



HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION AGENDA

PUBLIC MEETING ROOM

THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 2024

6:00 PM

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda
2. Items for Discussion
 - A. 216-218 Central Avenue Certificate of Appropriateness and Review of Work Completed
3. Adjournment



Request for Action

TO: Faribault Heritage Preservation Commission
FROM: Mathias Hughey, Community Development Coordinator
THROUGH: Harry Davis, City Planner
MEETING DATE: March 7, 2024
SUBJECT: 216-218 Central Avenue Certificate of Appropriateness and Review of Work Completed

BACKGROUND:

In November 2023, the Heritage Planning Commission (HPC) questioned Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) compliance of panels installed at 216 & 218 Central Avenue and started a process to determine if the work is not consistent with the approved scope of work. After multiple discussions with the owner and applicant of 216-218 Central Avenue, and their representatives, the applicant expressed an intent to request amending their original COA to address the issues raised by the HPC:

1. The panels failed to adequately cover the concrete masonry units (CMU) as originally intended.
2. The panels did not appear level and had uneven gaps around the central column.

The applicant submitted three (3) applications to amend their original Certificate of Appropriateness. Two of the applications were received without adequate time to prepare a staff report for the February 21, 2024 meeting, and one was submitted later. The HPC voted on February 21 to hold a special meeting to review the applications within the 30-day window required by the ordinance.

Approval or denial of an application by the HPC at the March 7, 2024 special meeting is an official action of the HPC fulfilling its obligations under the UDO Sec. 13-330(F). After an official decision by the HPC, city staff will prepare a resolution to formalize those actions at the HPC's next regular meeting.

For a comprehensive background on this project, see the previous Agenda Packet from the HPC February 21, 2024 meeting.

REQUESTED ACTION:

The HPC should discuss the solutions proposed in each of the three (3) attached applications to develop consensus, then entertain an official motion to approve, deny, or conditionally approve each proposed application. Staff will prepare a formal resolution for adoption at the HPC's next regularly scheduled meeting, tentatively on March 20, 2024, based on official actions taken during the March 7, 2024 special meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Staff Report Memo Amend COA 216-218 Central Ave Special Meeting
2. Exhibit A - Application 1
3. Exhibit B - Application 2
4. Exhibit C - Application 3
5. Exhibit D - Application 1 Findings
6. Exhibit E - Application 2 Findings
7. Exhibit F - Application 3 Findings



Staff Report to the Heritage Preservation Commission

TO: Heritage Preservation Commission
THROUGH: Harry Davis, City Planner
FROM: Mathias Hughey, Community Development Coordinator
MEETING DATE: March 7, 2024
SUBJECT: 216-218 Central Avenue Amend COA

Request:

The HPC should discuss the solutions proposed in each of the three (3) attached applications to develop consensus, then entertain an official motion to approve, deny, or conditionally approve each proposed application. Staff will prepare a formal resolution for adoption at the HPC's next regularly scheduled meeting, tentatively on March 20, 2024, based on official actions taken during the March 7, 2024 special meeting.

Discussion:

The applicant submitted three (3) applications.

- Application 1 proposes to leave the existing panels in place and paint the CMU to resemble the original brick of the structure. Application 1 and all supplemental documents are attached as Exhibit A.
- Application 2 proposes to remove the existing panels and install larger panels aligned to minimize unevenness and the visibility of the CMU. Application 2 and all supplemental documents are attached as Exhibit B.
- Application 3 proposes to leave the existing panels in place and install a larger raised border on those panels, which may or may not cover the CMU, and any remaining exposed CMU would be painted to resemble the original brick. Application 3 and all supplemental documents are attached as Exhibit C.

The Community Development Coordinator and City Planner determined that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are the appropriate treatment guidelines for this project. Consistent with the enabling ordinance, a series of findings have been made for each application regarding these standards. These findings are attached as Exhibits D, E, and F.

Per the Secretary of the Interior, rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

Note on Terminology:

Sign Panels versus Façade Panels

Previous discussions and iterations of the scope of work described the panels that were to be installed as “sign panels” or “sign boards” as the intent was that these panels could serve as the location for signs if and when building tenants decided to install them. However, because no signs were proposed at the time of the approval, this confused the applicant and created administrative uncertainty. Since signs are temporary features, and these panels are intended to be permanent features of the façade, they will be referred to as “façade panels” to avoid confusion with signs. A variance will not be required to enlarge the panels. A sign permit will still be required to install any signs or lettering on the façade panels.

Previously Installed CMU

In preparing the attached findings, it is understood that the CMU that was installed, and the slumping and out-of-level appearance of the façade of the building are inconsistent with the applicable Secretary of the Interior Standards for historic properties and the City of Faribault’s Downtown Design Guidelines. Findings are therefore focused on the proposed solutions.

Application 1 – Paint CMU

This application was received February 13, 2024.

The applicant proposes leaving the existing façade panels in place and addressing the visible CMU by painting it. The paint will “match [the] appearance of the current brickwork and mortar on the façade of the buildings, using historically accurate paints.”

The applicant has provided samples of the painting techniques that would be used. The supplemental photographs included are for documentation while the physical samples themselves should be referred while reviewing the proposal.

This proposal does not include any work that addresses the out-of-level appearance, or uneven gaps between panels and the central column, and evidence supporting the applicant’s claim that the panels are level is not included.

Application 2 – Larger Façade Panels

This application was received February 13, 2024.

The applicant proposes to replace the current façade panels with new façade panels large enough to cover all of the CMU and to reduce the visible gap between the façade panels and the central column to one (1) inch on each side.

The applicant provided drawings from their contractor showing the proposed alignment of the enlarged façade panels. The proposed panels are 37" x 240" for the south façade (i.e. 216 Central Ave) and 37" x 241.5" for the north façade (i.e. 218 Central Ave). the difference in size is due to the spacing between the exterior and central columns being different by 1.5".

The applicant has not clarified the alignment of the panels beyond stating that the gap at the central column would be 1 inch on either side.

Application 3 – Enlarge Raised Borders on Existing Panels

This application was received February 28, 2024.

The applicant proposes to install a 3.5-inch (width) raised border over the current border on the existing sign panels to "cover the visible gap between the [façade panels] and the center column." Additionally, the applicant proposes that "any portion of the CMU that remains visible" after the larger borders are installed, would be painted to match the appearance of the historic brick and mortar.

The applicant included a drawing that notes that the enlarged borders would increase the width of the façade panels to 21' 3." The applicant does not specify the new vertical dimensions of the façade panels, nor do they specify the amount of CMU that would be visible based on their proposal. The applicant does not clarify how the enlarged borders would be aligned to address the out-of-level appearance or the uneven gaps at the central column.

Recommendation:

The Community Development Coordinator recommends approving the proposal to install larger façade panels based on the findings identified in Exhibit E – Application 2 Findings. This proposal is consistent with all seven (7) applicable standards of the ten (10) total possible standards. It may be conditionally approved to address the uneven gaps and out-of-level appearance of the existing façade panels, which are the two (2) identified deficiencies by the HPC. The Community Development Coordinator recommends that the June HPC meeting serve as the deadline for review of the completed work. To allow time for staff to document and develop a report on the completed work, the work should be completed no later than May 31, 2024. The recommended motion is as follows:

"Motion to approve Application 2 by Darrell Jensen for 216-218 Central Avenue amending the COA issued February 2023, install enlarged façade panels to cover the CMU installed on the façade as proposed in the application and associated materials, with the following additional conditions:

- The criteria and findings listed in Exhibit E are the adopted criteria and findings of the HPC.
- The façade panels shall be installed addressing gaps on either side of the central column to within one (1) inch of the brick edges.
- The façade panels shall be installed to minimize the out-of-level appearance of the façade.
- The deadline for completion of work shall be May 31, 2024."

The Community Development Coordinator recommends denying the proposal in Application 1 to paint the CMU based on the findings identified in Exhibit D – Application 1 Findings. This proposal is inconsistent with four (4) of the seven (7) applicable standards of the ten (10) total possible standards. The proposal fails to address the uneven gaps and out-of-level appearance, correcting only one (1) of the two (2) identified deficiencies. The installation of larger façade panels, if properly installed, will adequately disguise the CMU making painting unnecessary. The recommended motion is as follows:

"Motion to deny Application 1 by Darrell Jensen for 216-218 Central Avenue amending the COA issued February 2023 based on the criteria and findings in Exhibit D."

The Community Development Coordinator recommends denying the proposal to install enlarged borders on the existing sign panels based on the findings identified in Exhibit F – Application 3 Findings. The proposal lacks sufficient information to conclude that it will be consistent with the applicable standards, or is inconsistent with the applicable standards. To avoid uncertainty about the final product and the correction of the two (2) identified deficiencies, the HPC should reject incomplete applications. The recommended motion is as follows:

"Motion to deny Application 3 by Darrell Jensen for 216-218 Central Avenue amending the COA issued February 2023 based on the criteria and findings in Exhibit F."

The Community Development Coordinator recommends tabling the discussion on Resolution HPC-2024-001 until the applicant accomplishes the proposed work or the deadline for accomplishing the work has passed. The recommended motion is as follows:

"Motion to table discussion on Resolution HPC-2024-001 until completion of work as described in the amended COA approved March 7, 2024 or the deadline for completing said work passes."

Attachments:

- Exhibit A – Application 1
- Exhibit B – Application 2

- Exhibit C – Application 3
- Exhibit D – Application 1 Findings
- Exhibit E – Application 2 Findings
- Exhibit F – Application 3 Findings



DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION FORM

Heritage Preservation Commission

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Site Address: 216-218 Central Avenue North, Faribault, MN 55021

Owner/Applicant: Darrell Jensen

Mailing Address: 216 Central Avenue North

City/State: Faribault, MN 55021

Phone Number: (612) 483-0367

Site File Number:

Work Site Address: 216-218 Central Avenue North, Faribault, MN 55021

TYPE OF WORK

☒ Restoration

☐ Demolition

☐ Site Improvements

☐ New Construction

☐ Remodeling

SCOPE OF WORK

Brief Project Description: Paint CMUs and concrete above the current sign boards above clerestory windows to match appearance of the current brickwork and mortar on the façade of the buildings, using historically accurate paints.

(See attached photographs of sample painted blocks and concrete, with mortar applications. The total cost for paint, supplies, and labor would be \$1,400.00)

ATTACHMENTS

☐ Historical Data / Site File Information

☐ Detailed Drawings of Proposed Modifications

☐ Manufacturers Specifications

☒ Photographs

☐ Site Plan

☐ Material Samples / Color Samples

ACTION OF HPC BOARD

Meeting Date: February 21, 2024

Action Taken:

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

☐ Issued

☐ Denied

NOTE

If this project is submitted as part of the City's SCDP rehabilitation program, it must receive a "no adverse effect" ruling from The State Historic Preservation Office.



Sample Painted Blocks

(Side A painted with sponge; Side B painted with brush)



Sample Painted Concrete with Mortar & Painted Block
(Overhead View)



Sample Painted Concrete - Fuzzy Tuck Point (Natural Look)



Sample Painted Concrete - Straight-Line Tuck Point



Heritage Preservation Commission
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Site Address: 216-218 Central Avenue North, Faribault, MN 55021

I hereby certify that the Heritage Preservation Commission has reviewed the above-described project and found the work proposed by the applicant to meet or exceed the design guidelines established by the City of Faribault.

The design features approved by the Heritage Preservation Commission are to be considered a condition of the building permit issued by the City of Faribault as stipulated in the Code of Ordinances.

David Wanberg, Director of Community & Economic Development

Notes:

Date of Heritage Preservation Commission Review: _____
Certificate of Appropriateness Issued: _____
Expiration Date: _____

Copies forwarded to	Building Official:	<u>X</u> _____
	Property Owner:	<u>X</u> _____
	Site File:	<u>X</u> _____
	SCDP File	_____



DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION FORM

Heritage Preservation Commission

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Site Address: 216-218 Central Avenue North, Faribault, MN 55021

Owner/Applicant: Darrell Jensen

Mailing Address: 216 Central Avenue North

City/State: Faribault, MN 55021

Phone Number: (612) 483-0367

Site File Number:

Work Site Address: 216-218 Central Avenue North, Faribault, MN 55021

TYPE OF WORK

☒ Restoration

☐ Demolition

☐ Site Improvements

☐ New Construction

☐ Remodeling

SCOPE OF WORK

Brief Project Description: Replace current sign boards above clerestory windows with new sign boards large enough to cover all CMU blocks to hide them from street view, and to reduce the visible gap between the sign boards and the center column to one inch.

(See attached letter, invoice, and plan drawings from Bohnhoff Design.)

ATTACHMENTS

☐ Historical Data / Site File Information

☒ Detailed Drawings of Proposed Modifications

☐ Manufacturers Specifications

☐ Photographs

☐ Site Plan

☐ Material Samples / Color Samples

ACTION OF HPC BOARD

Meeting Date: February 21, 2024

Action Taken:

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

☐ Issued

☐ Denied

NOTE

If this project is submitted as part of the City's SCDP rehabilitation program, it must receive a "no adverse effect" ruling from The State Historic Preservation Office.



February 5, 2024

City of Faribault Historic Preservation Commission

To: Members of Faribault HPC,

I am writing this letter regarding the 216-218 Central Avenue buildings.

I have been designing, building and installing exterior signage on historic buildings for over 40 years. With over 150 wall, projection and pylon signs installed on historic buildings in Northfield, Faribault, Cannon Falls, Minneapolis St. Anthony Falls Historic District and downtown St. Paul. I have worked with their Historic Preservation councils and staff on each of the projects to successfully design, build and install all signage in accordance to all rules and regulations for each location. During many of these years I worked with historic architect Steve Edwins, AIA and the Minnesota Historic Preservation Commission.

I believe strongly in following all state and local historic guidelines when renovating and remodeling buildings along with the placement of new and /or renovated building signage.

I was asked to find the solution for the addition of signage panels on the 216-218 Central Ave. buildings, to rectify a botched/unfinished job of installing the sign panels by a previous contractor. The large three story building built in 1878 had a number of issues which needed to be addressed. In particular the center column between the buildings had dropped over 8" when part of the basement wall under the street façade of 216-218 was removed by the City when excavating for the new utilities under Central Ave street and sidewalk. This was not the fault of the building owner. This has been structurally repaired to hold up the center column but the column is still 8" lower than when originally built. This is why a plan was developed to hide this imperfection with the horizontal sign boards.

To accomplish this work, (24) custom steel brackets were designed, built and attached to the (2) out of line and twisted 12" and 14" original steel beams. Then (6) panels: (4) 27" x 8' and (2) 27" x 4' with 44' of 2" raised borders were primed, painted and installed onto the (24) steel brackets. As is common with many historic buildings, over the years the facades or parts of a façade may shift, drop, bricks fall apart, fall off, steel beams turn and shift, etc. I have encountered mortar joints which had turned to sand, buildings which were level 100 years ago and have sagged or shifted is quite normal in historic buildings. The 216-218 Central buildings are no different, the North buildings façade under the new sign boards has 'grown' from the original 20' to 20' 1.5". This is the difference between the North and South buildings. Historic buildings are not perfect.

I stand behind the work completed of installing the new sign panels on the 146 year old building. The issue of adding several inches to the top of the sign boards to 'hide' the 'new' brick would be a waste of money. A simpler solution is to paint the new bricks to match the existing bricks. Regarding having the levelness of the new sign panels checked by a laser – sure do that – but then check every other historic building and signs in the downtown. From my experience it is rare that any historic building is perfectly level and any thing like signage added to the building needs to be **visually** level using ones eyes.

Thank you for your time. I appreciate all that your commission does to take care of historic buildings.

Jim Bohnhoff

ESTIMATE 0912

February 05, 2024

Darrel & Lu Jensen
216 – 218 Central Ave
Faribault, Mn 55021

Re: Exterior 216-218 Central Wall Sign Panels:

To cover up uneven windows and for future business signage.

Design, Consultation & files for owner approval & Sign permit:

(6) Building & Sign Permit sheets for City of Faribault: ... \$

* City of Faribault Sign permit PAID

Exterior Wall Sign Backboards: (2) 20' x 33" x .5" = 116 sq.ft.

Cutting, laminating, sanding, Painting & Finishing:

(6) **Main Backboards:** : (4) 8' x 33" x .5" & (2) 4' x 33" x .5"
Primed & Painted:

(2) **Backboard Borders:** : (2) 45' x 2" x .5"
Primed & Painted:

(12) **Boards attached to Custom Brackets:** (12) 30" x 4" x 1"
Painted:

Installation:

Wall Sign Backboards installed onto Custom Steel Brackets:
Rental of 32' Lift

Materials:

(24) Custom Steel Brackets (24) 15" x 3" x .25

(8) 4' x 8' x .5" MDO board

(12) 10" x 1" x 4", attached to Custom Steel Brackets

Benjamin Moore prime & paint

Total: \$ **5,800.**

Deposit to begin work \$

BALANCE DUE: \$ **5,800.**

Heritage Preservation Commission
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Site Address: 216-218 Central Avenue North, Faribault, MN 55021

I hereby certify that the Heritage Preservation Commission has reviewed the above-described project and found the work proposed by the applicant to meet or exceed the design guidelines established by the City of Faribault.

The design features approved by the Heritage Preservation Commission are to be considered a condition of the building permit issued by the City of Faribault as stipulated in the Code of Ordinances.

David Wanberg, Director of Community & Economic Development

Notes:

Date of Heritage Preservation Commission Review: _____
Certificate of Appropriateness Issued: _____
Expiration Date: _____

Copies forwarded to	Building Official:	<u>X</u> _____
	Property Owner:	<u>X</u> _____
	Site File:	<u>X</u> _____
	SCDP File	_____



* Sign backboards
size increased to
South 37"x 240"
North 37"x 241.5"

216-218 CENTRAL ~ revised RESTORED FACADE

02/07/2024



DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION FORM

Heritage Preservation Commission

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Site Address: 216-218 Central Avenue North, Faribault, MN 55021

Owner/Applicant: Darrell Jensen

Mailing Address: 216 Central Avenue North

City/State: Faribault, MN 55021

Phone Number: (612) 483-0367

Site File Number:

Work Site Address: 216-218 Central Avenue North, Faribault, MN 55021

TYPE OF WORK

☒ Restoration

☐ Demolition

☐ Site Improvements

☐ New Construction

☐ Remodeling

SCOPE OF WORK

Brief Project Description:

Install a 3.5-inch raised border over the current border around the sign boards above the clerestory windows to cover the visible gap between the sign boards and the center column.

If any portion of the CMUs remains visible above the current sign boards after applying the larger sign board trim, paint the CMUs and concrete to match the appearance of the current brickwork and mortar on the façade of the buildings, using historically accurate paints.

(See attached plan drawing from Bohnhoff Design.)

ATTACHMENTS

☐ Historical Data / Site File Information

☒ Detailed Drawings of Proposed Modifications

☐ Manufacturers Specifications

☐ Photographs

☐ Site Plan

☐ Material Samples / Color Samples

ACTION OF HPC BOARD

Meeting Date: February 28, 2024

Action Taken:

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

☐ Issued

☐ Denied

NOTE

If this project is submitted as part of the City's SCDP rehabilitation program, it must receive a "no adverse effect" ruling from The State Historic Preservation Office.



**ADDITIONAL
WORK
to be completed:**

*** CMU Bricks
to be painted
to match -
existing brick.**

*** New 3.5"
raised border
installed over
existing border.
Increasing total
sign width
for each
backboard
to 21' 3"**



216-218 CENTRAL - RESTORED FACADE

Faribault, Minnesota

02/16/2024

Heritage Preservation Commission
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Site Address: 216-218 Central Avenue North, Faribault, MN 55021

I hereby certify that the Heritage Preservation Commission has reviewed the above-described project and found the work proposed by the applicant to meet or exceed the design guidelines established by the City of Faribault.

The design features approved by the Heritage Preservation Commission are to be considered a condition of the building permit issued by the City of Faribault as stipulated in the Code of Ordinances.

David Wanberg, Director of Community & Economic Development

Notes:

Date of Heritage Preservation Commission Review: _____
Certificate of Appropriateness Issued: _____
Expiration Date: _____

Copies forwarded to	Building Official:	X _____
	Property Owner:	X _____
	Site File:	X _____
	SCDP File	_____



Exhibit D – Findings for Application 1 Painting CMU

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

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

Finding: The use of the property is not changing, and is **consistent** with historic uses featuring commercial on the first floor and residential above.

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

Finding: The existing façade panels are **inconsistent** with this standard as they compromise the symmetrical and level historic character of the structure. The material in question (CMU) is not distinctive, and the panels do not alter the spaces or spatial relationships that characterize the property. Namely, the panels do not alter the relationship of the façade to the street, nor of the commercial space to the residential uses above. The panels serve to visually divide the commercial storefront from the residential uses above. The proposed painting is consistent with this standard as the material in question (CMU) is not distinctive, and does not alter the spaces or spatial relationships that characterize the property. The project, taken as a whole is inconsistent.

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

Finding: The existing façade panels and painting of the CMU are **consistent** with this standard. The panels are not conjectural as they do not seek to replicate a historic feature, and instead serve as a contemporary solution to a contemporary problem. The panels are not taken from another historic property.

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

Finding: This standard **does not apply** because the CMU and existing façade panels have not acquired historic significance.

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

Finding: The proposal to retain the existing façade panels is **inconsistent** with this standard because the craftsmanship that characterizes the property, that of a level and symmetrical appearance is not retained. This standard does not apply to painting the CMU.

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

Finding: Accepting that the replacement of the historic brick was either necessary or cannot be rectified and therefore matching materials is impossible. The proposal to paint the CMU to match the brick is **inconsistent** with this standard based on the samples provided as they fail to accurately match the old in design, color, and texture.

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

Finding: This standard **does not apply** as the proposal does not include any treatments of the façade or building materials.

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

Finding: This standard **does not apply** as the work and façade do not include any archaeological resources.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Finding: The proposal to retain the existing façade panels is

inconsistent with this standard. The out-of-level appearance and uneven gaps are not compatible with the historic features. The unpainted CMU is not compatible with the historic materials. Painting the CMU to match the brick is **inconsistent** with this standard as it fails to differentiate the new material from the old.

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

Finding: The existing façade panels and proposed paint are **consistent** with this standard because they can be removed in the future without interfering with or destroying the essential form and integrity of the property.



Exhibit E – Findings for Application 2 Larger Façade Panels

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

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

Finding: The use of the property is not changing, and is **consistent** with historic uses featuring commercial on the first floor and residential above.

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

Finding: The proposed façade panels are **consistent** with this standard as the material in question (CMU) is not distinctive, and the panels do not alter the spaces or spatial relationships that characterize the property. Namely, the panels do not alter the relationship of the façade to the street, nor of the commercial space to the residential uses above. The panels serve to visually divide the commercial storefront from the residential uses above.

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

Finding: The installation of the façade panels is **consistent** with this standard. The panels are not conjectural as they do not seek to replicate a historic feature, and instead serve as a contemporary solution to a contemporary problem. The panels are also not taken from another historic property.

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

Finding: This standard **does not apply** because the CMU and façade panels have not acquired historic significance.

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

Finding: The proposal to install the façade panels is **consistent** with this standard because all materials are retained while addressing the existing deficiencies.

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

Finding: This standard **does not apply** because the proposed façade panels do not replace a distinctive feature.

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

Finding: This standard **does not apply** as the proposal does not include any treatments of the façade or building materials.

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

Finding: This standard **does not apply** as the work and façade do not include any archaeological resources.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Finding: The proposal to install the façade panels is **consistent** with this standard. The new work is differentiated from the old while remaining compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportion, and massing of the original. The façade panels visually separate the residential upper stories from the commercial first floor like the historic I-beams they cover. The panels do not extend excessively from the front of the building, and by installing two separate panels, the separation created by the central column is retained. The panels are of a simple

design and do not seek to replicate the ornate elements of the window hoods, cornice, or other historic features while matching them in color. The proposed size is not excessive, while it is large enough to cover the required deficiencies.

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

Finding: The proposed façade panels are **consistent** with this standard because they can be removed in the future without interfering with or destroying the essential form and integrity of the property.



Exhibit F – Findings for Application 3 Enlarge Raised Borders on Existing Panels

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation:

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

Finding: The use of the property is not changing, and is **consistent** with historic uses featuring commercial on the first floor and residential above.

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

Finding: The proposed larger borders on the existing façade panels and painting are **inconclusive** with this standard as the level and symmetrical historic character of the property is not retained or preserved. The application does not adequately address the identified deficiencies. The material in question (CMU) is not distinctive, and the panels do not alter the spaces or spatial relationships that characterize the property. Namely, the panels do not alter the relationship of the façade to the street, nor of the commercial space to the residential uses above.

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

Finding: The installation of larger borders on the façade panels is **consistent** with this standard. The panels are not conjectural as they do not seek to replicate a historic feature, and instead serve as a contemporary solution to a contemporary problem. The panels are not taken from another historic property.

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

Finding: This standard **does not apply** because the CMU has not acquired historic significance.

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

Finding: The proposal to install enlarged borders on the façade panels is **consistent** with this standard because all materials are retained.

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

Finding: The proposal is **inconclusive** because it does not specify how much CMU will be visible. The proposal to paint the CMU to match the brick may be consistent with this standard if the painting matched the design, color, and texture of the historic brick. The samples provided are **inconsistent** with this standard as they fail to accurately match the old in design, color, and texture.

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

Finding: This standard **does not apply** as the proposal does not include any treatments of the façade or building materials.

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

Finding: This standard **does not apply** as the work and façade do not include any archaeological resources.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Finding: The proposal to retain the existing façade panels is **inconsistent** with this standard. The out-of-level appearance and

uneven gaps are not compatible with the historic features. The new work is differentiated from the old while remaining compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportion, and massing of the original. The façade panels visually separate the residential upper stories from the commercial first floor like the historic I-beams they cover. The panels do not extend excessively from the front of the building, and by installing two separate panels, the separation created by the central column is retained. The panels are of a simple design and do not seek to replicate the ornate elements of the window hoods, cornice, or other historic features while matching them in color. The proposed size is not excessive, while it is large enough to cover the required deficiencies.

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

Finding: The existing façade panels and proposed paint are **consistent** with this standard because they can be removed in the future without interfering with or destroying the essential form and integrity of the property.