

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

---

---

FILE NAME: 101 5<sup>th</sup> Street South, First National Bank – Soo Line Building, Individual Landmark

DATE OF APPLICATION: July 22, 2008

APPLICANTS: Charlene Roise, Hess, Roise and Company, (612) 338-1987

PUBLICATION DATE: September 23, 2008

DATE OF HEARING: September 30, 2008

END OF APPEAL PERIOD: September 26, 2008

HPC SITE/DISTRICT: Individual Landmark

CATEGORY: Contributing

CLASSIFICATION: Certificate of Appropriateness

STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Molly McCartney, (612) 673-5811

---

---

**A. SITE DESCRIPTION & BACKGROUND:**

A Minneapolis Landmark, the Soo Line Building, was designated by the City in 1996 and earlier this year was listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The proposed rehabilitation project is also seeking federal tax credits as part of the project.

At the time of its completion in 1915, the First National Soo Line Building was the tallest building in Minneapolis. Standing nineteen stories tall, it represented a symbol of corporate wealth and civic pride in Minneapolis. The building was a collaboration between two Minneapolis companies: the First National Bank and the Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Sault Ste. Marie Railway (the Soo Line) and was built for their corporate offices.

Heavily influenced by the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago, architect Robert Gibson used techniques from the Les Ecole des Beaux-Arts to design the Soo Line Building. Representing a return to classicism in architecture, the Soo Line Building stands out as one of the few tall buildings in Minneapolis to incorporate Second Renaissance Revival details. The building has a rectangular form at the first three floors and then separates into a U-shape that continues to the top. The sixteenth through nineteenth floors form the capital.

The building's exterior is clad in grey granite on the first three floors. Terra cotta is the primary material on the rest of the building's primary façades, or north, east, and west facades. The southern or rear façade is clad in brick. The primary facades have a consistent window pattern with replacement storefronts on the first floor and large non-original windows on the second and third floors. The second floor also has a significant amount of non-original louvers. The fourth through eighteenth floors have groups of three windows in the bays and the end bays are marked with double windows. The eighteenth story has arched window openings in most of the bays.

The building has had a number of alterations that affect its architectural integrity including a second story skyway addition, window and louver replacement, alterations to the storefronts and interiors. The interior is not part of the local designation.

## **B. PROPOSED CHANGES & ANALYSIS:**

The applicant is proposing a rehabilitation of the building which includes repair of exterior terra cotta, replacing entrances on 5<sup>th</sup> Street South, adding and replacing entrances on Marquette Avenue, and replacing windows. Changes are also proposed for the interior space, including lobby and staircase changes, however, the local designation does not protect the interior of this building. The building is being renovated for the new use of a hotel from the basement to the tenth floor Skyway uses as well as upper-level office space will be retained (eleventh through the eighteenth).

### **Terra cotta**

The applicant is proposing to repair exterior terra cotta along the fifth through nineteenth floors, especially terra cotta at the cornice at the fifteenth floor. There has been significant water damage to the material on the east and west sides of the interior courtyard below the 15<sup>th</sup> floor windows due to an inadequate copper gutter flashing. The proposed work includes restoration and when necessary, replacement of tiles. Please see Attachment 1, page 29 “Exterior Building Wall Review” memo for a detailed description of the water damage terra cotta.

### **5<sup>th</sup> Street South Entrances**

The main entrance on 5<sup>th</sup> Street South is proposed to be changed, including new doors and door locations, and addition of stairs. The main entrance is centered on the first story divided by five bays with granite columns. The current doors are not original and they come very close to the granite columns when fully opened. This entrance has one stair riser in the bays and the interior slopes downward toward the doors. The entrance doors are proposed to be replaced and located 3 ft. back to allow for clearance of the granite columns. The interior floor will be leveled, and additional risers are needed at this entrance for access. An entrance on the Marquette Avenue façade will be accessible. The proposed stairs and landing would be clad in granite and the doors are proposed to be metal with a glass insert.

A new emergency exit is proposed at the second storefront bay from the east. It currently has non-original storefront windows. The proposed door is located in a storefront window bay and would be an emergency exit only (exit for new internal stairwell). The proposed door is metal with a glass insert.

### **Marquette Entrances**

Proposed changes to entrances on Marquette Avenue include replacement of the existing entrance that is located in the second storefront from the south. The entrance currently has a set of non-original metal and glass doors. The proposed changes of this entrance are for the main entrance of the hotel. Sliding glass doors are proposed to be installed and will be set back 1 ft. from the location of the existing doors.

A canopy above the entrance is proposed to be installed above this entrance as well. The canopy is a metal awning projecting into the right of way approximately 5 ft. that will be attached to the building at the canopy and also be suspended brackets. The canopy will be approximately the length of the bay. A previous canopy had been located at the window bay to the south originally. The new canopy has a simple design with clean lines, which is different from the original ornate metal canopy.

A new entrance is proposed to be installed in the second storefront from the north. This storefront is currently a three-plate storefront window. The proposed doors would include a new storefront, with a metal and glass door with new windows on each side.

### **Windows**

The windows on the building are all replacement windows, which includes louver replacements in original window opening, most visual are the second story louvers. Window materials varies from aluminum to other metal frames. On the east, north, and west facades, the applicant proposed to replace windows on the second and third story – however, the existing second story louvers will remain. The first story storefront windows will also remain.

Windows on the south elevation, or rear elevation, face an adjacent parking garage. Some of the windows on the east and west ends have been replaced with windows similar to the other facades. The windows in the middle of this elevation do have some of the original metal three-over-three sash windows. These windows look into the elevator shafts and the actual openings have been filled in behind the glass with concrete block. The proposed work includes filling in two bays of windows (which look into mechanical shafts) which the applicant states are for fire code issues. The applicant is proposing that these windows be filled in with masonry recessed slightly to show the outline of the original windows. The proposed windows are on a secondary façade and not easily viewed by right of way or other public spaces. The proposed changes will keep some of the original windows on the building, while replacing two bays of windows needed to rehabilitated the building up to current safety codes. This work is consistent with the Standards that call for retaining character defining features, like windows, while updating and reusing the building.

### **C. GUIDELINE CITATIONS:**

#### **The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (1990)**

The Soo Line Building does not have local individual design guidelines, so the proposed work is being evaluated based on the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (or “*Standards*”) for the following work.

**Masonry:** *Brick, stone, terra cotta, concrete, adobe, stucco, and mortar*

#### **Recommended:**

Identifying, retaining, and preserving masonry features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as walls, brackets, railings, cornices, window architraves, door pediments, steps, and columns; and joint and unit size, tooling and bonding patterns, coatings, and color.

Protecting and maintaining masonry by providing proper drainage so that water does not stand on flat, horizontal surfaces or accumulate in curved decorative features.

Cleaning masonry only when necessary to halt deterioration or remove heavy soiling.

Carrying out masonry surface cleaning tests after it has been determined that such cleaning is necessary. Tests should be observed over a sufficient period of time so that both the immediate effects and the long range effects are known to enable selection of the gentlest method possible.

Cleaning masonry surfaces with the gentlest method possible, such as low pressure water and detergents, using natural bristle brushes.

Inspecting painted masonry surfaces to determine whether repainting is necessary.

Removing damaged or deteriorated paint only to the next sound layer using the gentlest method possible (e.g., hand scraping) prior to repainting.

Applying compatible paint coating systems following proper surface preparation.

Repainting with colors that are historically appropriate to the building and district.

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

Repairing masonry walls and other masonry features by repointing the mortar joints where there is evidence of deterioration such as disintegrating mortar, cracks in mortar joints, loose bricks, damp walls, or damaged plasterwork.

Removing deteriorated mortar by carefully handraking the joints to avoid damaging the masonry.

Duplicating old mortar in strength, composition, color, and texture.

Duplicating old mortar joints in width and in joint profile.

Repairing stucco by removing the damaged material and patching with new stucco that duplicates the old in strength, composition, color, and texture.

Using mud plaster as a surface coating over unfired, unstabilized adobe because the mud plaster will bond to the adobe.

Repairing masonry features by patching, piecing-in, or consolidating the masonry using recognized preservation methods. Repair may also include the limited replacement in kind or with compatible substitute material of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of masonry features when there are surviving prototypes such as terracotta brackets or stone balusters.

Applying new or non-historic surface treatments such as water-repellent coatings to masonry only after repointing and only if masonry repairs have failed to arrest water penetration problems.

Replacing in kind an entire masonry feature 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 large sections of a wall, a cornice, balustrade, column, or stairway. 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 installing a new masonry feature such as steps or a door pediment when the historic feature is completely missing. 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.

### **Not Recommended:**

Removing or radically changing masonry features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Replacing or rebuilding a major portion of exterior masonry walls that could be repaired so that, as a result, the building is no longer historic and is essentially new construction.

Applying paint or other coatings such as stucco to masonry that has been historically unpainted or uncoated to create a new appearance.

Removing paint from historically painted masonry.

Radically changing the type of paint or coating or its color.

Failing to evaluate and treat the various causes of mortar joint deterioration such as leaking roofs or gutters, differential settlement of the building, capillary action, or extreme weather exposure.

Cleaning masonry surfaces when they are not heavily soiled to create a new appearance, thus needlessly introducing chemicals or moisture into historic materials.

Cleaning masonry surfaces without testing or without sufficient time for the testing results to be of value.

Sandblasting brick or stone surfaces using dry or wet grit or other abrasives. These methods of cleaning permanently erode the surface of the material and accelerate deterioration.

Using a cleaning method that involves water or liquid chemical solutions when there is any possibility of freezing temperatures.

Cleaning with chemical products that will damage masonry, such as using acid on limestone or marble, or leaving chemicals on masonry surfaces.

Applying high pressure water cleaning methods that will damage historic masonry and the mortar joints.

Removing paint that is firmly adhering to, and thus protecting, masonry surfaces.

Using methods of removing paint which are destructive to masonry, such as sandblasting, application of caustic solutions, or high pressure waterblasting.

Failing to follow manufacturers' product and application instructions when repainting masonry.

Using new paint colors that are inappropriate to the historic building and district.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of masonry features.

Removing non-deteriorated mortar from sound joints, then repointing the entire building to achieve a uniform appearance.

Using electric saws and hammers rather than hand tools to remove deteriorated mortar from joints prior to repointing.

Repointing with mortar of high portland cement content (unless it is the content of the historic mortar). This can often create a bond that is stronger than the historic material and can cause damage as a result of the differing coefficient of expansion and the differing porosity of the material and the mortar.

Repointing with a synthetic caulking compound.

Using a “scrub” coating technique to repoint instead of traditional repointing methods.

Changing the width or joint profile when repointing.

Removing sound stucco; or repairing with new stucco that is stronger than the historic material or does not convey the same visual appearance.

Applying cement stucco to unfired, unstabilized adobe. Because the cement stucco will not bond properly, moisture can become entrapped between materials, resulting in accelerated deterioration of the adobe.

Replacing an entire masonry feature such as a cornice or balustrade when repair of the masonry 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 masonry feature or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Applying waterproof, water-repellent, or non-historic coatings such as stucco to masonry as a substitute for repointing and masonry repairs. Coatings are frequently unnecessary, expensive, and may change the appearance of historic masonry as well as accelerate its deterioration.

Removing a masonry feature that is unrepairable 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 masonry feature is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

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

#### **Entrances and Porches**

##### **Recommended:**

Identifying, retaining, and preserving entrances - and their functional and decorative features - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as doors, fanlights, sidelights, pilasters, entablatures, columns, balustrades, and stairs.

Protecting and maintaining the masonry, wood, and architectural metal that comprise entrances and porches through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems.

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

Repairing entrances and porches by reinforcing the historic materials. Repair will also generally include the limited replacement in kind - or with compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of repeated features where there are surviving prototypes such as balustrades, cornices, entablatures, columns, sidelights, and stairs.

Replacing in kind an entire entrance or porch that is too deteriorated to repair - if the form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. 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 entrance or porch if the historic entrance or porch is completely missing. 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 building.

### **Alterations/Additions for the New Use**

Designing enclosures for historic porches when required by the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building. This can include using large sheets of glass and recessing the enclosure wall behind existing scrollwork, posts, and balustrades.

Designing and installing additional entrances or porches when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building, i.e., limiting such alteration to non-character-defining elevations.

### **Not Recommended:**

Removing or radically changing entrances and porches which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Stripping entrances and porches of historic material such as wood, iron, cast iron, terra cotta, tile and brick.

Removing an entrance or porch because the building has been reoriented to accommodate a new use.

Cutting new entrances on a primary elevation.

Altering utilitarian or service entrances so they appear to be formal entrances by adding paneled doors, fanlights, and sidelights.

Failing to provide adequate protection to materials on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of entrances and porches results.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of historic entrances and porches.

Replacing an entire entrance or porch when the repair of materials and limited replacement of parts are appropriate.

Using a substitute material for the replacement parts that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the entrance and porch or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Removing an entrance or porch that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new entrance or porch that does not convey the same visual appearance.

### **Design for Missing Historic Features**

Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced entrance or porch is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

Introducing a new entrance or porch that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

### **Alterations/Additions for the New Use**

Enclosing porches in a manner that results in a diminution or loss of historic character such as using solid materials such as wood, stucco, or masonry.

Installing secondary service entrances and porches that are incompatible in size and scale with the historic building or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.

### **Windows**

#### **Recommended:**

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 reapplication 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 or 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.

**Not Recommended:**

Removing or radically changing windows which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Changing the number, location, size or glazing pattern of windows, through cutting new openings, blocking-in windows, and installing replacement sash which does not fit the historic window opening.

Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which radically change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of the glazing; or the appearance of the frame.

Obscuring historic window trim with metal or other material.

Stripping windows of historic material such as wood, iron, cast iron, and bronze.

Failing to provide adequate protection of materials on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of the windows results.

Retrofitting or replacing windows rather than maintaining the sash, frame, and glazing.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of historic windows.

Replacing an entire window when repair of materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

Failing to reuse serviceable window hardware such as brass lifts and sash locks.

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

Removing a character defining window that is unrepairable and blocking it in; or replacing it with a new window that does not convey the same visual appearance.

**Design for Missing Historic Features**

Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced window is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

Introducing a new design that is incompatible with the historic character of the building.

**Alterations/Additions for the New Use**

Installing new windows, including frames, sash, and muntin configuration that are incompatible with the building's historic appearance or obscure, damage, or destroy character defining features.

Inserting new floors or furred down ceilings which cut across the glazed areas of the windows so that the exterior form and appearance of the windows are changed.

**D. ANALYSIS**

The Soo Line Building does not have local individual design guidelines, so the proposed work is being evaluated based on the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (or "*Standards*") for the

following work. Many of the proposed changes are consistent with the Standards that guide rehabilitation work for exterior changes. The following is an analysis of those changes.

### **Terra cotta**

The proposed terra cotta work is consistent with the Standards that call for character defining features to be retained and preserved. The proposed work includes replacement of terra cotta that has been damaged due to improper water drainage, mainly on the upper most stories of the building. The proposed work to the terra cotta sensitively replaces a number of tiles, which are character defining features of the Soo Line Building. The attached “Exterior Building Wall Review” memo on page xx for a detailed description of the terra cotta condition.

### **5<sup>th</sup> Street South Entrances**

The proposed work to the main 5<sup>th</sup> Street South entrance is consistent with the Standards that call for character defining features, such as entrances to be retained and preserved. The proposed changes include replacing non-original doors and moving the actual entrance away from granite piers in this entrance.

The proposed emergency exit on 5<sup>th</sup> Street South is a new entrance/exit that is proposed to fit into an existing storefront. This entrance is to be used for emergency exit only and is at the base of a new internal staircase needed for the new hotel. There has been no documentation submitted that shows a door was ever in this location. The removal of the non-original storefront for an entrance does not damage character-defining features and is a reversible action as well. However, the proposed doors are not in keeping with the original character of the building, mainly in that the door and storefront windows do not move toward a more historically accurate design, instead they repeat the non-sensitive storefronts that have been installed.

### **Marquette Entrances**

The proposed work for the main Marquette Avenue entrance is consistent with the Standards that call for character defining features, such as entrances to be retained and preserved. Sliding glass doors are a different type of material and entrance mechanism than the other building doors. Due to the recessed nature of this entrance, their visibility is lessened and the door replacement is a reversible action. However, the proposed doors are not in keeping with the original character of the building, mainly in that the sliding door opening mechanism does not move toward a more historically accurate design, instead it is more similar to the non-sensitive storefronts and entrance that have been installed in the last 20 years.

The proposed canopy is consistent with the Standards that call for character defining features, such as entrances to be retained and preserved and that the new canopy is based on pictorial which is differentiated by a less ornate design, compatible with the historic character of the building. Staff would like more detailed drawing of how the suspended brackets will be attached to the building prior to exterior building permit review. Masonry disturbance should be minimal and any attachments should be through mortar and not masonry.

The proposed new storefront entrance on Marquette Avenue While it is not sure that an entrance was in this location, the removal of the non-original storefront for an entrance does not damage character-defining features and is a reversible action as well. However, the proposed doors are not in keeping with the original character of the building, mainly in that the door and storefront windows do not move toward a more historically accurate design, instead they repeat the non-sensitive storefronts that have been installed.

### **Windows**

These proposed window changes on the facades are minimal and the proposed work does not damage any historic fabric of the building. However, the proposed window changes are not in keeping with the original

character of the building, mainly in that the proposed windows do not move toward a more historically accurate design, instead they repeat the non-sensitive windows that have been installed.

The proposed changes to the rear windows will keep some of the original windows on the building, while replacing two bays of windows needed to rehabilitated the building up to current safety codes. This work is consistent with the Standards that call for retaining character defining features, like windows, while updating and reusing the building.

#### **E. FINDINGS:**

1. 101 5<sup>th</sup> Street South, First National Bank – Soo Line Building, is an individual landmark designated by the City of Minneapolis in 1996 and recently added to the National Register of Historic Places.
2. The applicant is proposing a rehabilitation of the building which includes repair of exterior terra cotta, replacing entrances on 5<sup>th</sup> Street South, adding and replacing entrances on Marquette Avenue, and replacing windows.
3. The proposed terra cotta work is consistent with the Standards that call for character defining features to be retained and preserved and sensitively replaces a number of tiles, which are character-defining features of the Soo Line Building.
4. The proposed work to the main 5<sup>th</sup> Street South entrance is consistent with the Standards that call for character defining features, such as entrances to be retained and preserved.
5. The proposed emergency exit on 5<sup>th</sup> Street South is a new entrance/exit that is proposed to fit into an existing storefront. While the removal of the non-original storefront for an entrance does not damage character-defining features and is a reversible action, the proposed door is not in keeping with the original character of the building, mainly in that the door and storefront windows do not move toward a more historically accurate design, instead they repeat the non-sensitive storefronts that have been installed.
6. The changes to the main Marquette Avenue entrance retain the entrance however, sliding glass doors are a different type of material and entrance mechanism than the other building doors. Due to the recessed nature of this entrance, their visibility is lessened and the door replacement is a reversible action. However, the proposed door are not consistent with the Standards that call for changes to retain the character of the building, mainly in that the sliding door opening mechanism do not move toward a more historically accurate design, instead it is more similar to the non-sensitive storefronts and entrances.
7. The proposed canopy is consistent with the Standards that call for character defining features, such as entrances to be retained and preserved and that the new canopy is based on pictorial which is differentiated by a less ornate design, compatible with the historic character of the building. Staff would like more detailed drawing of how the suspended brackets will be attached to the building prior to exterior building permit review. Masonry disturbance should be minimal and any attachments should be through mortar and not masonry.
8. The proposed new storefront entrance on Marquette Avenue is located in a storefront that may not have an entrance, the removal of the non-original storefront for an entrance does not damage character defining features and is a reversible action as well. However, the proposed door are not in keeping with the original character of the building, mainly in that the door and storefront windows do not move

toward a more historically accurate design, instead they repeat the non-sensitive storefronts that have been installed.

9. These proposed select window changes on the façades of the building are minimal and the proposed work does not damage any historic fabric of the building. However, the proposed window changes are not in keeping with the original character of the building, mainly in that the proposed windows do not move toward a more historically accurate design, instead they repeat the non-sensitive windows that have been installed.
10. The proposed windows on the south, or rear elevation, are on the secondary façade and not easily viewed by right of way or other public spaces. The proposed changes to these windows will keep some of the original windows on the building, while replacing two bays of windows needed to rehabilitated the building up to current safety codes. This work is consistent with the Standards that call for retaining character defining features, like windows, while updating and reusing the building.
11. The proposed work, subject to the following conditions, will not negatively impact this resource, provided that CPED-Planning staff reviews specific drawing of how the suspended brackets will be attached to the building prior to exterior building permit review. Masonry disturbance should be minimal and any attachments should be through mortar and not masonry.

#### **F. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the HPC adopt staff findings and **approve** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work subject to the following conditions:

1. The new storefront entrances/exits on 5<sup>th</sup> Street South and Marquette are denied,
2. The sliding glass door design of the hotel entrance on Marquette Avenue is denied,
3. The proposed window changes on the north, east, and west façade are not denied,
4. Masonry disturbance for the canopy installation shall be minimal and any canopy attachments shall be installed through mortar and not masonry, and
5. Detail elevation drawings shall be submitted to CPED-Planning staff for final approvals, specifically elevation details of how the canopy will be attached to the building.

#### **Attachments:**

1. Certificate of Appropriateness for 101 5<sup>th</sup> Street South, including project description, photos, memo on exterior building wall review, letter from masonry subcontractor, pages 13-
2. Site, elevation, floor plans and window and door detail, pages