presented at the June 28, 2005 hearing) does not follow *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards* which recommend against "creating a false historical appearance because the replaced feature is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation." The proposed design creates a false sense of history and recreates a design element in a new position on the building.

15. An open planting area around the parking deck wall would allow for vine plantings. Vine plantings would provide dimension to the tall wall and would deter graffiti. Vine plantings would also alleviate the concerns expressed at the public hearings with the stark nature of the parking deck wall.

## F. STAFF RECOMMENDATION (amended June 28, 2005):

Staff recommends that the HPC adopt staff findings and approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions:

1. The proposed metal cornice detail on the Standard Mill building is not approved

2. The proposed railing on the rooftop must be placed in the same location and setback as the current railing.

3. The north (river) elevation balconies and the associated openings are approved, but the additional 30 window openings are not approved on this elevation.

4. The applicant must record archaeological resources under the plaza before the parking deck receives building permits.

5. The design of the two-story building with the three-story addition should incorporate the following recommendations: the windows of the two buildings should relate in size and shape; the number of panes should be increased to relate to the industrial character of the district; the design should incorporate a vertical emphasis; the upper floors should be set back from the lower floors to differentiate the old and the new.

6. Rooftop or penthouse equipment is not part of this approval and should not be added to the addition. Because the two rooftops of the buildings are closely the same, rooftop equipment would detract from the historic character of the Standard Mill.

7. Details of the ground floor privacy screen separators must be provided to and approved by HPC staff.

8. At least eight inches (8”) of ground must be left around the perimeter of the parking deck to allow for vine plantings to screen the wall.

**G. HPC RECOMMENDATION:**

The HPC continued the public hearing of June 14, 2005 to the public hearing of June 28, 2005 and asked for further information including drawings, specifications and elevations and details on the parking deck. At the June 28, 2005 public hearing, the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission voted to **adopt** the staff findings and **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness with staff recommendations and conditions.

Attachments:
1) Planning staff report for C of A for 150 Portland Ave for August 9, 2003
2) Application for C of A for 150 Portland Ave for August 9, 2003
3) August 9, 2003 minutes

**MINNEAPOLIS HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

**ROOM 317, CITY HALL**
**350 SOUTH FIFTH STREET**
**MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55415-1385**

**PERMIT REVIEW/PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES**
**JUNE 14, 2005**
**5:00 P.M.**

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 p.m. **Present:** Commissioners Anderson, Glancy, Grover, Herman, Koski, Larsen, Lee, Messenger, Neiswander and Nordstrom. **Excused Absences:** Commissioner Dunn. **Unexcused Absences:** None. **Staff Present:** Lucas, Mathis, Poor and Campbell.

**PERMIT REVIEW/PUBLIC HEARING**

**Approval of the Consent Agenda**

**MOTION** by Commissioner Koski to move Item #3, for 115 Second Avenue South, to the consent agenda. **SECOND** by Commissioner Messenger. **MOTION APPROVED** with no abstentions.

## Consent Items for Public Hearing

The public hearing was then opened for the following item.

**3. 115 Second Avenue South, St. Anthony Falls Historic District, by Gateway Investors Limited, dba Rivergate Apartments, for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an entry canopy. (Staff, Greg Mathis)**

No one wished to speak for or against the application. The public hearing was then closed.

**MOTION** by Commissioner Nieswander to **adopt** staff findings and **approve** a Certificate of Appropriateness for and entry canopy subject to the staff recommended conditions. **SECOND** by Commissioner Messenger. **MOTION APPROVED** with no abstentions.

**Items for Public Hearing**

1. **1201 Hennepin Avenue, Harmon Place Historic District, by Lund Food Holdings Inc., for a Certificate of Appropriateness to rehabilitate the existing building and construct a one-story addition. (Staff, Greg Mathis)**

Mr. Mathis presented the staff report recommending that the HPC adopt staff findings and approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work subject to the following conditions:

1. After the brick infill has been removed from the storefronts on the building, the applicant must prepare a façade restoration plan, outlining any necessary changes, including brick and stone repair/replacement. The HPC staff must approve this plan before the façade restoration can begin.

2. The new stone or cast stone that is needed for the storefront restoration must match the existing stone in terms of color, size, texture, profile and detail.

3. The HPC staff must approve the brick, stone, cast-stone (pre-cast concrete) and any terra cotta replacement materials.

4. The tuckpointing mortar must have the same strength, color, composition, texture and profile as the historic mortar.

5. All door and window glazing must be clear, non-tinted, non-reflective glass. One coat of Low-E glazing is allowed on the inner surface of the window.

6. The new windows on the rear (east) elevation must have applied muntins that match the glazing pattern of the existing three-over-three windows.

7. Any dropped ceilings that drop below the window heads must be setback 5'0" from the exterior windows where they drop below the window head.

8. The doors, windows, and storefronts must have a paint finish.

9. The new, fixed garage door on the rear elevation of the historic building must be installed in the same location, in terms of wall plane and setback, as the existing garage door.

10. The cornice on the addition must be pre-cast concrete, not stucco.

11. The awnings must be mounted to the metal window frames on the buildings.

12. No signage is approved. All signage will require additional approvals.

13. The HPC staff must approve the final construction plans.

14. The alley behind the building must be left in place. Any damage incurred to the alley during construction must be repaired/replaced in-kind and all such work must be approved by the HPC staff.

The public hearing was then opened and public testimony was taken. The public hearing was then closed.

**MOTION** by Commissioner Grover to **adopt** staff findings and **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness to rehabilitate the existing building and construct a one-story addition, subject to the fourteen staff recommended conditions, amending Condition 9 to read "Instead of installing an actual garage door in the historic garage door opening, a simulated garage door can be installed, provided it is installed in the same wall plane and has the same set back as the existing garage door". **SECOND** by Commissioner Anderson. **MOTION APPROVED** with no abstentions.

**2. 1221-29 Harmon Place, Harmon Place Historic District, by Mina Adsit on behalf of 1229 Harmon Place, LLC, for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new storefronts and windows. (Staff, Greg Mathis)**

Mr. Mathis presented the staff report recommending that the HPC adopt staff findings and approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work subject to the following conditions:

1. All door and window glazing must be clear, non-tinted, non-reflective glass. One coat of Low-E glazing is allowed on the inner surface of the window.

2. Any dropped ceilings that drop below the window heads must be setback 5'0" from the exterior windows where they drop below the window head.

3. The wall plane of the simulated garage doors must be in the same location, in terms of wall plane and setback, as the existing overhead garage door.

4. Any replacement stone must match the existing stone it terms of type of stone, size, color, finish and texture. The HPC staff must approve any replacement stone.

The public hearing was then open for this item and public testimony was taken. The public hearing was then closed.

**MOTION** by Commissioner Anderson to **adopt** staff findings and **approve** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work subject to the staff recommended conditions. **SECOND** by Commissioner Neiswander. **MOTION APPROVED** with no abstentions.

**3. 150 Portland Avenue (Whitney Hotel), St. Anthony Falls Historic District, by Whitney Partners LLC, for a Certificate of Appropriateness to convert the hotel into 50 condominium units and a partially below-grade parking structure on the plaza. (Staff, Amy Lucas)**

Ms. Lucas presented the staff report recommending that the HPC adopt staff findings and approve the Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant must submit specifications and drawings for the following for final staff approval:
    a. Proposed cornice details including sample of the aluminum
    b. Specifications for Portland Avenue elevations windows and doors
    c. Elevation drawings of the west elevation and the interior courtyard
    d. Details of the railings for the new addition and the parking deck
    e. Material samples of the lintels and decorative bands of the new addition'
    f. Specifications for the garage doors
    g. Details of the main entrance on Second Street
2. The north (river) elevation balconies and the associated openings are approved, but the additional 30 window openings are not approved on this elevation.
3. The applicant must record archaeological resources under the plaza before the parking deck receives building permits.
4. The applicant should make efforts to disguise the electric transformer in the plaza.
5. The design of the two-story building with the three-story addition should incorporate the following recommendations: the windows of the two buildings should relate in size and shape; the number of panes should be increased to relate to the industrial character of the district; the design should incorporate a vertical emphasis; the upper floors should be set back from the lower floors to differentiate the old and the new.
6. Rooftop or penthouse equipment is not part of this approval and should not be added to the addition. Because the two rooftops of the building are closely the same, rooftop equipment would detract from the historic character of the Standard Mill.

Commissioner Neiswander sought clarification of staff recommendation 5 and asked if the word "horizontal" should be changed to "vertical". Ms. Lucas responded yes, and indicated that she did not try to redesign the building, but tried to incorporate some of the design guidelines in the recommendation.

Commissioner Larsen asked Ms. Lucas about the proposed north elevation on sheet A8 and not approving the 30 additional windows. He asked if these were the larger windows that did not have balconies and questioned the reason for that. Ms. Lucas responded that in the findings she noted that the Commission has looked at minor window openings. The nearby Utility Building is one case where it was to bring the building windows down in the units. The HPC approved the lowering of three brick courses, less than a 1' of an opening on one part of the window and the decorative design under those windows was maintained. It is fairly invisible when one looks at this elevation. Using the drawing as an example, she showed that the windows did not line up and historically they did. The shape did not change, the number of panes was maintained and the character of the windows was maintained. That was the only case for marketing reasons besides some minor windows on the Northstar, but the Northstar was not completely opened up on that building. When the HPC reviewed the Northstar Building, at the time of its initial review the Commission thought it was going to be apartments and therefore receive tax credits for rehabilitation. Later the owner decided not to apply for tax credits and that federal review of design changes. The applicant was not proposing new holes, just larger holes in every case. Commissioner Larsen inquired if part of the concern was because the HPC had not approved that before, or the fact that the style of the window that is being proposed does not match what the original design. Ms. Lucas responded that if you completely wholesale the building wall, in this case, you would no longer know this is an 1880s, Italianate building. There are nine windows left in the proposed changes to date the building. In the previous approval on the Whitney, the HPC did not even approve half of the window openings in 2003 to be enlarged, so there was still a fair amount of character with the inset balconies and the historic windows being left open. Opening all the windows on the building for marketing reasons is a serious precedent, one that has not occurred before historically, and there are many more buildings with Italianate vertical double

hung windows that have not been rehabbed in the Mills District. It would be precedent setting to completely destroy the one visible riverfront elevation that is seen on this building.

Commissioner Grover stated that he had concerns about the details the Commission is not seeing, especially the elevations and whether or not there are changes happening on these elevations. Ms. Lucas stated that the HPC can make it a condition when making the motion to note that the Commission would like some of these missing drawings to return to the full Commission for review. The applicant did want to move forward with the main issues that they noted in the pre-permit discussion items.

Commissioner Koski stated with the *St. Anthony Falls Historic District Guidelines*, there is a section titled "purpose" and there are four intentions, with the third stating "to encourage and enable access to the river." In the letter received today, it looks like they are going to be closing off the plaza to public access. Ms. Lucas responded that she did not ask that, but the Commission can ask that of the applicant. She does not know if that would be open to the public and does not know the proposal. Commissioner Koski stated that right now it does allow public access to the river, anybody can climb the stairs that go up to the Crown Roller Mill. Right now it is a public thoroughfare.

Ms. Lucas showed the 1920's Northstar building and stated that the State Historic Preservation Office allowed the applicant at the time to put in two windows, they were really 9 or 12 paned windows and applicant at the time put in 4-paned windows when they thought they would have tax credit issues. The State Historic Preservation Office and the National Park Service were not in favor of the larger, fewer panes. Eventually the windows were changed to have more panes, six-over-sixes, so they created a double-hung window. There were many pre-permit discussion items about the (North Star) elevation. She could not find the drawings of the exact measurements.

Commissioner Koski stated that in the guidelines, under the section titled "purpose" the fourth item states "foster along the riverfront and the adjacent areas of viable community geared to the pedestrian". Looking at the parking garage that is proposed, one can see on the drawing the tiny little person next to the really tall wall and he did not think that this fosters a pedestrian environment, let alone visual access to the building. Ms. Lucas stated that she had a hard time with the drawings, or lack there of. She did not have details on the parking deck. She felt that she wrote approximately quite a few times when she was looking at the measurements. She was guessing where the height on the current level of the parking deck was in relation to where they are proposing the deck is. As you know now the plaza is sidewalk level and it steeps. She could not tell where the ground level was or how far they were going down on those drawings. She did not know how tall the little man is and is assuming that he is 5' 10". There is a lot of detail that is lacking. There are design elements that could be added to the parking garage to at least make a little more movement. A lot of entrances these days on the West River Parkway are being denied by the Park Board. She did not know if after further review by other City departments if that would even be the entrance. Commissioner Koski indicated his concern when he looked at sheet A-10 in the packet, said it measured 9' 3", at least on the south side and he believed it only got worse from that. Having a 9' wall at the zero lot line would be problematic, and that is not even to the top of the railing. Ms. Lucas stated that she is also missing specs on the railing and wondered if it would match others on the building. Commissioner Koski stated that if one looks at the preliminary landscape plan, for example, sheet C-7, it looked like the face of the parking garage wall projects out in front of the face of the existing building and if it is a 10' wall, it is not within the plane within the historic building. It will come out and it will block views. Ms. Lucas said she was not as concerned with that elevation or the set back because it is much more set back from the historic building.

Commissioner Nordstrom questioned why the parking garage cannot be below grade. Ms. Lucas stated that it is expensive and there is a bedrock issue.

The public hearing was then opened.

Steven DeRoyter, an attorney with the law firm Leonard, Street and Dienard, representing the owners of the Crown Roller Mill and the boiler house, stated that the boiler house was on the west side of the plaza and Crown Roller Mill is adjacent to it. On behalf of the owners, they support the renovation of the former

Whitney Hotel and they think the improvements that are proposed are attractive and fairly consistent with the historical aspects of those buildings and they think they are done in a tasteful way, given the necessities of the marketing efforts that will have to be undertaken to sell these units and they welcome an operating entity as a neighbor of the buildings. Their primary concern and interest is in the development on the plaza itself. The Standard Mill limited partnership, which owns the Whitney Hotel property, the Ceresota Mill, Crown Roller Mill and the boiler house are parties to a plaza agreement, which requires that the Whitney Hotel owners maintain that property as a plaza for the benefit of all four buildings. In addition to their private agreement, the MCDA has rights which call for pedestrian access to that plaza. They really need to get information and further details on exactly what this plaza is going to look like. The plan basically meets the requirements of the agreement and that it replaces the plaza with another plaza, but they are concerned with the elevations themselves. It appears that it may obliterate or interfere with access to the boiler house in particular and views from the boiler house. It appears that the plaza is at an elevation which is above the entrance level of the boiler house and maybe on top of that is a 42" railing. They cannot say they oppose the proposal as it stands because they really need better drawings and better analysis of how that is going to impact their building. They support the development and think they have done a good job as far as they can see and will be following this project and looking for more information and more details on it.

Erin Fitzgerald, a resident at 401 South 4th Street, stated that she has an interest in the development of this property. She would like to see this property get developed. The property is in extreme decline and since she has bought a condo in the area, she would like to see it developed further. She is concerned about the vagrants and homeless people being attracted to the area.

Cynthia Newsom, a resident at 200 South 2nd Street, indicated that she had concerns about the plaza. She came to the meeting to get a better understanding of that, it seems pretty vague to her. As a resident she is concerned about the area.

Mike Roess, from Whitney Partners, LLC, owner and partner in the Whitney Hotel project, said that since 1992 he has been involved with adaptive reuse projects, primarily in historic buildings. Most of his work has taken place in San Francisco and New York. The reason 1992 is delineated in his mind is because that is the year of the earthquake during the World Series. One of the effects of that earthquake was that it put 2,000 buildings in downtown San Francisco on the seismic upgrade list. That created a 20 year time cycle of which those buildings could not be reused unless they were seismically upgraded. It meant that if you had an office building and you had it occupied and 2002 rolled around and you did not spend the money to do the upgrade the building could no longer be used for office use. It created an incredible dilemma in San Francisco because many of these 2000 buildings were either individually listed within a district or were just cool old brick buildings. He spent the last 15 years of his life renovating those buildings and coming up with an adaptive reuse or another reuse to those buildings. This building is a challenge, it is not at the top of the list of the buildings he has been involved with, but it is close to the top. His sister is an AIA and an ASID. He tends to be more on the marketing and development side of the family and his sister is the architecture and design side of the family. Most of the buildings he has been involved with have been either individually listed or in a district. As he has mentioned last time he was here, he has also done buildings he felt could be contributing to a district, but were not in a district. One of the other efforts he has been involved with in the last 15 years was actually establishing a district of 22 buildings. If you have not ever talked to a building owner about limiting their rights and putting a building into a district, it was one of the most challenging projects, aside from this project, he has ever been involved with. It is an understatement to say that he has a passion for this sort of thing. He is marketing about 500 condominium units or office units within those buildings. Currently he is doing about 200 in Minneapolis. One of the buildings is the Sexton Building and though that building has not been individually listed, it is not in a district, it reminds him very much of 58 Howard Street in San Francisco, which is a building he really did not want to see torn down. That is what previous proposals had been for the building. He needs to divide this project into pieces because it has a lot of different pieces to it. At the end of the evening they want to try to get some consensus in four areas. They are parking on the site, how they park the sites. The second area is windows. The third area would be balconies. As they have studied previous approvals, they can see that balconies had been previously approved; buyers do want them, particularly on the river. And the last area would be the 1986 addition to the building, on the south side of the building.

Ken Piper, from Tanek Architects, stated that the plaza right now is something that raises a lot of questions. They are proposing to take the 96 room Whitney Hotel and create 50 condominium units. With the history of this building, parking has never been addressed on site. They are attempting to address that in a creative way. He wanted to draw attention to the sidewalk with an elevation of 810' and proceed down the stairs to the north side of the building, which would be predominately on the plaza. At this point it is at 800'. There is about an 8' to 10' difference down to the point and proceeding further north at about 800' the bottom of the existing pool is at 797' elevation that is about another 3½' below that. The elevation on 1st Street is at 802'. Based on the borings that have been done on this plaza is that roughly 2' below the pond which is at 795', they are experiencing consistent table form bedrock. That is their limitation and challenge in terms of nestling the sub-grade parking through there. What they need for parking is a clearance of 8' and about 3' of structure to get to the top of the plaza. They are looking at about 11'. If they were to do that on top of bedrock they would be at an elevation of about 795' at the bottom of the pool, to which they have a consistent table that they than could add another 11' which would take them to 806' of elevation. This is the best case scenario. While they would be optimistic and assume that it would be possible for that to occur, they are in fact showing varying portions of that in our presentation. If one looks at the adjacent buildings they are setting back the parking structure about 12' to 14' away from each structure that allows them to respect the structural integrity of these adjacent aged buildings and also allows them to make connections that come back and preserve the access back up to the plaza at Ceresota and Crown Roller Mill. There is an easement that gains access that they are also going to preserve. As one looks at the parking, what he has talked about in terms of the parking and the setback and setting that down with the lowest point being on 1st Street on the site and coinciding with an area where there is a curb cut already they are proposing to put in the access to the sub-grade parking. That also allows them to have the entire area open so this is in fact the protected sub-grade parking area. It allows them to come and ramp down while leaving the area open, creating the garage door, which allows them to put a lower wall, which then opens up the view point and creates it as a lower open level. That is a critical and important thing as they are trying to fit it in. They end up with a total of 43 stalls down below. They are proposing to come in under the existing 1986 addition and put an additional 7 stalls, for a total of 50 stalls. There will also be a number of tandem spaces and when adding 14 tandem spaces there will be a total of 64. Commissioner Koski indicated that the HPC was not concerned about the parking count. He would like issues that were brought up in staff report addressed.

Mr. Piper stated that one final point is that they do have access to the plaza, so the plaza is accessible to the public. They did not plan to change that. One of the important things looking at the façade of the adjacent North Star development. This façade actually lines up with the 1925 façade of the North Star; the projection of the Northstar would be the equivalent of the plaza in front of [this] building. The façade on [this] building was always a secondary façade. There are a number of changes that this façade has gone through. The building was one story shorter and there was an area that was sub-grade. There was a raised trestle on [this] elevation and an area that was added in 1986, and an entire wing that was also added. Looking at this in addition to the utilitarian use of the building this building was always set up as a secondary façade in terms of addressing the functionality of the mill and its product going back and forth on the raised rail trestle [this] façade was permeated with windows filled in. It had a lot of different window opening formations to this through history. They look at the major façade in terms of contributing that, as the Portland façade, they are proposing to preserve that. They have looked at openings that they are proposing here that actually are vertical openings when you look at the existing openings as being 3' by 7'. They are proposing 6' by 11'4" dimension. They do have a proportion that is vertical and they are making the openings uniform. A total of 100 openings on [this] façade, they are proposing that 69 of those openings be enlarged. The previous proposal that was approved in 2003, called for 44 enlarged openings. They are proposing the openings to be the same size as those 6' by 11'4". They feel that the general punched integrity of the building remains intact and doing what they call the "book ending", which is essentially preserving openings on the perimeter of that. They are asking for 30 balconies that are 6' by 8' that allows them to functionally address each unit. On the Portland side, which was originally the primary façade and has remained intact, they are proposing to reconstruct the corbel and cornice elements on the façade. The openings will stay as original and in essence, this façade does tell the history of the 1986 addition and therefore what they are proposing to do with the new is essentially come in and build a structure on top of that. On the existing parapets, they are setting the building off that existing parapet, so

then again, the line going all the way up is not exceeded but in essence setting that within the parapet tube. Observe [this] component they will take the two single windows and in fact make them larger, make them one.

Betsy Bradley, from the 106 Group, said there is a need to think carefully about this building and showed a photo of when it was the working mill. When it was the working mill, that was when the Portland Avenue façade was predominant, it always was the façade. It is the portion of the building where the stylistic elements were concentrated. Also need to think carefully about the arched window openings in industrial buildings. She tends to think of them as decorative and as part of a style, when in fact they were the sort of way one built in brick during the last 19th century. They built a large arched window opening to avoid using a wood or metal lintel with these thick walls; it was the manner of building. It did add to the character of the building, but the style of this building was expressed on the Portland Avenue façade. What they have now is what she calls the idealized mill building. The 1986 version of which is recognized as iffy in integrity, particularly on the north wall. The addition of the west bay and a new west wall and a new monitor level with habitable space are the kinds of changes that are seen in rehabilitation projects but they are true changes to the building. This forces them to think about all four sides of the building. There is the Portland Avenue façade with pretty good integrity. There is the opposite end of the building, a 1986 wall which does not have historic integrity and the north and the south walls which have an idealized expression of what a mill building might be. There are so many window openings. She is troubled most about the appearance of the building as it is today is that it gives the feeling that historically it could have appeared this way. Until studying this building, one is not aware that this is not in historic condition, that it is an idealized version of a mill that you saw with the result of the 1986 work. She spoke about applying the *Secretary of Interior Standards* to this project, specifically the two standards of how property can be changed over time. Standard 2, recommends preserving the historic character of buildings and limiting the changes made to them. Standard 3 acknowledges that changes have been made and will continue to be made. The team that is working on this project seriously took the portion of the standard that states changes will not create a false sense of historic development. Moving to the design of the enlarged window openings she thinks that some important points could be made about those. The square headed larger opening was proposed for a specific reason, it does not attempt to replicate shape of the historic windows, and it is also a practical consideration. The use of arched heads on the windows of the top floor honors the way that window openings were organized by bay and by story historically on this building. On the larger side she asked how large is too large, that is difficult to judge. She would argue that even with the larger window openings, this is a wall with individual punched openings, it is a wall with windows, it is not a wall completely of windows, and therefore they could find some reason to accept that the larger size is appropriate. The sash proposed for those windows was chosen with care, it did not seem appropriate to replicate either types of historic sash in this building, either the wood windows that were there initially or the wire glass windows that were put in there in the early 20th century is configuration that the windows in the building now replicate did not seem appropriate for the larger openings. The new sash is obviously new, it is functional and can be read as a change related to the new use of the building. The proportions of the openings meet the *St. Anthony Falls Historic District Guidelines* they have vertical orientation. In many ways this project meets the *Secretary of Interiors Standards* if you can accept that the larger window openings are necessary. It meets those standards by restoring the Portland Avenue façade side of the building by locating the changes by what has always been the secondary elevation. You need to think carefully about the difference between visibility and historic significance. This was the working secondary elevation of this building. It is now quite visible, its visibility and historic significance are related but different concepts. The enlarged south addition to the property is compatible with the historic district and by accommodating the parking off street meets the *Secretary of Interiors Standards* for dealing with parking. Another way to think about the sum of all the proposed changes is that if one saw this historic mill building with the changes that were proposed, could you recognize it has a historic mill building? Of course the answer would be yes. Could you recognize it as being converted to residential condominiums? Yes, you could recognize that as well. Does the building still convey its period of historic significance? Well, it certainly can and would through its Portland Avenue façade, the south wall of the building will have the same degree of integrity that it has now, the north wall would be altered and the west wall would express the 1986 condition. A building has four walls; it is more than the north wall of the building. If the changes proposed would be approved the building would be changed but over all it would probably still have fair to good integrity that it has now with some parts of the building like the Portland Avenue façade

having excellent integrity and others would demonstrate the changes made to accommodate the new use. She encourages the HPC to consider the building as an entire entity; the north wall is part of the larger whole that needs to be kept in mind.

Mr. Piper expressed a desire to summarize a few things. He showed a comparison of the 2003 proposal versus the 2005 proposal. The 2003 proposal had a unit count of 34. The 2005 proposal is 50, an addition of 16 units. They are smaller units and that is a key element when looking at windows. On site parking proposing 64 spaces as opposed to none. Enlarged openings, again approved 44 enlarged openings, they are asking for 69, that is a net addition of 25 same size openings. Balconies approved 19 inset and 4 projecting balconies, they are asking for 30 projecting balconies. Projections are to be 6' x 8'. South addition is non-contributing. What was approved was a one-story addition to that façade, they are asking for a three-story, stepped addition, keeping the 1986 exterior. The 2003 proposal called for a total reclading of that part of the building. The plaza, the proposal called for the existing plaza to remain, they feel that there is an opportunity to enhance that plaza further, as well as to get their parking component in, which is essential to this project. Because the building has formed a utilitarian purpose all the way through and has changed with use; it has accommodated changes in use and this is historically through time. He showed a picture of a study of the existing panoramic view that is out there and what happens by the 3'x 7' window, the high sill and what is captured in terms of a view. There is very little view that is captured. The thickness of the walls starting on the ground level with four feet of thickness in the walls all the way up to two feet on the top level, somewhere in the three 2'x 8' to 3 ½' range through the others and is a factor as part of the 3' opening. Commissioner Koski asked if Mr. Piper could tell what floor the plan section was cut through. Mr. Piper responded that he believed it was perhaps the 3rd or 4th floor. Commissioner Koski then asked if that was with the understanding that the wall gets thinner as it goes up. Mr. Piper stated that it is 4' at the ground level and then 2' at the top. In summarizing, it is important to note that they are maintaining access through and into the plaza.

Michael Norton, an attorney, with Kennedy and Graven, representing the Whitney Partners, stated that he believed they did meet the legal standards that the Commission has to consider in determining the approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness. The code of ordinances section 539.350 provides two elements of the standard for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness; the first is what is the alteration in the particular building that is being talked about since talking about a contributing structure in an historic district. Not talking about this building as an isolated building that the building in the district will not materially impair the integrity of the district. The second element of that is whether or not the proposal in the application that he was provided with is consistent with the applicable guidelines for the St. Anthony Falls Historic District, the West Bank Milling guidelines and the *Secretary of the Interiors Standards*. The significant bodies of approvals that have been reviewed and gone through this body and predecessors. Those approvals are directly relevant in their view. They directly inform how this body has historically interpreted whether or not other items such as the large windows in the Northstar, the balconies, the new addition to the Humboldt, etcetera, whether or not there is an impairment of the historic integrity of the St. Anthony Falls Historic District and based on those determinations this body in the city has determined that those kinds of significant architectural and new construction types of activities have been conducted have not impaired the integrity of the district. With respect to the *St. Anthony Falls Historic District Guidelines*, they believe that in the record, the Commission will see an exhaustive discussion by Ms. Bradley of how all the *St. Anthony Falls Historic District Guidelines* have been met with the exception of the issue of the projections and the balconies. Note that with the balconies, staff recommends approval largely because there is need to see what amenities are going to help restore and maintain these buildings for another 100 years. Staff has taken a different position with respect to the compliance of the guidelines with the window openings. Suggest that a look be taken at Ms. Bradley's report and compare her objective facts that she brings and the analysis that she brings as to how our application meets the guidelines as compared with personal conclusions and unsupported facts of claims of drastic changes that have never been approved before. There is evidence in the record before you supports the conclusion that the application meets the *St. Anthony Falls Historic District Guidelines*. In response to the chair's question about weather or not they meet the general guidelines; he thinks that clearly Mr. Piper has shown that they do meet the general guidelines with respect to the pedestrian access. There are no findings from staff that suggest they do not. With respect to the chair's question, he would respectfully suggest that they do meet all of the guidelines including the general guidelines that have not been analyzed by staff. With respect to the Secretary of the Interiors guidelines, he

thinks that Ms. Bradley is focused on her report in how in fact those guidelines work. There has been no suggestion and he does not think anyone has ever suggested in front of this body that in order to receive approval that you have to meet every single guideline word for word. He thinks there are some objective facts that have to be looked at to determine if they are meeting at least the intent of the guidelines to the extend that they can while still balancing the intent of the guidelines with preserving the featured historic aspects of the building. In this particular case, he thinks Ms. Bradley clearly shows that they meet all of the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines, with the exception of they certainly meet the intent of the guidelines with respect to the windows and the use of how they are trying to treat those windows so that they are not mimicking other types of construction on this building such as what was approved in 1986. Without going through a point by point analysis which he did not think was necessary. He thinks it is clear that when you look at this project and what this building is going to do in comparison to, first of all, the district as a whole, he does not think there are any facts in the record that show that this project is going to materially impair the St. Anthony Falls Historic District. If you look at this project in comparison to other projects which the HPC has approved, it is consistent and actually based on what was approved two years ago they are asking for a significantly smaller number of openings to be approved this time, than for example what was approved for the Northstar. It is his recollection that the north façade, the river side of the Northstar, all those windows were opened significantly larger than what was originally in that building. They are asking for no more than what has been approved previously. Based on all this, they think they have clearly met all of the guidelines and all of the applicable guidelines.

Pat Smith from Whitney Partners, LLC, said they were excited about moving forward with this project. They have spent many hours with their design to put together a design that is respectful to the Whitney's history that will compliment the other buildings in this historic district. They have also been careful to stay within the boundaries and the guidelines of other approvals that they have made within this district. They do have some concerns though, the building is vacant and there are inherent risks with that. They have had a couple of failed hotel attempts with the property. There has been one condo conversion attempt that failed. Most concerned about the condo market becoming saturated. If residential becomes unrealistic for this project, then what, it is his job to do the financial analysis for the property and he has not come up with a good financially viable alternative for this property. They feel that now is the time to make this change. They are willing to invest many dollars into the Whitney and breathe new life into this project and hopefully give it new life for the next 100 years.

No one else wished to speak for or against the application. The public hearing was then closed at 7:24 p.m.

Commissioner Grover said he wanted to touch on one thing that has been bothering him with the current proposal and put it on record. In looking at the comparisons between the 2003 and 2005 proposals, the number of window openings that are being talked about and the north elevation, the 2003 proposal has on the main, north elevation 27 window openings that would be enlarged. What is being proposed tonight is opening up 69 openings and that is a significant piece. Granted the original proposal had 44 openings which were talked about, but they were on different sides of the building, whereas all of the 69 openings are on one side of the building. Granted they can work with the numbers, but where they are located is a concern for him.

Commissioner Nordstrom indicated that she was sympathetic to the market needs of making it habitable. She noted that she has stood in the Whitney Hotel and saw how dark and uninhabitable it felt, but she finds for herself and maybe for the entire body of the Commission, that they have to balance the needs of an efficient and livable adaptive reuse, the view the people will get living there, the tremendous asset of the river and all of that which the HPC has worked very hard to preserve in many pieces. The Commission has to balance that with the needs of the city in terms of the historic preservation of what was there. That is part of the Commission's charge here; to balance that need of making it marketable, adaptive and wonderful, but also preserving the view of what it was and what it will be and what it could be.

Commissioner Larsen stated when talking about the windows and the shape and looking at the guidelines replacing windows in-kind, he has looked at the Northstar Blanket building, where windows were opened, that recreated the similar muttons, number of muttons, etcetera. It seemed that a lot of the projects the HPC has seen where changes were made to the windows, it seemed to be reflective of the original character and

one of this group seems to be saying in this particular case that we should not being doing that. He wanted clarification from staff. Ms. Lucas responded that her staff report did not take that angle. Betsy's main point was; does this alteration impair the integrity of the building. Ms. Lucas felt that if there are only two historic elevations that you see left on this building,and one of them is virtually destroyed; you could not look at that building if you took those changes into account and say that is a mill building from 1879. With those alterations you would not know that any longer, that is impairing the integrity of the structure beyond what the 1986 alterations did. They always maintained the character. They were always aware of the era of the building. There are aluminum windows, we know that they were new windows. All of the restorations you look at try to take into account the viability, the marketability, the new use, but when you look at new windows, if it is an industrial building of the 1920's you look at multiple panes. If you look at a building on 1st Street and it's a small Italianate store front you look at double-hung windows and you look at the number of panes, they are usually insulated glass. This alteration is major, not only because Julie Snow's proposal had 25 openings, there was not a balcony on that 2003 proposal, so you are looking at 30 balconies plus 30 more openings on the only major elevation that is visible. The Portland Avenue elevation is probably only 4 bays or 3 bays. Commissioner Larsen then asked if it was primarily the number of windows or the number and style. Ms. Lucas responded that the style of the proposed windows do not look at all to the character of the building. In fact, it is a really odd. The juxtaposition of two double-hung windows with a fixed transom above and below is new and different. It is something that is probably seen in new construction, but not a rehab that the HPC has seen before.

Commissioner Herman stated that she had concerns about the plaza and the appearance of it from the river and the accessibility to it. She said she needed more information on how it is going to look. Looking at page A-8, it looks like they are proposing significant walls that would really form a barrier to the river from the plaza and vise versa. That was not there before. This is one area that she thinks needed to be looked at carefully as far as this proposal. Commissioner Koski stated that he completely agreed. He thought that there is some information that the architect attempted to provide the HPC this evening to try to get a better understanding of that, but unless one is an architect or civil engineer, maybe it did not make a lot of sense to Commissioners when talk was about elevation spots. If there were a rendered elevation of the Portland Avenue elevation, all the way to the corner, with true elevations and maybe section lines, that would give the HPC a better understanding. He thought there was a lot of missing information. He was concerned about the access. The current access is through the site in every direction and the way that it was presented this evening, it looks like it there is a single pathway along the face of the Crown Roller Mill as opposed to across the entire plaza. He indicated that he wanted a better understanding about how that is all going to work and if there are security issues. He wanted to know how those are going to be addressed in advance of approving it. Commissioner Herman added that right now, they are proposing the vehicular access off of the River Road and she is not certain that that would be approved by other entities that look at road access, but she believes that vehicular access would also form a barrier. The whole idea of the plaza is to allow for pedestrian movement to the river. She would like to see some thought given to alternatives and maybe cars entering off of Portland into the site and into the parking ramp. They already have cars entering from that façade. She would like to see some ideas from the architects on how that might be accomplished or why it is not possible.

Commissioner Koski said he wanted to get back to the issue of the north elevation which the applicant has argued many times as historically not a primary elevation, but as secondary and never significant. He thought that in evolving urban context like this, clearly there are buildings that have been removed and no one is going to suggest that we re-build a building that was covering up that elevation. The fact is that it is a very significant primary and highly visible elevation from the district, from the Stone Arch Bridge, and up and down the river corridor. One can argue all you want that it is not a primary elevation, but it very clearly is. Having served on this body for almost four years, he thought is was a primary elevation because of its visibility. There is a difficulty whenever the Commission hears applicants trying to translate the Commission's decision that was made about one specific project and a specific design solution and carrying those over for another project. These buildings are all different. If one looks at the Northstar Blanket Building, it is a concrete frame with infilled brick, it is not a solid brick masonry wall construction like this, it does not have and never had arched windows. The part that has the balconies and expanded windows. There are many different elements that vary, that he does not think one can plug in the number of windows, the stylistic changes and put them into a spread sheet formula and find out whether or not you

are going to pass muster. That is why there is a design review panel of eleven experts and lay people of the city, to determine and make a resolution of some of these gray areas. In this case, looking at some of the previous projects for this building they were not already ideal from a preservation standpoint. He stated that personally he was uncomfortable approving the last design proposal since it goes way beyond that by eliminating virtually all of the original windows on that north elevation. It may be a matter of degree, not black and white, but this is so far over the edge. He said he did not see much attempt or creativity applied toward mitigating the need to add amenities like balconies and wider windows. There needs to be a balance and more methodology on how that is done. Right now it is very aggressive. He thought the design of the balconies was quasi-traditional, quasi-historical, but he did not know from what style of architecture they come from, but they do obscure the industrial cleanness of that original elevation of the cross bracing. The window patterning with the over/under transoms and the split windows is also a pattern that is not germane to this building, it comes from the outside and he is not sure how it relates to this building from an appreciation of the building's original design. He indicated that he was inclined to do one of two things. One is to continue this item for more information on the plaza and alternative window organization, or simply to deny the application. He indicated that he was putting this out there for the sake of discussion.

Mr. Norton said he did not want to interrupt the commission's deliberations, but he said he would like to question the Commission. Commissioner Koski reminded Mr. Norton that the public hearing was closed. Mr. Norton then stated that with respect to postponing the matter for the plaza issue, the plaza issue was not before the Commission. It is a non-contributing element; it is not on their application. If the Commission is not inclined to not approve the items that are actually before it, then they would request that the Commission do that. Commissioner Koski replied that Mr. Norton's opinion was not his understanding and it looked like it was not the understanding of the other commissioners. Ms. Lucas then explained that HPC reviews all alterations in a designated historic district. If the Commission wanted to talk about paint on the Fifth Street Southeast Historic District, it could start to do that. The Commission could talk about their window closures and their gutters. We often have conversations about the color of asphalt shingles, but "all alterations" are not defined by a permit; it is any alteration, any design element in an historic district.

Commissioner Koski asked why the Commission was looking at the plaza. Ms. Lucas stated the she would say the Commission was and that it is in the application, there are 6 or 7 pages of drawings on the parking deck, more than she got for any of the building elevations.

Commissioner Larsen stated that he would concur with the suggestion to continue the item. He thought it is always better to work together to achieve a proposal that can receive acceptance. He would hate to leave this on a negative note, requiring an appeal rather than to request them to consider some of the issues. He would have made many of the same comments that were made. His questions high lighted many of those earlier. He would suggest that a continuance would be highly appropriate in this instance.

Commissioner Herman indicated that she would concur with Commissioner Larsen. Rather than a complete denial, she would like to see a continuance. From her perspective, she would like to see some significant rethinking of this proposal, both in terms of the balconies, the windows and the plaza. The plaza is an integral part of the property as it has existed for quite a few years and it has to remain accessible to the river and users, be pedestrian-friendly both from the river as well as leading to the river. She stated that she did not like the fortress-like look that she saw that was being proposed for the whole border along the river. She concurred that the balconies and windows are out of step in terms of their design for the historic nature of this façade. She said she appreciated the difficulty of these windows and views as they exist, and she thinks that something does have to be done to make these units marketable for almost any reuse, be it condominiums, office or what ever they might propose for this building. It is probably the one reason that the hotel failed, it was that there were essentially no views for any of those windows, but there has to be a better way. She agrees that everyone needs to work together, we can do better and we all want to see success for this property and want to see it reused in an economically successful way.

Commissioner Messenger said she would reiterate what Commissioner Larsen stated that this is a project, like any project, that the Commission wants to work with, but there is a lot of information on the building that is missing, a lot of details. She thought the Commission would be wise to continue this item.

Commissioner Neiswander stated she would agree with the idea of continuing this item. She thought if the applicant wanted more guidance that they might look closely at the design that was approved previously as more in keeping with the Commission's thinking about this building.

Commissioner Grover questioned what information can be given to the applicant on this continuance, and asked what the Commission needed to see. He stated that the HPC has talked about the windows and some of the plaza and the details that Ms. Lucas wants, just in general more information is needed. One of his concerns is the north elevation and that the HPC has seen it a few times and it seems like it has not changed much since seeing some of the initial schematics. One of his concerns is that by continuing, they would come back with the same design even though they have heard the Commission's concerns before. He said he is all for working with this and thinks that this is what should be done instead of denying it. He then asked what was the next step that the Commission could give them for direction. He said they needed to move forward on this instead of readdressing issues that the HPC would have concerns with again. Commissioner Koski stated that is a point that is very well taken and asked if there are there specific things that would be stated to provide a reason for the continuance.

Mr. Norton stated that for the purposes of representing his client and making the record, he had to address the Commission. Based on the comments that he heard, he has no objection to working with this body. They came to a pre-permit meeting and thought they were trying to work with the HPC; they took comments at that time to heart. They came back with an application and design that they felt met their needs for this particular project. They have heard the Commission's comments and respect the comments, they just do not happen to agree with them. That is fine, that is what makes this country great. He cannot see from all of the comments they have heard here that there is any guidance that the HPC can give them that they could agree with or would want to agree with. With the recent comments, all that we'll get approved is what was approved in 2003. If they felt that they could live with the 2003 approvals, he said he could assure the HPC that they would not have wasted its time by coming back with the application they have tonight. He requested that in lew of a continuance, if the majority of the Commission did not agree with the application, they ask for an up or down vote on this so they can get on with what they need to be doing. There is no amount of guidance that the Commission can give them that they can live with.

Commissioner Koski stated that he appreciated everything Mr. Norton had to say, but again, this is not a public hearing, that part is closed. The point is well taken. The Commission needs more information about the plaza. He is not sure how that works, what the actual elevations are, what is the best scenario, what is the worst case scenario. He thought that the Commission can work through some of the other details with recommendations attached to an approval, but right now we are to far away. He did not want to go ahead and try to amend the staff recommendations at this point, but he would go ahead and move that the Commission continue this item until the next meeting and request that the applicant consider the comments and specifically provide more information with regard to the plaza building elevations and details, public access and security of that plaza.

**MOTION** by Commissioner Koski to **continue** the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to convert the hotel into 50 condominium units and a partially below-grade parking structure on the plaza, to June 28, 2005, time certain 7:00 p.m. **SECOND** by Commissioner Anderson. **MOTION to continue to June 28, 2005 time certain 7:00 p.m**. **MOTION to CONTINUE** with no abstentions.

Commissioner Grover suggested a friendly amendment to include the items under staff recommendations A – G, that some of the other drawings and details that were missing at this time. For instance, replacement window details on Portland Avenue elevation. Commissioner Koski agreed.

Commissioner Herman added that alternative concepts for access into the parking, potentially not off of the River Road but from elsewhere are needed. The re-working of the plaza was presented, but she would like

to see some true alternatives to what was presented to the Commission, if possible. If they are physically impossible to do, she would like to know why.

Commissioner Koski said he would take that as some kind of an explanation for the current design and justification if other designs are not workable. That was acceptable.

Commissioner Lee stated that there has been a lot of discussion that this building will, in the state that the renovation is proposed to the Commission, or will not impair the integrity of the building or the district. Looking at it himself he can say that it will definitely impair the integrity of the building and the district. In as much as the applicant is trying to draw comparisons on other projects that do not have the same situations or structural character, he believes that the commission would be looking at future applicants making the same kind of comparisons on this structure approved in the manner that it is presented today, in terms of a precedent for opening windows and facades major and minor. He summed up by saying that there is more work to be done.

The meeting was **ADJOURNED** at 7:53 p.m.