

**Community Planning & Economic Development
Planning Division**

350 South 5th Street, Room 210
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1385



City of Minneapolis
*Department of Community Planning
& Economic Development - CPED*

MEMORANDUM

TO: Heritage Preservation Commission
FROM: Aaron Hanauer, Senior City Planner 612.673.2494
DATE: November 30, 2010
RE: Ford Centre Rehabilitation
APPLICANT: Hess, Roise and Company

Executive Summary: At the October 26, 2010 Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) meeting, the Commission approved a Certificate of Appropriateness application with conditions for the Ford Centre rehabilitation and new construction project. The approval contained 19 conditions of approval (see below):

1. When completing masonry repair work, all attempts shall be made to reuse the building's original brick.
2. The proposed replacement masonry shall receive final approval by CPED staff.
3. The design of the entrance for Bay 4 on the south elevation shall retain the original transom window and be recessed at its current depth. Details and materials shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.
4. The design, detail, and materials of the entrance for Bay 7 on the south elevation shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.
5. Bay 3 on the west elevation shall be restored to the original condition based on historical photos or other evidence. Details and materials shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.
6. The decorative metal elements that flank Bay 3 on the west elevation shall be retained.
7. The design of the entrance for Bay 9 on the north elevation can be for pedestrians; however, the design shall better reflect and interpret the historic train entrance at this location and receive HPC approval. Design details and materials shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.
8. Bay 9 of the north elevation shall retain the cylindrical portion of the original rollup door.
9. The details and materials of the entrance for Bays 4-8 on the north elevation first floor shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.
10. A window restoration plan shall be submitted that identifies the location of the 198 original steel industrial sash windows with conditions 1-4 that will be restored or are believed to be restored. The window restoration plan shall be approved by CPED staff.
11. Design and material details for louvers shall be submitted for approval by the HPC.
12. Clear transparent glass shall be used to replace missing window panes or in full window replacement unless historical documentations show other treatments. Low emission coatings will be considered if they are not reflective or tinted.
13. Final design and materials of the new construction (vestibule addition) on the north side elevation shall be submitted and receive final HPC approval.

14. The vestibule's main entrance shall face 5th Avenue, and shall have a walkway that directly connects the vestibule to the 5th Avenue sidewalk.
15. Original windows removed for the louver installation and brick removed for the vestibule addition shall be stored on site for future repairs.
16. The proposed site plan shall better interpret the railroad access to the building at Bay 9 on the north elevation. The details and materials of the interpretive plan shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.
17. CPED-Planning Preservation Staff shall review and approve the final plans and elevations prior to building permit issuance.
18. The Certificate of Appropriateness approval shall expire if it is not acted upon within one year of approval, unless extended by the Planning Director in writing prior to one-year anniversary date of approvals.
19. 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.

The HPC decision on the Certificate of Appropriateness was not appealed.

Of the 19 conditions of approval, eight conditions of approval required final Heritage Preservation Commission review and approval (see below):

1. Condition 3: The design of the entrance for Bay 4 on the south elevation shall retain the original transom window and be recessed at its current depth. Details and materials shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.
2. Condition 4: The design, detail, and materials of the entrance for Bay 7 on the south elevation shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.
3. Condition 5: Bay 3 on the west elevation shall be restored to the original condition based on historical photos or other evidence. Details and materials shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.
4. Condition 7: The design of the entrance for Bay 9 on the north elevation can be for pedestrians; however, the design shall better reflect and interpret the historic train entrance at this location and receive HPC approval. Design details and materials shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.
5. Condition 9: The details and materials of the entrance for Bays 4-8 on the north elevation first floor shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.
6. Condition 11: Design and material details for louvers shall be submitted for approval by the HPC.
7. Condition 13: Final design and materials of the new construction (vestibule addition) on the north side elevation shall be submitted and receive final HPC approval.
8. Condition 16: The proposed site plan shall better interpret the railroad access to the building at Bay 9 on the north elevation. The details and materials of the interpretive plan shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.

In addition to seeking final approval for Conditions 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 16, the Applicant is requesting approval of two additional items:

1. The reconstruction of the terra-cotta medallions and belt course on the north elevation
2. Approval of a modification to window rehabilitation plan.

CPED Analysis: The following is an assessment of the newly submitted information from Hess, Roise and Company. The assessment is organized by providing a background description, proposal description, and analysis of the proposal.

Condition 3: The design of the entrance for Bay 4 on the south elevation shall retain the original transom window and be recessed at its current depth. Details and materials shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.

(see Attachments A5-A6, B6-B11, and B56)

Background: The October 26 HPC staff report stated that Bay 4 was recessed at the same depth as it was originally, and retains the original transom window. After further investigation and information from the Applicant, CPED believes that the opening was recessed; however, the original depth of the recession is unknown. In addition, CPED now believes that the existing transom window is not original (see Attachment A5 and A6 for analysis). Currently, Bay 4 has an interior and exterior transom window with nearly the same configuration (see Attachment A6). The internal transom has a support element that runs to the floor. This support element would not have been part of the original transom since this opening was a main access point for vehicles (Attachment B7). In addition, after a closer comparison of historic and existing photos, the mullion pattern of the original and existing is different (see Attachment A5). Historic photos show six columns of windows and existing photos show five columns.

Proposal: The Applicant is proposing to replace the existing transom window and install “a metal wall system with large amounts of glass to make these enclosures as transparent as possible. The new entry system is proposed to be recessed back from the façade. Each wall system will have a five-part division that reflects the rhythm of the window/door system that was installed during the period of significance. The three center sections of the metal frame will hold doors (Attachment B6-B11, and B53).” The frame will be painted charcoal-gray, and have a Kynar finish, which will appear on the metal-panel walls behind the existing brick pier return (see Attachment B9). To reconnect the building and the street, a section of the parapet/railing will be removed and concrete stairs will be built between the street-level sidewalk and Bay 4 (see Attachment B10).

Analysis: The Applicant’s proposal for Bay 4 on the south elevation is in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards and the Minneapolis Warehouse District Guidelines. The Applicant has demonstrated that they have used historical, pictorial, and physical documentation to guide their proposed replacement entrance. The entrance is proposed to be similar to the original design with a multi-part transom, and an opening that is recessed.

The charcoal grey color and Kynar finish of the metal parts will compliment the building's rehabilitated windows.

Condition 4: The design, detail, and materials of the entrance for Bay 7 on the south elevation shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.

(see Attachments A7, B12-B13, and B56)

Background: Historically, Bay 7 on the south elevation held double doors flanked by sidelights and a four-part transom window (see Attachment A7 and B12-B13). The bay has been filled in with non-historic concrete blocks but the original granite base is extant (see Attachment A1 and B12-B13).

Proposal: The Applicant states that, "The concrete blocks will be removed and the original granite base will remain. A new entry system that references the historic entry will be installed. It will have central double doors flanked by plate-glass sidelights, with a three-part transom window above. The metal light fixture bases flanking the bay will be retained (Attachment B13). The door and window frames will be aluminum with a charcoal-gray painted finish (see Attachment A7, B12-B13, and B53)

Analysis: CPED believes that the proposed work to Bay 7 on the south elevation meets the Secretary of Interior Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of Entrances and the Minneapolis Warehouse District Guideline 2.36. The Applicant has demonstrated that they have used historical, pictorial, and physical documentation to guide their proposal. The proposal is similar to the original design with a multi-part transom, sidelights, and an open design for the front entrance doors. The charcoal grey color, and Kynar finish of the metal parts will compliment the building's rehabilitated windows and other metal elements.

Condition 5: Bay 3 on the west elevation shall be restored to the original condition based on historical photos or other evidence. Details and materials shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.

(see Attachments A8-A9, B14-B21, and B57)

Background: Bay 3 has been an opening to the building, however, it has modified since the building was constructed. Originally, the entrance likely provided access for pedestrians and products. Inside of this bay was a ramp that led to the first floor garage (see Attachment A9). The Applicant states that, "Originally, the entrance was at grade, but the street has subsequently been lowered several feet (Attachment B14-B21). The doorway was originally flanked by granite bulkheads, which remain today. The doorway was apparently a loading dock with large metal and glass doors (see Attachment A4). A ramp on the interior went from street level to the first floor."

"After Honeywell purchased the building in the 1940s, the doors were removed and the opening partially filled in. Sometime in the last sixty years, the ramp leading from the first floor to the street was removed and the floor slab raised to the level of the rest of the first

story. A nonhistoric window system is currently in the opening (Attachment B15). The granite bulkhead is extant, but the door area has been filled in with concrete blocks that are slightly recessed from the facade. This “scar” covers the raised floor slab and suggests that an entrance was once in the bay (Attachment B14).”

Proposal: Hess Roise and Company and HGA Architects explored the design options for the bay given the existing conditions: which consist of the original interior ramp being removed, the first-floor slab has been extended to the exterior wall, and the grade of the sidewalk and street have been dramatically lowered. The combination of these changes make it difficult to use the bay as an entrance (see Attachment B14).

The Applicant created three alternatives for Bay 3. All options have framing that replicates the spacing of the original window and door openings, including a large horizontal framing member that will cross the bay where the top of the doorway would have been.

Option 3, which is preferred by the Applicant, uses fixed windows above the floor line but leaves the existing concrete-block “scar” in the granite base (Attachment B21). The concrete blocks would be skim-coated with stucco to create a smooth surface, but the depression would remain (see Attachment A2, B14-B21, and B57). The metal light fixture bases flanking the bay will be retained. Also, the concrete blocks in the former basement window openings that are adjacent to Bay 3 will be skim-coated with stucco, but the section will remain recessed. The base of the building, which was formerly below grade, will be painted to match the granite above. The Applicant is proposing a prominent horizontal mullion and two vertical mullions at the approximate location of the original mullions (see Attachment B19).

Analysis: Although it would be ideal to have an actual entrance at Bay 3 on the west elevation, CPED agrees with the Applicant that the combination of 5th Avenue experiencing grade alterations and the building experiencing structural changes makes it difficult to return this entrance to an actual building opening that respects the historic design. In reviewing the photographs of the western portion of the building it can be seen that the northern portion of the western elevation experienced substantial regarding (see Attachment A8). The Applicant’s proposal to have the proposed windows respect the mullion lines of the original entrance opening is an effort to respect the building’s original design and it give clues to the historic use of this opening. CPED believes that the Applicant’s preferred option (Option 3) on the west elevation is consistent with Secretary of Interior Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of Entrances and the Minneapolis District Guideline 2.36 in that the Applicant has used historical, pictorial, and physical documentation to guide the work, and the design of the window is compatible in terms of size, scale, design, material, and color of the original entrance opening.

Condition 7: The design of the entrance for Bay 9 on the north elevation can be for pedestrians; however, the design shall better reflect and interpret the historic train entrance at this location and receive HPC approval. Design details and materials shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.

(see Attachments A10, B22-B24, and B54)

Background: The former train entrance in Bay 9 has been filled in with concrete blocks. An entryway and canopy have also been installed (see Attachment A10 and B22-B24). A metal overhead door and its housing are extant. The Applicant states that, “the train tracks both inside and outside of the building were removed, and the interior floor slab was raised to the level of the rest of the basement floor. Because of this change, a set of stairs leads from the current non-historic doorway down to the ground. The current grading of the parking lot causes storm water to flow towards this area (Attachment B22-B24).”

Proposal: The Applicant is proposing to raise the grade of the parking area to direct storm water away from the building. The Applicant states that, “As a result, the grade will be at the level of the non-historic doorway, so the stairs will be removed. The entryway and concrete-block infill will be removed as well (see Attachment A4, B22-B24). The metal overhead door and housing will be retained, rust will be carefully removed, and the metal will be painted charcoal gray to match the rest of the metal on the building. More of the overhead door will be rolled up into the housing so that less of the door will be exposed, and it will be fixed in place.”

A new metal and glass entry system will be installed in the opening, extending to the top of the opening behind the overhead door. The metal frame which is proposed to be painted charcoal grey and have a Kynar finish, is proposed to be as minimal as possible and hold clear plate glass that is butt glazed. The paired doors will also be plate glass with minimal metal hardware (Attachment B22). “

Analysis: The Applicant’s proposal for Bay 9 is in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of Entrances in that the proposed entrance configuration is compatible in terms of size of the original opening. The Applicant is proposing to remove the existing infill and reopen Bay 9 to its original horizontal extent.

The Applicant’s minimal design proposal for Bay 9 differentiates itself from the divided-light window design of the other openings on the north elevation. This difference will assist in providing greater clues to the significance of this opening as a railroad access point. The railroads were a vital element to the Minneapolis Warehouse District, and played an important role for the Ford Motor Company to decide locating at this site. The Applicant’s proposed minimal design with a replacement door that is simple, with an open transparent glass panel and a transom is in compliance with Minneapolis Warehouse District Guideline 2.36.

MWD 2.36: When replacement is proven necessary, a door style that is similar in material and design to that used originally shall be used. If historic photos or models are not available, the new replacement door shall be of simple design, with an open transparent glass panel and a transom.

In addition, the Applicant’s proposal to retain the coiling door head is in compliance with Guideline 2.35:

MWD 2.35: Original or historic features of the entryway and storefront including trim and other architectural features shall be retained.

Condition 9: The details and materials of the entrance for Bays 4-8 on the north elevation first floor shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.

(see Attachments A11-A13, B25-B28, and B54)

Background: Bays 2-8 on the north facade were steel industrial windows similar to the ones on the floors above (see Attachment A12). The bay openings were altered with the addition of several loading docks in the 1940s (see Attachment A11).

Proposal: The non-historic loading docks will be removed and the site will be re-graded so that storm water will drain away from the building. The bays will be treated as follows:

- Bays 4 and 5 will hold metal louvers to ventilate electrical and mechanical rooms. The metal louvers will be painted with the charcoal-gray color used on the rest of the metal on the building. A sample of the louver will be provided at the meeting.
- Bay 6 will hold a new metal overhead garage door for access to parking in the basement. The door and doorframes will be painted with the charcoal-gray color used on the rest of the metal on the building.
- Bay 7 will hold an emergency entrance for one of the building's stairwells. A concrete curb and slab will be poured on the ground in front of the bay. Garbage dumpsters, transformers, and the back-up generator for the building will be set in this area. Per city ordinance, a metal fence will be installed on the north and west sides of the slab to shield the equipment from view. The metal will be painted with the charcoal-gray color used on the rest of the metal on the building.
- Bay 8 will be used as a new loading dock. Two metal overhead doors will be installed in the bay. The doors and doorframes will be painted with the charcoal-gray colored used on the rest of the metal on the building.

Analysis: As stated in the October 26 HPC staff report, CPED realizes that each elevation of the Ford Centre is a primary elevation, and the proposed opaque openings on the basement level on the north elevation will allow for protection of the proposed electrical and other mechanical equipment. The plans submitted for the November 30 review are similar in design with the October 26 submittal (Attachment A13). The Applicant's submittal of greater detail for the November 30 submittal including proposed material (aluminum), color (charcoal grey) and finish (Kynar) provide a better sense of the appearance. CPED believes that the November 30 proposal is consistent with the October 26 approved plans, and the proposed material, color, and finish meet the Secretary of Interior Guidelines for Entrances and the Minneapolis Warehouse District Guidelines in terms of replacement material.

Condition 11: Design and material details for louvers shall be submitted for approval by the HPC.

(see Attachments B29-B30)

Background: At the October 26 HPC meeting, the Commission approved a floor-by-floor mechanical system for Bay 6 on the north elevation that included louvers in floors one through nine (see Attachment A15). In addition, the approved plans included louvers in Bays 4 and 5 on the north elevation of the basement level. The condition of approval was that the “design and materials for louvers shall be submitted for approval by the HPC.”

Proposal: The Applicant is proposing a typical horizontally oriented louver system in Bay 6 on the north elevation floors one through ten have industrial steel windows, as well as for Bays 4 and 5 on the north elevation on the basement level. The proposed louvers would be a charcoal grey color and have a powder coat finish (see Attachment B29).

Analysis: CPED believes that the design (horizontally oriented), material (aluminum), and finish (powder coat finish) of the proposed louvers is adequate, and that the proposed design, material, and finish of the louvers will not further detract from the building in having louvers placed within the window openings at these locations.

Condition 13: Final design and materials of the new construction (vestibule addition) on the north side elevation shall be submitted and receive final HPC approval.

(see Attachments A14, B40, B54, and B57)

Background: At the October 26 HPC meetings, the Commission approved a vestibule addition on the north elevation with the condition that the final design and materials of the new construction (vestibule addition) on the north side elevation shall be submitted and receive final HPC approval (see Attachment A14).

Proposal: The Applicant’s vestibule/stairway on the north elevation is proposed to connect grade level at parking lot/Fifth Avenue with the first floor. The proposed vestibule will have a 1,500 square foot footprint. It is proposed to be setback slightly from 5th Avenue. The Applicant has revised their plans so the vestibule provides direct access from 5th Avenue as well as the parking lot to the north (see Attachment B51 and B57).

The Applicant states that, “the vestibule’s design is intended to be as transparent as possible. The majority of the wall surfaces will be clear insulated glass with a pyrolitic low-E coating. The exposed steel-structural frame will have a charcoal-gray painted finish. The same finish will be used for the smooth metal panels that will clad the underside of the staircase structure. The flat roof will be covered with an EPDM system. The proposed vestibule will have an entrance that faces 5th Avenue and the parking lot (see Attachment B40, B54, B57-B58).

Analysis: CPED believes that the limited size of the vestibule addition in comparison to the Ford Centre is in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior Guidelines for Rehabilitation for new additions and the Minneapolis Warehouse District Guidelines (2.73). In addition, the vestibule’s proposed location, slightly recessed from the 5th Avenue plane, reduces its appearance.

The simple, vertical-oriented, and rectilinear shape of the addition is also consistent with the Minneapolis Warehouse District Guidelines entryways. In addition, the proposed materials (steel and aluminum), finish (Kynar), and color (charcoal grey) will compliment the historic metal materials of the building.

Condition 16: The proposed site plan shall better interpret the railroad access to the building at Bay 9 on the north elevation. The details and materials of the interpretive plan shall be submitted for review and approved by the HPC.

(see Attachments B41-B44, and B51)

Background: The parking lot to the north of the building has never been developed with a permanent building (see Attachment A12). The site was re-graded in the 1940s to slope down towards the building to make it possible for trucks to use the loading docks (see Attachment A1). This has had the negative effect of channeling storm water towards the building.

Proposal: To stop ongoing deterioration from this moisture, the site will be re-graded to slope away from the building. In front of Bay 9, the landscape design is proposed to interpret the former railroad spur line that entered the building. The railroad tracks are proposed to be echoed by a concrete sidewalk that extends perpendicularly from the former railcar entry. The sidewalk will be scored and stained at regular intervals to recall the pattern of railroad ties, while manganese ironspot brick pavers laid flush on edge will recall the rails. On either side of the concrete walk, there will be flush beds of gray trap rock (see Attachment B41-B44, B51)

Analysis: The Applicant's site plan proposal is in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Rehabilitation Guidelines for Setting in that the Applicant is proposing to design an interpretive site plan that is compatible with the historic character of the setting and in scale with the building, without creating a false historical appearance. The material choices used scored and stained concrete, brick pavers, and grey trap rock will help interpret the historic significance of this opening.

Additional Items (Cornice)

(see Attachments A1, B5, and B54)

Background: The west, south, and east elevations of the Ford Centre contains the original terra-cotta medallions and belt course on the cornice (see Attachment A2-A4). However, these elements on the north elevation have been damaged and/or removed (see Attachment A1).

At the October 26 HPC meeting, the Commission inquired about proposed work to the cornice since the proposed elevation drawings showed a restored cornice (see Attachment

A16). At the October 26 HPC meeting, the Applicant agreed to restore and/or replace the missing cornice elements on the north elevation.

Proposal: The Applicant is proposing to replicate the missing terra-cotta medallions and belt course on the cornice that has been damaged (Attachment B5). The Applicant is proposing to replicate the missing features in fiberglass, which will be painted to match the original (Attachment B54).

Analysis: The Applicant's proposal to replicate the terra-cotta medallions and belt course with painted fiberglass to match the original is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation for Masonry. The Applicant is using the physical evidence and historic pictures to reproduce the feature. Although replacing the medallions in terra-cotta would be ideal, the use of fiberglass is considered a compatible substitute material.

Condition 10: A window restoration plan shall be submitted that identifies the location of the 198 original steel industrial sash windows that will be restored or are believed to be restored. The window restoration plan shall be approved by the HPC.

(see Attachments B31-B39)

Background: At the October 26, 2010 HPC meeting, the Applicant received approval of a window restoration project that included the restoration of 198 of the original 244 steel industrial sash windows (81 percent). The Applicant's approved window rehabilitation proposal also includes restoring the 15 Chicago-style/original wood windows, and seven galvanized metal double hung windows. At the October 26 meeting, the Applicant testified that the steel industrial windows could only be placed in their original opening, but has since rethought that position.

Proposal: With the new information submitted, the Applicant provided CPED-Planning staff a window restoration plan that identifies the location of 202 original steel industrial sash windows that will be rehabilitated; an increase of four rehabilitated windows from their October 26 Certificate of Appropriateness approval (see Attachment B31-B39). However, the Applicant has revised their rehabilitation proposal to include the moving of 54 of the 202 restored windows to different location; 148 of the restored windows will remain in their original location (see Tables 2-4). The reason for proposing to move 54 of the restored windows is to group all of the restored windows on the south and west elevation and the lower floors of the east and north elevations. The Applicant states that the grouping of the rehabilitated windows will "minimize the visual distraction that a patchwork of historic and new windows would cause (Attachment B31)." Hess, Roise and Company also state that "the restored windows in the lower levels of the north and east elevations will be the most visible to the public."

The Applicant's window consultant states that the steel windows are able to be moved to opposite elevations (and different locations on the same elevation) because the window opening sizes are very consistent (see Attachment B31a and B31b). The Applicant's

consultants also add that they will not need to modify the original frames to accommodate a relocated frame.

Note: CPED-Planning staff did not consider the movement of restored windows to a different location to be a minor change from their approved Certificate of Appropriateness; therefore, this requested amendment requires approval by the Commission.

Table 1: Existing Conditions of Openings That Originally Contained Steel Industrial Windows (All Facades)

Window type	Number	Percentage
Original steel industrial sash	244	88
Non-historic windows	34	12
Total	278	

Table 2: Pre-Work Original Industrial Steel Window Rehabilitation Proposal

Window type	Number	Percentage
original steel industrial sash that will be rehabilitated	202	83
Original windows unable to be restored	42	17
Total	244	

Table 3: Post-Rehabilitation Window Proposal (All Facades)

Window type	Number	Percentage
Total openings	278	
Restored original window in place	148	53
Restored window moved to different location	54	19
Replacement windows	66	24
Louvers	10	4

Table 4: Post-Rehabilitation Restored Original Windows by Façade

Façade	Number
Total	202
East	24
West	49
North	46
South	83

East Elevation The Applicant highlighted 54 window openings that originally contained steel industrial windows on the east elevation (see Attachment B38). Of these windows openings, 43 contain the original steel industrial windows. The Applicant is proposing to restore 18 of the east elevation steel windows on floors two through five and place them back in their original location. The Applicant is also proposing to restore 20 of the east elevation steel windows on floors six through ten; six of the rehabilitated windows are proposed to be moved to floors two through six of the east elevation in order to replace the windows that are beyond repair (3 total) or for the openings that contain modern windows (3 total). The other 14 rehabilitated windows are proposed to be moved to the west elevation

to replace windows that are beyond repair or openings that contain modern replacement windows.

Table 5: East Elevation Existing Window Type

Window type	Number
Opening with original steel industrial windows	43
Openings with modern replacement window	11
Total openings	54

Table 6: East Elevation Window Pre-Work Evaluation

Window type	Number
Original windows to be restored in place	18
Original window to be restored and moved	20
Original windows unable to be restored	5
Non historic windows	11
Total openings	54

Table 7: East Elevation Window Proposal

Window type	Number
Restored original window in place	18
Restored window relocated from floors six through ten on east elevation	6
Replacement windows	30
Total openings	54

West Elevation The west elevation contains 49 window openings that originally contained steel industrial windows (see Attachment B34). Of these windows openings, 41 contain the original steel industrial windows. The Applicant is proposing to restore 35 of the west elevation steel windows and place them back in their original location.

For the remaining 14 window openings on the west elevation that will not have restored windows placed back in their original location, the Applicant is proposing to relocate restored windows from the top five floors of the east elevation and place them in the west elevation openings that currently contain original windows that are beyond repair (6 total) or for the openings that contain modern windows (8 total).

Table 8: West Elevation Existing Window Type

Window type	Number
Opening with original steel industrial windows	41
Openings with modern replacement window	8
Total openings	49

Table 9: West Elevation Window Pre-Work Evaluation

Window type	Number
Original windows to be restored	35
Original windows unable to be restored	6
Non historic windows	8
Total openings	49

Table 10: West Elevation Window Rehabilitation Proposal

Window type	Number
Restored original window in place	35
Restored original relocated from east elevation	14
Total openings	49

North Elevation The Applicant highlighted 90 window openings that originally contained steel industrial windows. Of these windows openings, 86 contain the original steel industrial windows (see Attachment B36). The Applicant is proposing to restore 31 of the west elevation steel windows on floors one through six; and one window on the seventh floor and place them back in their original location.

The Applicant is also proposing to restore 34 windows on the north elevation and move them to different locations including the original windows in Bay 6 that are proposed to be replaced by the floor-by-floor louver system (see Attachment B37). The Applicant is proposing to relocate 15 of the windows to different locations on the north elevation and 19 of the restored original windows to the south elevation to replace windows that are beyond repair or contain modern replacement windows.

Table 11: North Elevation Existing Window Type

Window type	Number
Opening with original steel industrial windows	86
Openings with modern replacement window	4
Total openings	90

Table 12: North Elevation Window Pre-Work Evaluation

Window type	Number
Original windows to be restored	65
Original windows unable to be restored	21
Non historic windows	4
Total openings	90

Table 13: North Elevation Window Proposal

Window type	Number
Restored original window in place	31
Original window to be restored and moved	15
Replacement window	34
Louver openings	10
Total openings	90

South Elevation The south elevation contains 85 window openings that originally contained steel industrial windows (see Attachment B32). Of these windows openings, 74 contain the original steel industrial windows. The Applicant is proposing to restore 64 of the south elevation steel windows and place them back in their original location.

For the remaining 21 window openings on the south elevation that will not have restored windows placed back in their original location, the Applicant is proposing to relocate 19 restored windows from the north elevation and place them in the south elevation openings that currently contain original windows that are beyond repair (10 total) or for the openings that contain modern replacement windows (11 total); two smaller windows on the top floor are proposed to be replica windows.

Table 14: South Elevation Existing Window Type

Window type	Number
Opening with original steel industrial windows	74
Openings with modern replacement window	11
Total openings	85

Table 15: South Elevation Pre-Work Evaluation

Window type	Number
Original windows to be restored	64
Original windows unable to be restored	10
Non historic windows	11
Total original windows	85

Table 16: South Elevation Window Proposal

Window type	Number
Restored original window in place	64
Restored original relocated from north elevation	19
Replica window	2
Total openings	85

Analysis: The Applicant's proposal to rehabilitate 202 of the 244 original steel industrial windows (83 percent) meets the Secretary of Interior Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of

Windows and the Minneapolis Warehouse District design guidelines for windows. The proposed window rehabilitation work includes identifying, retaining, and preserving windows and their decorative features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building.

The Applicant's proposal to move 54 of the 202 restored windows (27 percent) to different window locations will improve the uniform appearance of the building. CPED agrees with the Applicant that concentrating the rehabilitated windows on the south and west elevations and the lower levels of the east and north elevations will improve the appearance of the building. CPED also agrees with Hess, Roise and Company that the proposal will minimize the visual distraction that a patchwork of historic and new windows would cause.

However, CPED has concerns in regards to the window rehabilitation plan being able to be completed as proposed. The ability to rehabilitate a window and move it to a different location was unknown until the submittal of this additional information. With the information presented at the October 26 public hearing, it was understood that rehabilitated windows would only be able to be restored to their original opening.

Recommendation:

CPED-Planning staff recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission **approve** the proposed work with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall submit monthly progress reports on the window rehabilitation work to CPED staff for review and approval. If changes to the approved window rehabilitation plan are required and not considered minor in scope, Heritage Preservation Commission approval is required.
2. All new exterior metal pieces for the rehabilitation work, with the exception of the louvers that contain a powder coated grey finish, will have a Kynar finish.

Attachment A: Materials submitted by CPED

- A1-A4: Building Photographs
- A5: Bay 4 South Elevation Comparison
- A6: Bay 4 South Elevation Interior Photograph
- A7: Bay 7 South Elevation Comparison
- A8: Bay 3 West Elevation Comparison
- A9: Bay 3 West Elevation Entrance
- A10: Bay 9 North Elevation Comparison
- A11: Bay 4-8 North Elevation Comparison
- A12: North Elevation Historic Photograph
- A13: Bay 4-9 North Elevation Comparison
- A14: October 26 Vestibule Proposal
- A15: Metal Finish Detail
- A16: 10/26 COA North Elevation Proposal

Attachment B: Materials submitted by Applicant

- B1-B2: Response to October 26 HPC conditions of approval
- B3-B5: Condition of Approval #2
- B6-B11: Condition of Approval #3
- B12-B13: Condition of Approval #4
- B14-B21: Condition of Approval #5
- B22-B24: Condition of Approval #7
- B25-B28: Condition of Approval #9
- B29-B30: Condition of Approval #11
- B31-B39: Condition of Approval #10
- B40: Condition of Approval #13
- B41-B44: Condition of Approval
- B45-B50: Findings
- B51: Site Plan
- B52-B53: Floor Plans
- B54-B58: Elevations