

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting  
February 11, 1997  
Council Liaison: Gina Janett  
Staff Liaison: Joe Frank  
Commission Chairperson: Jennifer Carpenter (225-0960)**

**SUMMARY OF MEETING:** The LPC approved final plans for the C & S Railroad Depot, 136 LaPorte Avenue-exterior stabilization and restoration. The LPC conducted final review of Jockey Red awning for Saltillo's Grill, 100 West Mountain Avenue. The LPC also requested that the window paint there be removed by March 15, 1997. The Commission heard a conceptual review by Scott Dedolph, owner, 402 West Oak Street on design options for a proposed addition and discussed designation of the property. The final recommendation was made for the 1997 Local Landmark Rehabilitation Grant recipients.

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:** Jennifer Carpenter, Commission Chairperson called the meeting to order 5:40 p.m., 281 North College Avenue. Commission members Jennifer Carpenter, Ruth Weatherford, Bud Frick, Per Hogestad, Jean Kullman, Diana Ross and James Tanner were present. Carol Tunner, Joe Frank, Karen McWilliams and Leanne Lawrie represented Staff.

**GUESTS:** Jim Reidhead, Lynn Lohr and Dick Beardmore, A-E Design Associates; Dave Lingle and Becky Spears, Aller/Lingle Architects; Jack Gianola, City Project Manager; Don Woeber, citizen; Chad Lingwood, Coloradoan; Scott Dedolph, owner, 401 West Oak Street.

**STAFF REPORTS:** Ms. Tunner presented copies of the Annual Report and a training packet on Wooden Window Replacement. Ms. McWilliams reported that a sub-committee was needed to review the RFP responses for the East Side and West Side Neighborhood surveys. It was also discussed whether a property should be designated contingent on a restoration being completed.

**Mr. Hogestad moved that the Jonas Finger House, 211 West Mulberry and the Thomas Nicholas House, 922 West Oak be recommended for Local Landmark designation with the condition that photo-reconstruction of the porches be completed by the end of the 1997 grant period. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weatherford, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

**COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS:** None

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The November 26, 1997 LPC meeting minutes were accepted as submitted. The December 10, 1997 minutes were accepted as submitted.**

**CURRENT DESIGN REVIEW:**

**136 LaPorte Avenue, C & S Railroad Depot - Final Review of Exterior Stabilization and Restoration**

Dick Beardmore, consultant, presented the final plans for the exterior stabilization and restoration of the C & S Railroad Depot. The proposal included Flutex glass in the front door light, sidelights and transom glass, restoration of the door with replication hardware and the removal of non-historic front steps to be replaced with stairs like in an historic photo. Cast caps of concrete will be added for strength. According to Building Inspection requirements, a pipe railing will also have to be added. Research suggests that the sign over the door was for C & S Freight Transit, which will be restored. Minor repairs will be made to the freight dock, including the replacement of failed members. It was concluded that the stabilization of the structure and the enclosing of the area from access is all that will be done. The tile on the parapet roof is to be removed (which was probably recycled from the original roof) and tile on the east side will be used to patch the west side of the roof, which is the more visible side. The west parapet will be completed with existing tiles and the east side will be completed with a mixture of old and new tiles. Renaissance Roofing and Ludiwici Tile will be used as sources for more tile.

On the gullwing section, new integral gutters are proposed up against the building on the east and west side. This change will make a big improvement. The re-roofing and installation of curbing will be set up to add a roof lantern later on, when a use is found for the building. On the administrative office wing, the repair and rehabilitation of the existing sheet metal upper cornice includes tightening the modillions. A new metal protection was also proposed for over top of the cornice with a lip to wick water away. The colors proposed were described as terra-cotta for the window covers and dock doors, a mustard color for the cornice and chocolate brown trim around the front door. The door will be re-shellacked and the entry will be covered with a temporary door for protection. Mr. Reidhead presented historical photo-enhanced images and spoke on the research done for the interpretation. A brass plaque is proposed for the left at the entry, which will acknowledge the Colorado Historical Society's contributions. Mr. Frick commented that the plaque should be mounted into the mortar joints. Mr. Reidhead agreed and said that they will specify the distance between the plugs so as to hit the mortar joints. Mr. Beardmore explained that the sign above the door is reversed of how it was historically, with a light background and dark letters.

They also discussed Annie the Dog's grave. The headstone will exist as is and fencing will be installed around the border with a gate in the front of the tombstone. Ms. Carpenter asked if the roofing over the lantern area would allow the building to be usable. Mr. Beardmore explained that it would encourage people to install it in the future for natural day lighting. He added that they were also proposing crawl space venting in the administrative building. Ms. Carpenter asked if they would review the dock again. Mr. Beardmore explained that they were making selective repairs and were trying to put as much money into the building as they could. Mr. Frick asked how they were going to secure under the dock. Mr. Beardmore said that they were going to drop down a skirting of grating. He also showed brass hardware selected to match ghosting on the present door.

**Mr. Frick moved to approve the request for the C & S Depot stabilization as presented because it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hogestad, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

**Mr. Frank left the meeting.**

**OTHER BUSINESS:** Ms. Tunner reported that several businesses in town were planning to host an art gallery "crawl" through the downtown area. They would like to have flags to put out in front of each one of the buildings, just for the day, once a month. She explained to them that the LPC's only concern was that they were not covering architectural detail or drilling into bricks. Ms. Tunner will handle it administratively. Mr. Hogestad suggested that she check with Building Inspection to make sure that flag poles are allowed, before they install any brackets.

**Ms. McWilliams left and Ms. Lawrie arrived**

**100 West Mountain Avenue, Saltillo's Grill - Final Review of Doorway Sign and Resubmittal of Window Painting Based on Impending Awning Installation**

The LPC waited fifteen minutes past the scheduled time, and went ahead with the review without the applicant because the proposal was being appealed to Council the following week. Ms. Tunner presented the request for the doorway sign and the re-submittal of the window painting. A picture of the awning which the LPC reviewed December tenth, with the logo and the colors was provided. The applicant asked to retain an existing metal sign over the doorway, which was seen in the picture. The sign hangs from two chains and replaced a similar sign in the same location. The new sign is yellow with the Saltillo's Grill logo in red, white and black letters. The Building Inspection Department has cited Saltillo's for not having one. They have given them until March fifteenth to obtain one. Before the sign was installed, the applicant should have received approval from the LPC. Ms. Carpenter commented that signs are

usually done administratively. Ms. Tunner explained that Building Inspection said that the current sign was illegal because it hangs from chains, so is categorized as a moving sign. They need to hang it from metal rods and fix it firmly. She said that she brought the sign to the LPC because they were also reviewing the windows. She suggested that the LPC approve the sign contingent on it being built according to Building Inspections specifications. Ms. Carpenter suggested that Ms. Tunner handle the sign administratively.

Ms. Tunner then presented information regarding the window painting. She explained that the applicant had postponed the City Council appeal regarding the December 10, 1996 LPC decision to remove the paint from the transom windows. They postponed the appeal in order to submit new information to the LPC. They have now signed a contract with an awning company and have received an awning permit. They expect the awnings to be installed by the first week in March (according to Erin Dando from Saltillo's). Now, they are coming back to the LPC requesting that the Commission reconsider the decision made December 10th and allow the paint to remain on the windows because the awnings will cover the windows from view in the public right-of-way. Staff recommended that the painted windows, although they do not meet Secretary of the Interior's Standard #9, be left because the awnings will cover the paint. They will not be visible from the public right-of-way, which is under the LPC's purview.

Ms. Tunner did make some recommendations for the awning, so that the paint would not be visible. On January 14, 1997 the LPC approved Jockey Red awnings, however the application which was approved had awning valences but no cross-section showing any awning sidewalls. Conversely, the permit which the applicant received from Building Inspection was for an awning with sidewalls, but no valence. Ms. Tunner told Ms. Dando that she would bring the issue back to the LPC to find out if the Commission required both the sidewall and the valence on the awnings. Staff recommended that they have sidewalls because the windows are very visible from the ends, as seen in the pictures which were passed around. Ms. Tunner added that the sidewalls would also help block out the sun and the valence would help cover the windows a little more. There is also one window which is recessed and located at the entry of the Stone Lion Bookstore. Ms. Tunner recommended that the paint on that one window be removed.

Mr. Frick said that according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standard #9 the colors were not compatible and you could still see these colors under the awning when standing an arms length away from the window. People will also be sitting underneath the canopy. He questioned the Commission, if the applicant had come in and requested to paint the windows, would they have approved it? Mr. Tanner said that he drew a couple of lines of sight, which illustrated that you could see the paint. Ms. Kullman agreed that the paint did not comply with Standard #9; she asked if the painting were allowed to stay and it was reversible, what happens in the future when

another business moves in. She said if the LPC allowed the paint to stay then they would also be allowing the paint to stay in the future. Mr. Frick agreed that they could be setting a precedent for this allowance in the future. Mr. Tanner explained that they could not approve something which was such a dominant detail on the facade and was not compatible with the details of the building or the neighboring storefronts. Ms. Carpenter agreed that the sight lines were a key factor. Mr. Frick explained that they originally painted the windows to block out the sun, so with the awning installed the paint will no longer be necessary. Ms. Carpenter stressed that the paint did not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Ms. Weatherford said that the LPC already approved an awning on January 14, 1997. Mr. Frick said that they would have to modify their awning.

Ms. Weatherford moved to deny the application for the new design and stay with the original approval of January 14, 1997. Mr. Hogestad made a friendly amendment to include side panels with valence as submitted January 14, 1997. Ms. Weatherford then withdrew her motion and Mr. Hogestad withdrew his friendly amendment. The Commission discussed what the side panels would look like on the proposed awning. Mr. Tanner suggested that they approve the current submission, which included the side panels, with the valence added.

**Ms. Weatherford moved to accept the awning design as submitted with a straight free flowing nine inch valence and sidewalls. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frick, which passed unanimously. (7-0) (Yeas: Frick, Hogestad, Kullman, Ross, Tanner, Carpenter, Weatherford) (Nays: none)**

Ms. Carpenter then brought back the window painting discussion. Mr. Frick asked if they needed to approve the removal of the paint, since they had already made a decision regarding that issue.

**Mr. Frick moved that Saltillo's Grill at 100 West Mountain Avenue be required to remove the paint from the windows in fourteen days based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standard #9. Ms. Weatherford seconded the motion.**

Mr. Hogestad asked if it would be better to allow them to get the awnings up first. This would allow them to conduct their business more smoothly.

**Mr. Weatherford made a friendly amendment to have the paint removed by March 15. Ms. Carpenter commented that the paint was definitely incompatible with the building and violates the Secretary of the Interior's Standard #9. She explained that these were nationally recognized standards and Mr. Frick agreed. The motion passed unanimously. (7-0) (Yeas: Frick, Hogestad, Ross, Kullman, Tanner, Carpenter, Weatherford) (Nays: none)**

**401 West Oak Street, Complimentary Design Review for Rehabilitation and Addition (Scott Dedolph, owner)**

Scott Dedolph, owner, informed the Commission that the address of the building was 401, not 402 West Oak Street. Ms. Tunner said that the house was built in 1902. In 1930 the clap board addition to the west was added on and they added the dormers with an interior staircase, which was spiraled, leading to the upstairs. Mr. Dedolph would like to build an addition with an enclosed stairway to code and would like to add another office space upstairs as well. He explained that Planning and Zoning has already approved one plan, which was drawn by Don Richmond. Mr. Frick thought that the addition was out of proportion with the structure. Mr. Tanner also commented that the scale of the addition was too large. Mr. Dedolph said that he was considering applying for designation of the building, so that he could take advantage of programs like the Colorado State Tax Credit. He said that he was not only motivated by financing, but he was also very interested in maintaining the historic integrity of the house. The house exhibits superior craftsmanship and it also has the original stone foundation. Ms. Carpenter suggested that the Design Assistance Program could be very helpful in designing a compatible addition which would meet his needs. Mr. Dedolph questioned if the addition would change the status of the house for local landmark designation eligibility. He presented plans which Mr. Frick prepared, which may be more appropriate for the structure. Mr. Hogestad said that if the addition was the right scale and proportion then it could work. Mr. Tanner explained some of the advantages of designation and said that designations should be considered to be in perpetuity and have been reversed in the past in just a few unusual cases. Ms. Carpenter explained that the Commission plays a role in sitting down with the citizens and helping them. She offered assistance if there was anything else they could do to help Mr. Dedolph out.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

**Local Landmark Rehabilitation Grant Program - Final Recommendation on 1997 Grants**

Ms. Lawrie reported staff was directed at the last LPC meeting to survey grant applicants as to whether, with partial funding, the projects could be completed as a whole. Ms. Lawrie stated that some of the applicants said that they would not complete the whole project if they did not get full funding. The LPC discussed whether this will change the project ranking or not. Mr. Hogestad commented on whether the applicant should complete the entire proposed project or do nothing. Ms. Lawrie reported that two applicants would not complete 100% of the project if the funding was cut. She said that the Froseths only wanted to do fifty percent of their project and Howard Nornes would do half of the windows and look elsewhere for funding for the remaining 50%. Everyone else said that they would do the entire project.

Janet Rodriguez has withdrawn her application, therefore, Sally Kennett, 922 West Oak Street, advances up one position. It was suggested making a condition that half of the Froseth's project be the front porch. Mr. Hogestad said that the sub-committee did set up some ground rules and the criteria should be adhered to. The applicant should do the whole project or not receive the grant money. Ms. Carpenter said that those rules were not set up when people applied for the program. Ms. Kullman explained that when the matching funds are cut for a project, the ranking was not changed but the points will be lower. For instance, 211 West Mulberry dropped from eleven to ten points. Ms. Carpenter said that it is imperative that they stay with the rankings. Discussion was held on what part of the projects would be completed and whether the Commission could tell the applicants what part of the partial project they could do. Mr. Hogestad said that he had a concern with the rankings and explained that if they don't do the whole project it isn't the same project. Mr. Tanner said that the Commission was exaggerating the administrative problems and forgetting the goals of the program.

Ms. Kullman explained that people get more points by having a larger match to begin with. She had a problem with the little person being left out because they don't have as much money. Mr. Hogestad said once the guidelines are set, you shouldn't back up. Ms. Lawrie said that she was directed to call and ask if the applicants would do the project with partial funding and she did not promise they would get any money. Ms. Carpenter explained that the match moneys are important in order to make leverage and the City wants to encourage that. Mr. Frick said that these grants are a bonus and the Commission has to be fair across the board. He recommended that they go back to the others to ask if they will reduce their project.

Ms. Carpenter explained that Ms. McWilliams feels the Commission needs to separate the deadline of the grant program and designation in order to separate the idea of the grant award as being perceived as compensation for designation. People need to think of the program as an incentive only and recognize both the benefits and the drawbacks of designation. Mr. Tanner asked if two applicants dropped out, how about dividing the money equally among the awarded projects. Ms. Carpenter explained that the idea was to make as meaningful an impact as possible and to give funding to more projects. Ms. Lawrie recommended that if two projects drop out then give full funding to the number one ranked project. Ms. Carpenter said that she was uncomfortable with that method. Mr. Frick said to call Froseth and Nornes and tell them that the Commission will only give partial funding to full projects and if they decline, then just go down the list.

**Mr. Frick moved that 211 West Mulberry and 220 East Laurel be contacted first stating that partial funding will be given only to full projects as submitted. If they do not agree, grants will go to alternates. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weatherford, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

Mr. Hogestad said that alternates should be decided. Ms. Carpenter recommended Neva Lawton, 808 West Mountain, and said that they need to pick a couple of alternates. Ms. Lawrie discussed what the alternates are doing. The alternates ranked at six points, with an I for historic importance, are 103 North Sherwood, 314 East Mulberry and 1611 Mathews. Mr. Hogestad asked if anyone agreed to rank 314 East Mulberry below the other two because it is a new porch based on no documentation. The Commission agreed. Mr. Frick said that Richard Lea's submittal of the decomposing porch is better documented, so it should be ranked higher than the Sheill's project. The Commission decided to rank the alternates as follows: Lawton, 808 West Mountain, Lea, 103 North Sherwood, Sheill, 1611 Mathews, Goodwin, 314 East Mulberry.

**Ms. Weatherford moved to recommend to the City Manager the approval of Landmark Rehabilitation Grant applications submitted by Hutchison, Starke, Genneton, Pearson, Sunde and Kennett. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kullman, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

**Mr. Tanner moved to recommend to the City Manager the approval of Landmark Rehabilitation Grant applications submitted by Froseth and Nornes/Anderson with the proviso that both accept partial award and agree to do the entire project, and if not, grant awards will be given to the alternates. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kullman, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

**Ms. Weatherford moved to recommend to the City Manager the approval of the Landmark Rehabilitation Grant application submitted by Mykles. The motion was second by Ms. Ross, which passed unanimously. (6-0) ( Mr. Frick abstained because of a conflict of interest)**

**Mr. Frick moved that if the Froseth and Nornes/Anderson projects, one or both decide not to use partial funding for the full project then the alternates are in order of preference as follows: Lawton, for partial funding on a full project, Lea, partial funding on a full project, Sheill, partial funding on a full project, and Goodwin, for partial funding on a full project. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ross, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

**OTHER BUSINESS:** Ms. Tunner showed slides of lights on 217 Linden Street. They were not approved by the LPC. Ms. Carpenter requested that Staff call Mr. Veldman and tell him to come in.

Ms. Lawrie said that extensions for Jennifer Kathol/Bruce Biggi and Helen Woodard, recipients of the grant program for 1996, will be brought in writing to the LPC.



Landmark Preservation Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
February 11, 1997  
Page 9

**The meeting adjourned 9:10 p.m.**

**Submitted by Nicole Sneider, Secretary**