

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**April 8, 1997**  
**Council Liaison: Gina Janett**  
**Staff Liaison: Joe Frank**  
**Commission Chairperson: Jennifer Carpenter (255-0960)**

**SUMMARY OF MEETING:** The LPC approved the demolition of a front porch at 628 Peterson, so that it can be replaced. Demolition of a portion of the rear of the house at 951 LaPorte Avenue was approved. The Commission discussed re-roofing the Northern Hotel, and stabilization and repair of the roof is approved contingent on the submittal of proposed methods and specifications for staff review. The restoration plans for the original Harmony School building were approved for the Local Landmark Rehabilitation Grant. The Carriage House at 113 North Sherwood was approved for Colorado State Tax Credit, Part 2. Masonry repair and new storm/screen combination windows was approved for the Mahood House, 832 West Oak Street for the State Tax Credit Part 1. The LPC retroactively approved the masonry, wood work and porch foundation repair for the Baker House, 103 North Sherwood, contingent on submitted drawings and specifications to staff for review.

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:** Jennifer Carpenter, Commission Chairperson called the meeting to order 5:35 p.m., 281 North College Avenue. Commission members Per Hogestad, Jean Kullman, Diana Ross and James Tanner were present. Bud Frick arrived late. Carol Tunner and Karen McWilliams represented Staff.

**GUESTS:** Doug and Kristi Buffington, owners, 628 Peterson; Jan Meisel, owner, 951 LaPorte Avenue; Bill Starke, owner, Northern Hotel, 170 North College Avenue; Al Hauser, Architecture One, Mark Young, Mark Young Construction Co., Eric Hutchison, owner, the Harmony School; Dr. Randy Everett, owner, 113 North Sherwood; Steve Davidson, owner, 832 West Oak; Richard Lea, owner, 103 North Sherwood; Leslie Borstad, Empire Carpentry.

**AGENDA REVIEW:** Ms. Tunner added a discussion to other business of the foundation work, which has already begun on the Baker House, 103 North Sherwood. She also reported that the Maxwell House, at the corner of West Mulberry and Impala Drive needs a new roof and a real estate agent would like to immediately begin the installation in order to sell the house.

**STAFF REPORTS:** Ms. Tunner reported that the historic Water Stand-Pipe, 330 North Howes, has been accepted by the Water Works project and will be moved to the Old Waterworks Building.

**COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS: None.**

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: The February 25, 1997 LPC meeting minutes were accepted as submitted.**

**The March 11, 1997 LPC meeting minutes were accepted as submitted.**

**DEMOLITION REVIEW:**

**628 Peterson (Doug and Kristi Buffington, owners) - Porch Replacement**

Ms. McWilliams explained that the porch of the historic Hardinger House is more than fifty years old, and the house meets the criteria for Architectural Importance. The Buffingtons have applied to demolish the existing front porch. Staff recommends approval of the request for demolition without conditions. Ms. Carpenter did not think that the porch looked original. Mr. Buffington said that the porch was enclosed in 1933, but they did not know when it was originally built. The LPC received information and plans for what the applicants would like to do with the space. Ms. McWilliams reported that she had received two comments from the public regarding this issue. Karen Solomon, 617 Peterson #14 said that she supports the plan. Tom Horn, 609 Whedbee sent a letter stating that he is in favor of the alterations, but would be opposed to a modern design for the planned addition. Mr. Buffington explained that the proposed new porch extends out farther. He said that the design of the new porch is similar to the character of the house, with the exception of the proposed bay window. Ms. Carpenter pointed out that some of the features are the same. Ms. McWilliams inquired if the original porch windows will be used. Mr. Buffington explained that some windows were custom built and are not square. Ms. Buffington added that they will try to use some of the glass elsewhere in the house. Ms. Tunner suggested that they create air holes in the porch skirt to prevent the skirt from rotting.

**Mr. Tanner moved to approve the application for demolition of the porch at 628 Peterson Street. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ross, which passed unanimously. (5-0)**

**Bud Frick arrived 5:50 p.m.**

**951 LaPorte (Jan Meisel, owner) - Addition**

Ms. McWilliams explained that the building proposed for partial demolition and renovation is more than eighty years old, and meets the criteria for Architectural Importance. Staff said that they would recommend designation of the house if an application was submitted, however, there is a large solarium addition on the back. Mr. Hogestad asked whether the LPC needs to evaluate the demolition based on the existing building or what will become

of it. The Commission agreed that they need to review the existing building. Ms. Carpenter stated that if a house is potentially eligible as a Local Landmark, but with the proposed changes it will become ineligible, she will consider that in her decision. She discussed whether the change is so extreme that it will significantly affect the house and the neighborhood. The LPC and the applicant discussed lowering the gable and the roof of the house. Mr. Frick said that the addition is overpowering the original structure. Ms. McWilliams stated that a very large addition on the back of the house would affect its historic integrity. Mr. Tanner commented that this house is a very common type of structure in the City. Ms. McWilliams added that the porch is not original. Mr. Hogestad asked if the stairs to the porch have always been in that location. Ms. Meisel responded yes. Ms. McWilliams reported that she received one phone call from a neighbor regarding the plans for 951 LaPorte. The neighbor stated that Jan Meisel is welcome to do whatever she wants to to her property. Ms. Carpenter reviewed the LPC's options.

**Mr. Tanner moved to approve the request for demolition of a portion of the house at 951 LaPorte Avenue. Mr. Frick seconded it.**

Mr. Tanner discussed the question of a non-consensual designation and does not want to go against the owner's wishes. Ms. Kullman supports the idea of an addition, but does not think that these plans follow the Design Guidelines. Ms. Meisel disagrees and stated that she did follow the Design Guidelines. Mr. Hogestad explained that it is an issue of scale. Ms. Carpenter said that she has an objection to the proposed addition because it is not subordinate to the house, but the Commission is not currently reviewing the addition.

**The motion passed unanimously. (Yeas: Carpenter, Frick, Hogestad, Kullman, Ross, Tanner) (Nays: none) (6-0)**

#### **CURRENT DESIGN REVIEW:**

##### **170 North College Avenue, Northern Hotel - Reroofing for the Local Landmark Grant Program and State Tax Credit, Part 1**

Ms. Tunner explained that the existing roof on the Northern Hotel is an assemblage of different roofs from different times. Bill Starke, owner, is seeking approval for the Landmark Rehabilitation Grant Program and for the State Tax Credit for materials, but not labor costs because they will do the work themselves. Mr. Hogestad inquired about the roofing system which will be used. Mr. Starke said that much preliminary work needs to be done to the roof. He proposes to apply the Snow Roofing System, which includes a latex undercoat overlaid with a nylon mesh. The roofing system is made to last from ten to fifteen years. Mr. Frick commented that the proposed roof seems more like a temporary solution. Mr. Starke agreed. Mr. Frick suggested using a foam roof and then sealing the entire area. Mr. Starke and Mr. Frick discussed the cost of alternative roofing systems.

Mr. Frick outlined some of the advantages of the foam roof and will provide Mr. Starke with information. Ms. Tunner explained that the roof repair will help preserve the building. Mr. Starke discussed the possibility of selling the building in the near future, and his financial return on the investment made in the roof. Mr. Tanner said that Mr. Starke's method would result in a partial stabilization rather than a re-roof. Mr. Hogestad explained that more work may need to be done in terms of re-flashing as well. Mr. Starke felt that the Snow System is a good compromise. Ms. Carpenter suggested that they label the work as roof repair and stabilization on the State Income Tax Program application. Mr. Frick said that he has some concerns regarding the method of the patch and asked what guidelines need to be followed for roof repair on an historic commercial building. Mr. Starke said that he has information on the Snow Roofing System from Builder's Square. Mr. Frick reported that this system was usually used on smaller roofs of outbuildings and mobile homes. Mr. Starke explained that it is used on commercial buildings as well. Mr. Hogestad asked if there is a slope requirement for the project. Mr. Starke said there is an existing slope to the roof. Mr. Hogestad asked if there are any large areas of ponding. Mr. Starke said that there are areas which need to be built up with foam. Mr. Tanner requested a review of the specifications of the products, the methods and the work impact in order to make sure some acknowledged system is going to be used. The Commission agreed that the information can be reviewed administratively.

**Ms. Kullman moved to approve the roof repair and stabilization for the Local Landmark Rehabilitation Grant Program and the State Tax Credit Part 1 for the Northern Hotel, 170 North College Avenue. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ross.**

**Mr. Frick made a friendly amendment that the project be approved with the submittal of specifications of the roofing system to Staff, to review with the consultation of Mr. Hogestad or Mr. Frick. If Staff or the consultants have a problem with it will come back for review by the LPC. Ms. Ross accepted the friendly amendment and the motion passed unanimously. (6-0)**

**Harmony School, Christian Early Childhood Center - Final Review for Rehabilitation of School Portion for the Local Landmark Grant Program (Final Review of the Addition Will be Held Later)**

Ms. Tunner explained that the applicant is presenting the rehabilitation of the original school building. Al Hauser, Architecture One, presented the revised plans and restoration work on the front entry. He called the Commission's attention to the lighted side windows on the front facade. It had been previously planned to install neon lights along the etched glass. Mr. Hauser said that in the original plans for the entry, the side lights are equipped with can lights to wash over the etched glass. He stated that replacing the cans with incandescent lamps may be purer to the historic reconstruction of the facade. Mr. Hogestad said that he is concerned about heat build up. Mr. Frick asked if there was

originally a cover on the inside. Mr. Hauser reported that the lighting system was not detailed. He explained that the depth of the enclosed space is between six and seven inches and that the glass is seven feet long by four to five inches wide. Mr. Hogestad then stated that there should be no problem with incandescent lamps. Mr. Hauser said that he is concerned that a neon tube light will create a hot spot and the definition of the light source will come across along the etched glass. Mr. Frick suggested using a lamp fixture which has a longer life for maintenance reasons and suggested a Pielf lamp. Ms. Carpenter stressed that the light fixture should meet fire safety regulations. Mr. Hauser concluded that the etched glass will be made to match the existing pattern and then illuminated by a light source.

The front doors will be replaced with rail style, hollow metal doors, for maintenance purposes, and painted white to match the windows. The concrete caps by the entry will also be replaced. Mr. Hauser suggested that they remove the school letters because they have blackened over time and no longer stand out from the brick background. He said they would like to powder coat the letters in a light color.

Mr. Hauser then discussed the changes made to the plans for the addition, which were illustrated on the revised elevation drawings. The proposed Kal-Wall translucent window panels have been replaced with aluminum storefront windows with an exterior glazing and an opaque glazing on the inside sheet. He said that the windows would be more reminiscent of the original school windows. Mr. Hogestad recommended the use of an interior valence to diffuse the light and help reduce costs. Mr. Hauser explained that the court runs east to west and the west windows may present a problem because of the setting sun. The window openings may have to be decreased on that elevation, which faces the street, but is set back. Mr. Hauser discussed the fire escapes in terms of health and safety issues. He said that they have been designed in as much of an historic nature as possible with horizontal rails, grated treads and an open riser. The existing stairwell on the north elevation served as a reference for the design. One window on the east and west side will be changed into a door with a transom glass above in order to keep an equal height. The fire escapes on the east and west sides of the building are the biggest alterations made to the original structure. Mr. Frick asked if the new railings are set away from the wall. Mr. Hauser said that the steps come right up against the wall. Mr. Frick inquired how the window will be treated, where it is crossed by the stairs. Mr. Hauser said that the steel stringer will be visible from that window and is flush with the masonry. An impact rail will be installed at that portion of the stairs and the window tilts in for cleaning. The fire escape can not be set off the side of the building because of the adjacent narrow entry way. Mr. Hauser added that an existing chimney on the north elevation will be demolished. The proposed windows are made by Marvin and are a replica of the originals, painted white.

Ms. McWilliams discussed painting the school letters white. She stated that unless the letters were white historically, they should be left as is. Eric Hutchison, owner commented that the letters were very rusty and should be treated. Mr. Frick examined a photograph of the letters and thinks they may have been Aluminum Silver. He suggested that the letters be color coated with that color. Ms. Carpenter added that the masonry should be repointed where necessary. Mr. Hauser reported that most of the masonry work is going to be done on the front, the top two feet of the brick and on the flashings. Ms. Carpenter recommended that a test patch be used with the mortar. Ms. Tunner noted that the Local Landmark Rehabilitation Grant will be used for replacement of the existing roof. A conventional build up roof or a cold applied modified bitumen will be installed.

Mr. Frick moved to approve the rehabilitation of the existing Harmony School as submitted April 8, 1997, with the letters to be removed and determined to be what material and color, and then powder coated that color. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kullman. Mr. Hogestad presented a friendly amendment that a conventional build-up roof or a cold applied modified bitumen be installed using the Local Landmark Rehabilitation Grant. The friendly amendment was accepted by Ms. Kullman, the motion passed unanimously. (6-0)

Ms. Carpenter relinquished the chair to Mr. Frick and left.

**113 North Sherwood, Bouton House (Randy Everett) - Final Review of Rehabilitation of Carriage House for the State Tax Credit, Part 2.**

Dr. Everett explained that the carriage house walls were falling in when they began the rehabilitation. New framing timbers and inlet metal braces at the base were installed. He described the restoration work. The top level, or hayloft is now a livable space and is insulated. The hay drops were kept in place, but closed off. New windows are on the north side at the site of the original hay inlet. Yellow pine lines the floors and walls, to match the original space. The new pine was finished with a light gray wash to make it appear historic. The exterior of the building was also painted to match the house. A chicken coop addition, a non-qualified cost, was constructed where structural evidence suggested there may have been one. Dr. Everett said that the approved French doors are not going to be installed and the siding on that corner still needs to be repaired. He added that the original sliding barn doors were repaired and installed. The cupola louvers were glazed as they exist because it provides enough ambient light and this way their original appearance is maintained on the outside.

Mr. Hogestad moved to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ross, which passed unanimously. (5-0)

Richard Lea, owner of 103 N. Sherwood commented that he is glad that the barn in the middle of the block is restored.

**832 West Oak, W. E. Mahood House - Masonry Repair and Install Storm Windows for the State Tax Credit, Part 1**

Ms. Tunner explained that the masonry repair will be completed by Salazar Masonry. The brick and sandstone foundation is missing mortar or was repaired poorly in the past. Some windows already have aluminum storm windows and others have no storm windows. Mr. Davidson explained that the original storms windows look like wood and he proposes to replace all the windows with one Marvin unit. Leslie Borstad, Empire Carpentry displayed a sample window and provided the manufacturers specifications. She reported that the combination wood storm/screen window is less expensive than purchasing screens and storm windows separately. Mr. Davidson said that he will paint the windows the color of the existing trim, which is a rusty red.

Mr. Tanner moved to approve the request for masonry repair and storm/screen installation for 832 West Oak Street. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kullman, which passed unanimously. (5-0)

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**103 North Sherwood, the Baker House - Foundation and porch Repair for Local Landmark Rehabilitation Grant - Richard Lea, owner**

Ms. Tunner explained that 103 North Sherwood received a grant to do foundation repair and woodwork. Kevin Murray, Empire Carpentry and Mr. Salazar, his masonry sub-contractor have already begun the work prior to receiving approval from the LPC. Richard Lea, owner, explained the project to the Commission. The house has three porches with foundations made of large cut stones. Presently, the porches are unsafe. The front porch has a rotten joist and the fourteen inch thick columns are sinking. Concrete stones will need to be replaced on top of the foundation. Mr. Lea stated that the porches will be built back to their original specifications. He added that they will also need to replace porch floor boards. Mr. Frick asked if a foundation existed below the stones. Mr. Frick suggested that the applicant implement frost protection techniques for the corners, in order to alleviate the problem in the future. Mr. Lea explained that the damage had been caused by poor drainage because of no gutters or poor gutters. The water then drained right into the corners of the porches. He said that the house had received sixty years of neglect, which caused mostly aesthetic deterioration. Mr. Lea added that a pier was placed at the one of the porches for stabilization and since the gutters have been repaired and new gutters installed, the pier has not moved. Mr. Lea explained that the stones shifted slightly, forcing the grout to fall out of the masonry. The inner stone foundation serves as the load bearing surface. He concluded that he was not concerned about the porches'

stability in the next fifty to sixty years because the drainage problem has been amended. Mr. Tanner explained that for a retroactive approval, the Commission must ask for details on how the porches are going to be repaired. Ms. Tunner commented that the woodwork has not been started yet. Mr. Lea explained that a rough cut joist two inches wide and eight inches tall will be replaced. Mr. Hogestad requested framing plans and materials to be submitted. Mr. Lea said that the wood has not been removed from the joist construction porch. Once the wood is removed they don't really know what they will find underneath, so it needs more exploration. Mr. Frick requested scale drawings, dimensions, cross-sections through the porch with the roof, what exists and what it will be replaced with, drawings of how the joist sits on the stones, information on the skirt boards, the color and type of stone and mortar mix and whether the porch will be reinforced, especially near the walkway. Ms. McWilliams added that the shape of the mortar joint should be explained too.

**Ms. Kullman moved to retroactively approve the application for the masonry work and the porch foundation repair at 103 North Sherwood, based upon the submission of the materials, details and specifications with the condition that they be submitted by April 9, 1997 for staff review and that they can proceed with the masonry work on the foundation with the requirement that the Secretary of the Interior's Preservation Brief #2 be followed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ross.**

**Mr. Tanner made a friendly amendment to include administrative review of the woodwork of the porch foundation. The friendly amendment was accepted by Ms. Ross and the motion passed unanimously. (5-0)**

**Maxwell House, West Mulberry, corner of West Mulberry and Impala Drive**

Ms. Tunner informed the Commission that she received a phone call that morning regarding the Maxwell House on West Mulberry. A real estate agent from ReMax explained that the roof is leaking and asked if an asphalt roof would be acceptable to install. Ms. Tunner responded that they would have to come to the LPC for review and did recommend using an architectural asphalt shingle. She invited him to present this evening, but he could not attend.

**The meeting adjourned 8:20 p.m.**

**Submitted by Nicole Sneider, Secretary**