

clerk's

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**January 28, 1997**  
**Council Liaison: Gina Janett**  
**Staff Liaison: Joe Frank**  
**Commission Chairperson: Jennifer Carpenter (225-0960)**

**SUMMARY OF MEETING:** The request for demolition of the Poudre Valley Hospital Foundation House, 1014 Lemay Avenue, was postponed for further information. The LPC recommended the Local Landmark Designations of the following properties: 832 West Oak, W.E. Mahood House; 218 Peterson Street, the B.H. McCarty House; 1611 Mathews Street, the A.W. Scott House; 922 West Oak Street, the Thomas Nicholas House; 924 West Magnolia, the Elizabeth Collins House; 722 Mathews Street, the Liggett House; 2112 East Harmony, the Harmony School; and 211 West Mulberry, the Jonas Finger House. The LPC evaluated the Rehabilitation Grant Program applications. The proposed extended rear storeroom addition was approved for Linden's, but the LPC tabled the discussion and approval of the proposed sign band and facade renovation for further information and more detailed drawings.

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

**GUESTS:** Gunther Seligmann, Poudre Valley Hospital; Tom Kalert, architect and Louis Skelton, designer, for Linden's and Bohemian Brewers; Bill Warren, National Inspection Services and Roger Warren, contractor, for Linden's; Donald and Leona Woeber and Pat Short, interested citizens. Applicants for the Rehabilitation Grant Program who attended the meeting included: David Sheill, 1611 Mathews, the A.W. Scott House; Janet Rodriguez, 722 Mathews House, the Liggett House; Sally Kennett, 922 West Oak Street, the Thomas Nicholas House; Wayne Carpenter, 218 Peterson Street, the B.H. McCarty House; Ellie Pearson, 924 West Magnolia, the Elizabeth Collins House; Carolyn Goodwin, 314 East Mulberry; Vicki Fogel Myckles, 321 Garfield Street; Richard Lea, 103 North Sherwood; Howard Nornes, 220 East Laurel; Matt and Bill Starke, 172 North College; Neva and Joyanne Lawton, 808 West Mountain; Les Sunde, 214-216-218-222 Pine Street and Eric and Cathy Hutchison, the Harmony School, 2112 East Harmony.

**AGENDA REVIEW:** None.

**STAFF REPORTS:** Ms. McWilliams reported that the RFP for the East Side/West Side survey document was re-issued because of errors by the Purchasing Department.

**COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS:** Ms. Carpenter requested a Commission member attend the February 4, 1997 City Council meeting for Saltillo's appeal. Ms. Weatherford volunteered. Ms. Carpenter also requested that Staff gather information on the design guidelines by which the LPC bases their decisions, the process which the LPC follows for any application and any background information on this issue, for Council's packet. Ms. Weatherford stressed that another major issue was that the applicant did not follow proper procedures with the LPC.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Mr. Tanner requested that the second sentence on page four of the November 12, 1996 minutes, which read *The application for projecting signs on the side of the building, are not permitted.* should be re-written as 'In this case projecting signs on the side of the building are not permitted.' On page six of the minutes the word pallet should be changed to palette.

**Ms. Weatherford moved to accept the November 28, 1996 minutes as corrected by Mr. Tanner. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kullman, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

**REQUEST FOR DEMOLITION:1014 Lemay Avenue (PVH Foundation House), Poudre Valley Hospital, Applicant**

Ms. McWilliams reported that Staff recommended approval of the demolition of the house at 1014 Lemay Avenue. Ms. Weatherford commented that the house could probably be moved and asked if there was any attempt made to market the house. Ms. McWilliams explained that the Housing Authority was conducting an analysis of the feasibility of their moving the structure. Ms. Carpenter explained that Demolition Delay could create some time in order to come up with other options for saving the structure. Mr. Tanner asked Gunther Seligmann, from Poudre Valley Hospital, what their time frame was for construction on the site. Mr. Seligmann explained that the new management of PVH placed the removal of the building on their agenda. Mr. Frick asked what were the plans for the area. Mr. Seligmann said that they plan to landscape the site and that the house was in poor condition. Mr. Tanner asked if asbestos was present in the house. Mr. Seligmann explained that the asbestos had been removed, but lead paint existed in the house. Ms. Weatherford said that a delay would give someone the option to move the house off the property as opposed to demolishing the structure. Mr. Tanner explained that he was more concerned with the structure's historic attributes, not what the property was being used for. Ms. McWilliams reported that it was used as the Superintendent's house for Poudre Valley Hospital between the 1940s and late 1960s. Mr. Hogestad commented that once the

house was moved it would lose its historical significance. Public input came from Donald Woeber representing from the Pioneer Association. He said that there was a POW camp near the site, and that through the years the hospital had grown and changed in its form and design tremendously. He said that the house was the only structure left which reflected the original design of the hospital. A letter was also provided from Donald Wells, MD., who felt that the house had no aesthetic or historic value. Ms. Weatherford explained that because there were no plans for the area, they should allow the time to find out if someone was interested in the house, and that it was important to investigate the possible association with a POW camp. Mr. Seligmann added that the house was presently a security liability for the hospital.

**Ms. Weatherford moved to postpone the consideration of the demolition request for up to forty-five days for further information. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ross, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

**(Yeas: Carpenter, Weatherford, Frick, Hogestad, Kullman, Ross, Tanner) (Nays: none)**

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

##### **208/214 Linden Street, the Mercer and Bernheim blocks (Linden's) - Final Design Review**

Ms. Tunner reported that the Design Sub-Committee, involving Mr. Frick, Mr. Hogestad and Ms. Tunner, met at Linden's, January 27. The applicants had been asked to provide section plans of the corner detail of the building, the interface of the facade of the building and the back of the proposed sign. Mr. Hogestad and Mr. Tanner had some concerns regarding the depth of the sign. Mr. Kalert commented that from the face of the masonry, the furthest projection of the sign was three feet out. The sign band was described to be two feet by seven and one-half inches high at the angle of the bracing. Mr. Hogestad commented that the plans were missing details of the connection. Mr. Skelton explained that they tried to create both signs to be the same length and to provide a channel instead of an I-beam. He explained that aluminum channel letters were proposed for the sign which when illuminated with neon, required more depth in the channel. Aluminum was used in order to reduce the weight of the sign. The seven and one-half inch depth of the sign was proposed in order to accommodate the letters, but the channel still had a slender feel to it. Mr. Hogestad said that the plans still need dimensions to detail the connections and the mounting of the sign to the building. Mr. Skelton added that the letters were ten inches high. Mr. Tanner asked if the distance of three inches from the letters to the wall was integral. Mr. Skelton explained that the distance was related to the radiation of the neon lights. Mr. Tanner asked if there was any way to reduce the width. Mr. Skelton responded that

it would create a different feel and they were trying to keep within the theme. He said that they could reduce the width from three to two and one-half inches, but then you could see the neon lights.

Ms. Carpenter and Mr. Tanner felt that the sign appeared to look heavy and industrial, like the original proposal. Mr. Skelton reviewed the dimension for the sign and explained that the steel support rod would not appear significant at thirteen feet up. Mr. Tanner said that he was having trouble creating a mental picture of a box beam across the building and felt that this design would have more impact than an open channel, which was supported by cables. Mr. Hogestad inquired about the font and type face of the proposed letters. Mr. Skelton said that he would provide a sample. He explained that the actual channel only existed where the letters were present. Mr. Kalert added a change to the original proposal, which was to replace the outbuilding with a 10' 8" wide structure as opposed to a 6' wide structure. Ms. Carpenter concluded that all the space in the back would be filled in and asked if they had any samples of the materials which they were using. Mr. Hogestad agreed that they needed more information and the details of the proposal to be keyed out on the plan. Ms. Carpenter commented that the current proposal was very different from what had been proposed prior. Mr. Frick added that they also required information on color, letters and materials. Mr. Hogestad addressed the overall depth of the sign and he was comfortable with it. Ms. Weatherford agreed.

**Mr. Hogestad moved to table the front facade application for more information, until a cohesive set of drawings is submitted, to include details for end connections, color, type face, elevation views and plan views with all the details keyed on one set of drawings. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frick, which passed unanimously. (6-0) (Yeas: Carpenter, Frick, Hogestad, Kullman, Ross, Tanner) (Nays: none) (Ms. Weatherford abstained)**

The LPC added that the proposed storeroom would eliminate a dark area behind the building, in the alley.

**Mr. Frick moved to approve the extended addition to the storeroom. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weatherford, which passed unanimously. (Yeas: Carpenter, Weatherford, Frick, Hogestad, Kullman, Tanner, Ross) (Nays: None)**

#### **LOCAL LANDMARK DESIGNATIONS:**

##### **832 West Oak Street, Steve Davidson and Jill Parmer, owners**

Ms. McWilliams reported that the added brick porch on the W.E. Mahood House was very compatible with the brick of the original house. She explained that the porch

railings were concrete. Mr. Hogestad pointed out that the columns on the porch were set on the top of the brick and not behind it.

**Mr. Frick moved to recommend 832 West Oak Street for Local Landmark Designation. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kullman, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

**218 Peterson Street, the B.H. McCarty House, Wayne and Ila "Jean" Carpenter, owners**

Wayne Carpenter, owner, reported that B.H. McCarty was associated with the barber shop on College Avenue. He explained that they had stripped all of the woodwork in the house. Ms. Kullman asked if there were any changes made to the rear of the house. Mr. Carpenter said that the house was built in 1902 and there exists a concrete, rather than sandstone, foundation and that the sleeping porch on the back of the structure may have been an addition.

**Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the recommendation for Local Landmark Designation for 218 Peterson Street, the B.H. McCarty House. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kullman, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

**1611 Mathews Street, the A.W. Scott House, David and Rebecca Sheill, owners**

Ms. McWilliams reported that the house was moved in 1959 to the corner of Remington and Prospect, and was built c. 1895 at 403 South College where Norwest Bank is today. Mr. Sheill was interested in removing a later sunburst motif, which covered the original transom. The additions were made to the house prior to the move. Mr. Sheill explained that A.W. Scott married into the Maxwell family and there were other relationships to the Abbott and Loomis family.

**Mr. Hogestad moved to approve the application as submitted for 1611 Mathews Street. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weatherford, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

**922 West Oak Street, the Thomas Nicholas House and Barn, Richard and Sally Kennett, owners**

Ms. McWilliams reported that alterations had been made to the Thomas Nicholas House, as discussed in the Staff Report. Sally and Richard Kennett explained that the front porch was not removed, it had collapsed. The reason which they applied for Local Landmark Designation was so that they would have the opportunity to restore the original porch. Mr. Hogestad and Mr. Frick discussed whether the barn was historic or not. Mr. Tunner explained that it was unusual to have Dutch a kick roof on an historic barn. Ms. Kennett said that there was a loft inside and that the existing garage door

was once a traditional barn door. Ms. McWilliams suggested that they do some more research on the barn and then designate it at a later time. Mr. Tanner asked how the applicants intended to reconstruct the front porch. Ms. Kennett explained that they would like to go back to a wooden balustrade.

**Ms. Weatherford moved to approve recommendation of the Local Landmark Designation for the Thomas Nicholas House, 922 West Oak Street, with the condition that the front porch be reconstructed to its original condition, and withhold the designation of the outbuildings until more research is done. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ross, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

**924 West Magnolia, the Elizabeth Collins House, Eleanor Pearson, owner**

Ms. McWilliams discussed the Bungalow style of the house and described its associated structures, such as the unusual stone fence and landscape features. Mr. Hogestad inquired if there were any early photos of the house. Ellie Pearson, owner said that the house exists exactly as it appeared in the tax assessor's files back to 1948.

**Ms. Kullman moved to approve for Local Landmark Designation, the Elizabeth Collins House and associated structures at 924 West Magnolia Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hogestad, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

**722 Mathews Street, the Liggett House, Janet Rodriguez, owner**

Ms. McWilliams explained that the applicant wants to remove the asbestos siding from the house, in hopes of uncovering existing Queen Anne architectural details.

**Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the Local Landmark Designation of the Liggett House, at 722 Mathews Street. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kullman, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

**2112 East Harmony Road, the Harmony School, LGT Real Estate Advisors Inc., owner**

Ms. McWilliams reported that Eric and Cathy Hutchison are under contract with the owners, LGT Real Estate Advisors, Inc. and the Oak Farm Inc., and would like to restore and use the structure for a pre-school.

**Mr. Tanner moved to accept the submission for the Local Landmark Designation of the Harmony School. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weatherford, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

**211 West Mulberry Street, the Jonas Finger House, B.K. Maxwell Co., owner**

Ms. McWilliams reported that Staff's recommendation was to approve this house for Local Landmark Designation, with the condition that the front and back porches be reconstructed by use of photo-documentation, if possible. The LPC discussed how the house was similar to one at 629 West Mountain.

**Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the recommendation for the Local Landmark Designation of the Jonas Finger House and barn at 211 West Mulberry Street, with the contingency that the porches be reconstructed with photo-documentation, if available. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kullman, which passed unanimously. (7-0)**

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

##### **Local Landmark Rehabilitation Grant Program - Evaluation of Applications**

Ms. Carpenter opened the discussion by addressing the Commission and citizens present. Many of the applicants were present at the meeting. She commented that the funds for the Rehabilitation Grant Program were limited. She explained that the program has been very successful in the past and encouraged individuals to contact the City Council in order to receive more funding to expand the program for the future. Regretfully, many worthy projects would have to be rejected this year. Ms. Weatherford added that last year \$40,000 was awarded, this year only \$20,000 was available for the program and between \$60,000 and \$70,000 was applied for this year. Ms. Lawrie provided a packet to the Commission. She said that twenty applications were to be reviewed, since four applicants had dropped out of the process. Ms. Kullman and Mr. Frick made up the sub-committee who determined the preliminary ranking of each application. Ms. Lawrie presented slides, an overview of each project and its ranking. Ms. Carpenter made an announcement that if any LPC member had a conflict of interest they should excuse themselves from the discussion of that application.

Ms. Lawrie reviewed the definition of rehabilitation and the goals of the program. Awards are based on the significance of the structure, the preservation necessity, the effort to return the structure to its original appearance, a reasonable expenditure and the present condition of the building and its improvements. Ms. Carpenter asked if the sub-committee had screened the applicants for periodic maintenance versus rehabilitation. Ms. Lawrie stated that those issues were reflected in the rankings. She explained that the sub-committee would reconvene and based on the preliminary decision made at this meeting, would make a recommendation for funding.

Ms. Lawrie then presented slides of each property and an explanation of the proposed work to be completed. The LPC discussed the reconstruction of the storefront at 200-204 Walnut Street. The Commission was informed that the building had been sold.

They discussed whether the award would be granted to the building or if it needed to be awarded to an applicant. Ms. Carpenter said that they would need clarification of the situation and verification that the new owner(s) wanted to head in the same direction with the building storefront. Ms. Carpenter and Ms. Rodriguez discussed what may or may not be under the siding of Ms. Rodriguez's house at 722 Mathews Street. Ms. Rodriguez said she was prepared to agree to a contingency of replacing the siding with cedar siding, if the original fish scale and gingerbread siding was not salvageable. Ms. Carpenter then gave the applicants and members of the public a chance to speak.

Norm Brunette, 503 Remington Street explained that he had already done a lot of work and had gone over budget, but the work needs to continue.

Wayne Carpenter, 218 Peterson Street, explained that the deterioration of the brick on his house was very bad. He said that he just finished a four thousand dollar paint job. He added that the bricks in the arch details over the windows were now falling out.

John Morley, 145 North Loomis Street, asked the Commission why the budget had been cut. Ms. Carpenter explained that last year, the program had funding leftover from 1995.

Carolyn Goodwin, 314 East Mulberry Street, thanked the LPC for their support.

Neva Lawton, 808 West Mountain Avenue, explained that she had to stuff cracks in her windows with newspaper and would rather install storm windows than replace the original ones.

Ms. Kullman mentioned that the sub-committee had discussed that homeowners might consider the Colorado State Tax Credit Program for historic restoration work as well. Ms. Lawrie explained that their decisions were based on HRPP guidelines and that the rating of *important* and *very important* was subjective, based on the sub-committee's opinion. That rating category would be used in the case of a tie. Ms. Kullman explained that the sub-committee tried to zero in on what the grant was intended to accomplish. For example, on 722 Mathews Street, the grant was to help fund the removal of asbestos siding in order to restore the original siding on the house. Ms. Carpenter asked if there was any weight given to projects that simply would not get done without the grant. Ms. Lawrie said that was not considered. Ms. Carpenter suggested that 924 West Magnolia presented a high effort to return the structure to its original appearance because the new proposal was to replace the asphalt shingles with wood. The increased total score moved the project up to a rank of 13, which was the fifth highest rank. Ms. McWilliams explained that the sub-committee was forced to look only at current efforts to return the structure back to its original appearance, not past efforts which had been made. The committee members found this to be restraining.



The LPC reviewed the worksheets. Mr. Tanner pointed out that 722 Mathews Street had a degree of threat at a moderate level, but with a high preservation effort, which did not seem to compare. Ms. Weatherford said that to take the house back to its original siding required a lot of work. Ms. McWilliams added that if the house was not taken back to its original siding, then Staff would not recommend its designation as a Local Landmark.

Ms. Carpenter questioned the threat of the building. Ms. Kullman and Ms. McWilliams explained that the threat was based on the worksheets, which were completed according to the HRPP.

Ms. Weatherford questioned why replacing the east porch on 314 East Mulberry was considered minor. Ms. Kullman stated that the project involved mostly maintenance issues. Ms. Carpenter suggested to look at partial funding for the porch. Ms. McWilliams added that a very large addition had been added. Ms. Carpenter said that they could only consider what work was being done now. They could not determine what percentage of the project was the porch restoration. Mr. Tanner commented that the available funding may not even go down that far on the list. Ms. Goodwin said that five thousand dollars went to the front porch reconstruction. She added that there was no photo-documentation of the east porch.

Ms. Lawrie commented that 808 West Mountain was a very pristine house and Staff was unaware of any other house like it without alterations.

Ms. Carpenter noted that the worksheet did not reflect that the porches were deteriorating on 1611 Mathew Street. The Commission agreed that the better information you get from the applicant, the better you can rank the application. The issue of neglect rating was changed for 922 West Oak and the application was therefore moved up in the ranking.

Ms. Kullman questioned if the work proposed for 218 Peterson Street was really routine maintenance, and not part of a larger project. Ms. Weatherford agreed and stated that they have been working on the house for a number of years, over time, and that the restoration of the structure was not just one big project. Ms. Lawrie explained that the applicants for 223 South Howes were reworking their application, because some proposed projects have already been completed. Ms. Carpenter and Ms. Lawrie discussed that painting was not eligible, but could be part of an overall rehabilitation. Ms. Carpenter asked how much of the budget was intended for painting. Ms. Lawrie said roughly five thousand applied to painting. Ms. Carpenter explained that roughly half the money was to be used towards painting, which was ineligible. She suggested to use the painting funds as matching funds and drop the grant application down to \$1800. Those changes did not affect the rank of the project. Ms. McWilliams

suggested to exclude the painting, but to include the stripping, staining and varnishing for the front door. The funding was divided so that \$800 went to masonry work and \$300 went to the door. Ms. Carpenter stated that the worksheet for 503 Remington should be changed from no neglect to minor neglect. 832 West Oak should also be considered to have minor neglect.

Ms. Carpenter then asked the Commission whether they wanted to fully fund a few projects or partially fund more projects. Ms. Kullman preferred to partially fund as many projects as they could. Mr. Tanner pointed out that commercial projects ranked highest on the list and they should try to balance out commercial and residential projects. Ms. McWilliams stated that according to the HRPP, the Rehabilitation Grant were intended for projects which were most important and most in need. Ms. Carpenter said that some projects would not get done without funding. Mr. Frick commented that their decision should not be based on financial need. Ms. Kullman said that there was so little money and so many projects, so partial funding could at least help applicants. Mr. Tanner stressed that the projects which received the money had to be really worth it. Ms. Weatherford stated that all of the applicants responded that they were willing to accept partial funding. Mr. Hogestad asked if they could target certain items in each application. A suggestion was made to give fifty percent, to the top 8-ranked projects. Ms. Carpenter said that she felt comfortable in giving fifty percent of the grant to the projects down the list until they ran out of funds.

Ms. McWilliams asked if they wanted to distinguish between *very important* and *important* projects. The LPC also needed to determine if the Everitt Company's project at 200 Walnut was going to remain on the list. If removed from the list, the funding would then stretch down to the *important* rank #8 and the *very important* rank #6. Mr. Hogestad asked if partial funding was awarded, would the applicants still be willing to do all of the work. The Commission would have to make it clear to the applicant that if they accept partial funding, they still have to complete the proposed project. Staff said they would contact the applicants before the next meeting. It was decided that if they were unwilling to complete the project, they would be dropped and the funding would continue down the line.

Ms. Carpenter suggested that if any matching funds were revised by the applicant and that did not change the worksheet, then let the current ranking stand. She also advised against earmarking funds for a particular part of the proposed project. Ms. Rodriguez commented that the funds should be worth the applicant's time spent filling out the paperwork and doing the final reporting. Ms. Carpenter suggested documenting what happened for next year's program and lobby hard to Council for more money. She commented that fifty percent funding and twenty percent back from State income taxes amounted to a fair amount of money. Ms. McWilliams pointed out that properties like

Landmark Preservation Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
January 28, 1997  
Page 11

the Harmony School were tax exempt. Mr. Tanner said that it would serve the program better if ten to eleven people get funding, rather than four.

**OTHER BUSINESS:** None.

**The meeting adjourned 10:15 p.m.**

**Submitted by Nicole Sneider, Secretary**