

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

**Certificate of Appropriateness**  
BZH-26219

**Date:** April 13, 2010

**Proposal:** Request for Certificate of Appropriateness to replace and/or repair windows, doors, loading docks, and one satellite antenna

**Applicant:** David Kelly

**Address of Property:** 119 4<sup>th</sup> Street North

**Project Name:** 119 4<sup>th</sup> Street North Certificate of Appropriateness

**Contact Person and Phone:** David Kelly, 952-922-2220

**Planning Staff and Phone:** John Smoley, Ph.D., 612-673-2830

**Date Application Deemed Complete:** April 2, 2010

**Publication Date:** April 13, 2010

**Public Hearing:** April 20, 2010

**Appeal Period Expiration:** April 30, 2010

**Ward:** 7

**Neighborhood Organization:** Downtown Minneapolis Neighborhood Association

**Concurrent Review:** n/a

**Attachments:** Attachment A: Materials submitted by CPED staff – A1-A9

- Location map – A1
- 350' map – A2
- Warehouse Historic District Design Guidelines – A3-A9

Attachment B: Materials submitted by Applicant – B1-

- Notification letter to Council Member and neighborhood organization (scope of work revised since letter was written) – B1-B3
- Property owner's letter (scope of work revised since letter was written) – B4-B5
- Application – B6-

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division



**119 4<sup>th</sup> Street North, 2010, photo submitted by Applicant**

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division



119 4<sup>th</sup> Street North, 1907, Minnesota Historical Society photograph

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

<b>CLASSIFICATION:</b>	
Local Historic District	Warehouse Historic District (contributing resource)
Period of Significance	1865 to 1930
Criteria of significance	The Warehouse Historic District is significant for its depiction of social history, architecture, and the work of master craftsmen during the period 1865 to 1930.
Date of local designation	1978
Applicable Design Guidelines	<i>The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties</i>  <i>Warehouse Historic District Design Guidelines</i>

<b>PROPERTY INFORMATION</b>	
Current name	PRI Building/Textile Building
Historic Name	Winston, Farrington, and Company Building
Current Address	119 4 <sup>th</sup> Street North
Historic Address	119-129 4 <sup>th</sup> Street North
Original Construction Date	1900
Original Contractor	Pike and Cook
Original Architect	Long and Long
Historic Use	Wholesale and warehouse
Current Use	Commercial – offices and restaurant
Proposed Use	Commercial – offices, restaurant, and radio station

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

**BACKGROUND:**

The subject property is a 5 story brick and terra cotta commercial building designed in the Renaissance revival style located at the southeast corner of 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North and 4<sup>th</sup> Street North in the Warehouse Historic District (Attachments A1 and A2).

The Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District is historically significant as an early example of commercial growth as the city's warehouse and wholesaling district. The district expanded during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and helped transform Minneapolis into a major distribution and jobbing center for the northwest. The district is also significant for its concentration of commercial buildings representative of every major architectural style from the late nineteenth to early twentieth century. Finally, the district is significant for exemplifying the work of master craftsmen in its construction.

The exterior portions of the 119 4<sup>th</sup> Street North contribute to the district's significance. Designed by Long and Long in 1900 for the Winston, Farrington, and Company grocery store, the building is representative of Renaissance Revival architecture, warehousing, and the work of master architects characteristic of the district.

**SUMMARY OF APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL:**

The Applicant wishes to conduct the following work on the exterior of the building at 119 4<sup>th</sup> Street North:

1. repair and repaint the existing ground floor wood windows and entrances;
2. replace the existing windows on the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floors;
3. sand and repaint existing wood window trim on the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floors;
4. sand and repaint existing wood doors on the alley side fire escape of the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floors;
5. sand and repaint existing metal windows and doors on the street side fire escape of the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floors;
6. add matching alley window opening on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor;
7. replace the existing steel loading dock platform;
8. replace and extend an existing railing on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North loading dock; and
9. install a rooftop satellite antenna.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

As of the publication of this staff report, staff has received no comment letters on the project.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:** Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows

***Findings as required by the Minneapolis Preservation Code:***

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

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

The exterior portions of the building at 119 4<sup>th</sup> Street North contribute to the district's significance due to the property's embodiment of Renaissance Revival architecture, warehousing, and the work of master architects characteristic of the district. Regardless of what changes are made to the subject property, it will maintain its historical significance, but proposed changes may affect its integrity (i.e. the property's ability to communicate its historical significance).

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

The proposed alterations are compatible with and support the property's exterior designation. The exterior portions of the building at 119 4<sup>th</sup> Street North contribute to the district's significance. The Applicant is proposing to conduct maintenance on exterior features; replace exterior features with new features that complement the design of the historic building; and install equipment necessary for the operation of a new use (one satellite antenna for a radio station).

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

Based upon the evidence provided below, the proposed work will impair, but not destroy, the integrity of the contributing resource.

*Location:* The Applicant proposes no changes to the contributing resource's location, thus the project will not impair the contributing resource's integrity of location.

*Design:* As proposed, the project will alter the design of the building by installing new windows whose dimensions do not replicate those of the existing features. Plan sheet a3.1 provides standard dimensions and designs that do not appear to match many existing windows, especially on the south side of the building. Dimensions of the existing window rails, meeting bars, stiles, jambs, and muntins (where applicable) are also missing. No proposed window dimensions beyond those of the window frames and panning have been provided. This lack of details makes a comparison between the existing and proposed replacement windows

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

impossible. The proposed ground floor wood window and entrance repair and repainting; matching fifth floor alley window opening; steel loading dock platform replacement; 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North loading dock railing extension and replacement; and rooftop satellite antenna installation will, as conditioned, have no impact upon the building's design.

*Setting:* The Applicant proposes no offsite changes, thus the project will not impair the contributing resource's integrity of setting.

*Materials:* The Applicant proposes to replace wood windows that date back to the building's period of significance with new aluminum windows that do not date back to the period of significance. The project will impair the contributing resource's integrity of materials. The proposed ground floor wood window and entrance repair and repainting; matching fifth floor alley window opening; steel loading dock platform replacement; 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North loading dock railing extension and replacement; and rooftop satellite antenna installation will, as conditioned, have no impact upon the building's integrity of materials.

*Workmanship:* The Applicant proposes no changes to the terra cotta, the feature that best communicates the workmanship inherent in the building, thus the project will not impair the contributing resource's integrity of workmanship.

*Feeling:* The Applicant is proposing to:

1. repair and repaint the existing ground floor wood windows and entrances;
2. replace the existing windows on the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floors;
3. sand and repaint existing wood window trim on the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floors;
4. sand and repaint existing wood doors on the alley side fire escape of the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floors;
5. sand and repaint existing metal windows and doors on the street side fire escape of the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floors;
6. add matching alley window opening on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor;
7. replace the existing steel loading dock platform;
8. replace and extend an existing railing on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North loading dock; and
9. install a rooftop satellite antenna.

What is proposed would have a huge affect on feeling.

*Association:* Replacement windows would undermine the building's association with Renaissance Revival architecture, warehousing, and the work of master architects characteristic of the district.

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

The application follows all guidelines laid out in the Warehouse Historic District Design Guidelines (adopted in 1978) with one exception: two of six guidelines related to windows.

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

The guidelines require preservation of original windows unless they are badly deteriorated or provide inadequate thermal performance. The proposed replacement of all windows does not meet this standard. A window survey conducted by DW Martin & Associates and submitted by the Applicant indicates that approximately 80% of the sashes in the north and east (street side) elevations have obvious dry rot, with dry rot in 15% of the sills and dry rot at the bottom of 30% of the interior window stops. No indication is given as to what percentage of each sash is rotten, or whether the sash could be repaired. The application does state that most of the rotten sills and interior window stops are repairable. The survey indicates that non-street side windows are in very good condition, with only five out of fifty-six sashes experiencing rot. No statistics are given for the energy efficiency of the existing windows, though the application does note complaints of drafty windows, a lack of weatherstripping, missing hardware, and poor fitting sashes. The Applicant also wishes to conduct window work that does meet this standard:

1. sand and repaint existing wood window trim on the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floors;
2. sand and repaint existing metal windows and doors on the street side fire escape of the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floors.

The guidelines do permit aluminum replacement windows, but require window paning replicate existing wood mouldings. Although the application states that the replacement sashes will match the existing offset design, the application is missing dimensions of proposed windows beyond those of the window frames and panning.

The guidelines require replacement windows have a true offset single- or double-hung operation. The Applicant is proposing the latter in accordance with the standards.

The guidelines require replacement windows have a paint finish, as opposed to anodized aluminum. The Applicant is proposing a green replacement window finish to match the existing street-side window finish, in accordance with the standards.

The guidelines require replacement windows utilize clear glass unless historical documentation suggests otherwise. The application states that the replacement window glass will be clear, in accordance with the standards.

The Applicant also wishes to:

1. to repair and repaint the existing ground floor wood windows and entrances; and
2. repaint existing wood doors on the alley side fire escape of the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floors.

This is in keeping with the guidelines, which require critical details of storefronts be retained.

The Applicant also wishes to:

3. add matching alley window opening on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor;
4. replace the existing steel loading dock platform;
5. replace and extend an existing railing on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North loading dock; and
6. install a rooftop satellite antenna.

This is in keeping with the guidelines, which permit selective removal of original building materials for remodeling as part of an adaptive reuse.

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

The Applicant is conducting a rehabilitation of the subject property.

The proposed project follows the rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* in all areas but one: windows on the second through fifth floors.

#### WINDOWS, SECOND THROUGH FIFTH FLOOR

The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* recommend conducting an in-depth survey of the condition of existing windows early in rehabilitation planning so that repair and upgrading methods and possible replacement options can be fully explored. The submitted survey does not meet this standard.

1. The existing number of windows on the building is not clear. Some windows, such as S2-5, S3-4, S4-5, S5-5, N3-3, N4-1, N4-12, N5-1, E2-9, E4-9, W2-2, W2-5, W2-6, W3-1, W3-2, W3-3, W3-4, and W5-5 do not have close-up photographs in the survey, though they do appear on elevations.
2. The specific location of each window, relative to other windows on the building, is not clear. Scaled elevations of each side of the building in question do not depict some windows, such as S4-5a, S4-5b, W2-2a, and W2-2b.
3. The survey is missing many existing window dimensions. This includes the dimensions of the rail, meeting bar, stile, jamb, and muntins (where applicable) for each window type. Sheet a3.1 provides standard dimensions and designs that do not appear to match many existing windows, especially on the south side of the building.

The guidelines do not recommend replacing windows important in defining the historic character of the building (street side windows on the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floors), as the Applicant is proposing, rather than maintaining the sash, frame, and glazing. The street (north and east) side windows are important in defining the overall character of the historic building. The guidelines also recommend repairing window frames and sash by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing. Such repair may also include replacement in kind—or with compatible substitute material—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. A window survey conducted by DW Martin & Associates and submitted by the Applicant indicates that approximately 80% of the sashes in the north and east (street side) elevations have obvious dry rot, with dry rot in 15% of the sills and dry rot at the bottom of 30% of the interior window stops. No indication is given as to what percentage of each sash is rotten, or whether the sash could be repaired. The application does state that most of the rotten sills and interior window stops are repairable. The survey indicates that non-street side windows are in very good condition, with only five out of fifty-six sashes experiencing rot.

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* do not recommend changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of the glazing; or the appearance of the frame. The application is missing specifications of all proposed replacement windows and parts, to include dimensions beyond those of the window frames and panning. Specifications should, but do not, include proposed treatments of arched window openings as well as the operation of each proposed window. The application does indicate that the windows will utilize clear glass. The plans and project description indicate that the proposed windows will be double hung. Submitted specifications for proposed ProVia windows included some, but not all, required dimensions for both a picture window model and a double hung window model. Specifications are also missing window installation depths. Existing windows S4-3, 4, and 6, all of which are mounted nearly flush with the exterior wall (as opposed to the majority of windows on the building), highlight the difference in appearance such details can make. This lack of details makes a comparison between the existing and proposed replacement windows impossible.

The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* do not recommend replacing windows solely because of peeling paint, broken glass, stuck sashes, and high air infiltration. These conditions, in themselves, are no indication that windows are beyond repair. Yet these standards acknowledge that energy efficiency is an appropriate consideration in the rehabilitation of historic buildings. The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (energy efficiency section) recommend making windows weathertight by re-caulking and replacing or installing weatherstripping. These actions also improve thermal efficiency. The application provides no statistics for the energy efficiency of the existing windows, though the application does note complaints of drafty windows, a lack of weatherstripping, missing hardware, and poor fitting sashes.

Despite this, the window proposal complies with this standard in four areas:

1. repair and repaint the existing ground floor wood windows and entrances;
2. sand and repaint existing wood window trim on the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floors;
3. sand and repaint existing wood doors on the alley side fire escape of the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floors; and
4. sand and repaint existing metal windows and doors on the street side fire escape of the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floors.

## FIRST FLOOR DOORS AND WINDOWS

First floor doors and windows proposed for repair and replacement also meet the rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* which recommend repairing storefronts by reinforcing the historic materials along with the limited replacement in kind—or with compatible substitute materials—of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of storefronts where there are surviving prototypes.

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

## WINDOW OPENING

The Applicant has also proposed to add one window opening on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor along the alley side of the building. The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* recommend designing and installing additional windows on rear or other non-character-defining elevations if required by the new use. This new window opening, required for the operation of the new radio station tenant, will appear on a non-character-defining elevation high above the ground.

## ROOFTOP SATELLITE ANTENNA

The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* recommend designing a rooftop addition when required for the new use, that is set back from the wall plane and as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street. The Applicant's request to install a rooftop satellite antenna meets this guideline, as indicated in the photographs and plans submitted with the application.

## LOADING DOCK

The proposal includes the replacement of the existing steel loading dock platform. Visual and building permit evidence indicates that this feature does not date back to the building's period of significance, which ended in 1930. The rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* recommend designing and constructing a new feature of this sort when the historic feature 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 building. The loading dock will remain in the same location: in an alley behind the building where it is minimally visible from the public right of way. The Applicant is altering the design of the dock minimally to make it building code compliant for egress routes. The steel guardrails and handrails will be painted to match the color of the existing southeast alley wall.

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

Action 8.1.1 of the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth indicates that the City shall protect historic resources from modifications that are not sensitive to their historic significance. The project will modify the building in ways that are insensitive to its historical character, as discussed in items 4 and 5 above.

Comprehensive plan policy 8.1 states that the City will, "Preserve, maintain, and designate districts, landmarks, and historic resources which serve as reminders of the city's architecture, history, and culture." The proposed work will not help preserve the subject property and will result in the wholesale removal of serviceable, historic wood windows.

The subject property lies within the Downtown Parking Overlay District. No new surface

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Planning Division

parking lots are being proposed nor are other changes proposed which would affect the building's off-street parking requirement.

**(7) Destruction of any property. Before approving a certificate of appropriateness that involves the destruction, in whole or in part, of any landmark, property in an historic district or nominated property under interim protection, the commission shall make findings that the destruction is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property, or that there are no reasonable alternatives to the destruction. In determining whether reasonable alternatives exist, the commission shall consider, but not be limited to, the significance of the property, the integrity of the property and the economic value or usefulness of the existing structure, including its current use, costs of renovation and feasible alternative uses. The commission may delay a final decision for a reasonable period of time to allow parties interested in preserving the property a reasonable opportunity to act to protect it.**

The project does not include the destruction of the subject property.

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

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

The proposed alterations are compatible with and support the statement of significance in the original nomination upon which designation of the landmark or historic district was based. The exterior portions of the building at 119 4<sup>th</sup> Street North contribute to the district's significance. The Applicant is proposing to conduct maintenance on exterior features; replace exterior features with new features that complement the design of the historic building; and install equipment necessary for the operation of a new use (one satellite antenna for a radio station).

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

Title 20 of the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances, Zoning Code, Chapter 530, Site Plan Review does not require site plan review for this proposal, which includes no additions.

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

As discussed in finding #5, the application is not in compliance with the rehabilitation guidelines of *the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

**Before approving a certificate of appropriateness that involves alterations to a property**

***within an historic district, the commission shall make findings based upon, but not limited to, the following:***

***(11) The alteration is compatible with and will ensure continued significance and integrity of all contributing properties in the historic district based on the period of significance for which the district was designated.***

The proposed alterations are compatible with and will ensure continued significance and integrity of all contributing properties in the historic district with one exception: window changes. The Applicant is proposing to replace historic wood windows with aluminum windows that may complement the character of the district. Yet the application is not specific enough in regard to the dimensions of existing and proposed windows to make this comparison.

***(12) Granting the certificate of appropriateness will be in keeping with the spirit and intent of the ordinance and will not negatively alter the essential character of the historic district.***

The spirit and intent of the City of Minneapolis' Heritage Preservation Regulations is to preserve historically significant buildings, structures, sites, objects, districts, and cultural landscapes of the community while permitting appropriate changes to be made to these properties. The property owners have requested they be allowed to replace serviceable, historic wood windows without comparing the cost, energy efficiency, environmental toll, or compatibility of new windows versus rehabilitation of the existing windows. This is not in keeping with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

***(13) The certificate of appropriateness will not be injurious to the significance and integrity of other resources in the historic district and will not impede the normal and orderly preservation of surrounding resources as allowed by regulations in the preservation ordinance.***

Approval of this Certificate of Appropriateness will impede the normal and orderly preservation of surrounding resources within the district and City at large. Approving this application will set a precedent that reduces the proof required to demonstrate that historic wood windows are energy inefficient; are contaminated with lead and asbestos that cannot be abated; and are compatible with replacement metal and wood windows.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

CPED-Planning recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission **adopt** staff findings and **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the following conditions:

1. All ground floor windows shall be repaired. No replacements will be made to ground floor windows.
2. Original windows on the primary character-defining facades (those facing 4<sup>th</sup> Street North and 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North) shall be repaired and restored to original condition and function by replacing rotted members, repainting, making upper and lower sashes operable, adding weatherstripping, reglazing where necessary, reroping, and adding missing hardware.
3. Existing metal frame windows on the secondary facades (those facing the interior of the block and alleys) shall be repaired as necessary. Non-metal windows on secondary facades shall be rehabilitated in accordance with the rehabilitation guidelines of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. In cases where more than 50% of the sash of a historic wood/metal window is completely rotted/rusted, replacement shall be permitted.
4. The rooftop antenna is installed so that it is set back no less than one structural bay from each side of the façade.
5. Removal of existing metal loading dock is allowed. Replacement of new concrete loading dock is subject to all necessary approvals related to encroachment permits for public alleys. Railings on new loading dock shall be horizontal in direction (not vertical) to be in keeping with design of original railings.
6. Installation of a guard railing along the sidewalk at 2nd Avenue North is allowed. The railing should be designed with an industrial character and horizontal direction. The updated railing design must be submitted to CPED staff for final approval.
7. Existing fire escapes will remain in place and be repaired as necessary.
8. Color selections and material samples for all windows, railings and fire escapes shall be submitted to CPED staff for final approval.
9. The property owner will apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a master sign plan for the entire building within one calendar year.
10. All workmanship must be conducted in accordance with *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.
11. Final plans, elevations, details, material selections, and finish samples must be submitted to CPED-Planning Staff for final review and approval prior to any permits being issued.
12. By ordinance, approvals are valid for a period of one year from the date of the decisions unless required permits are obtained and the action approval is substantially begun and proceeds in a continuous basis toward completion. Upon written request and for good cause, the planning director may grant up to a one year extension if the request is made in writing no later than April 20, 2011.
13. By ordinance, all approvals granted in this Certificate of Appropriateness shall remain in effect as long as all of the conditions and guarantees of such approvals are observed. Failure to comply with such conditions and guarantees shall constitute a violation of this Certificate of Appropriateness and may result in termination of the approval.
14. CPED-Planning Preservation Staff shall review and approve the final plans and elevations prior to building permit issuance.