

clerk's

LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

December 10, 1996

Council Liaison: Gina Janett

Staff Liaison: Joe Frank

Commission Chairperson: Jennifer Carpenter (225-0960)

SUMMARY OF MEETING: Felix Lee, Director of Building and Zoning provided the LPC with information on the Uniform Code for Building Conservation as it pertains to guard and hand rails. 622 Remington Street, the C. M. Smith House was approved for part 2 of the Colorado Historic Preservation Income Tax Credit. Linden's facade rehabilitation was approved with the deletion of the proposed I-beam sign band on 208 Linden. New plans for signage and lighting will have to be submitted. The LPC and representative from Saltillo's Grill discussed the window painting. The LPC required that the paint be removed within ten days. The plans for the rehabilitation of the second porch on the Howard House, 145 North Loomis, were reviewed, and the item was tabled until more definitive plans are submitted.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL: Jennifer Carpenter, Commission Chairperson called the meeting to order 5:07 p.m., 281 North College Avenue. Nicole Sneider, Secretary called the roll. Commission members Ruth Weatherford, Per Hogestad, Diana Ross and James Tanner were present. Commission members Bud Frick and Jean Kullman arrived late. Joe Frank, Carol Tunner, Karen McWilliams and Leanne Lawrie represented staff.

GUESTS: Felix Lee; Director of Building and Zoning; Mary Harnett, owner, 622 Remington Street, the C.M. Smith House; Kristen Krueger and Tom Kalert, Architecture Plus; Bill Warren, Linden's; A. B. Tellez, Saltillo's Grill, 100 West Mountain Avenue; John Morley, owner, 145 North Loomis, the Howard House.

AGENDA REVIEW: Ms. Tunner noted the continued item of the painted windows at Saltillo's Grill. An application for awnings was not able to be submitted but the applicant may attend concerning the transom window painting at 100 W. Mountain. Ms. McWilliams added a report concerning the East Side/West Side Survey to Other Business on the agenda.

STAFF REPORTS: Ms. Tunner reported that the Coopersmith's Barley Malt Silo Design Review Sub-Committee has planned to meet and Brad Page, applicant had requested that the meeting be for one day next week. It was decided that Ms. Ross,

Mr. Frick and Mr. Hogestad would meet Tuesday, December 17, 1996 at 8:00 a.m. at the site. Ms. Tunner reported that the water pipe located at the Trolley Barn has been leaking underground. The pipe was installed in 1959 and she will research more of its history. She requested that the LPC start thinking about recipients for the Outstanding Historic Renovation Award and a list would be provided of all applications reviewed by the LPC for 1996. Ms. Tunner also reported that the City of Fort Collins had been awarded a thirty thousand dollar grant from the Office of Energy Conservation through their Transportation Partnership Program to study the feasibility of using the C & S Depot as a multi-modal transportation center for downtown Fort Collins.

COMMISSION MEMBER'S REPORTS: Mr. Frick reported on discussion which took place at the latest Downtown Development Authority meeting. It was noted that the DDA needs to take the lead on the establishment of the Justice Center and would form a Sub-Committee to discuss their goals. They also discussed a Community Horticulture Center which had been proposed by Jim Clark. They currently have a plan for a site which would be between two and ten acres. The DDA also expressed their concerns and opposition to the painted windows at Saltillo's Grill.

Ms. Carpenter explained that the Colorado State University Economics Department was interested in conducting a study on some site in town. They would look at intangible factors which contribute to the economic value of a property, besides the market value. Ms. Carpenter said that they may use the Northern Hotel for the study. Mr. Frick said that they could look at storefronts. Ms. Carpenter explained that this was a pilot study and they would like to focus on one project. She added that a Community Development team had been put together for the Northern Hotel.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The August 27, 1996 LPC meeting minutes were accepted as submitted.

Discussion on Uniform Code for Building Conservation Pertaining to Guard and Hand Rails - Felix Lee, Director of Building and Zoning

Mr. Lee was present to help the LPC understand how the building code applied to historic structures. He provided a copy of the adopted ordinance and the code itself. He focused on the UCBC, Uniform Code for Building Conservation, and explained that it was really a small part of the document which has been adopted by the City in March of 1994. It was explained that some chapters were left out including chapters #4 and #7. Mr. Lee said that Chapter #4 addressed minimum standards which would have applied to all buildings in the City. Some Building Review Committee members felt that the standards were too intrusive. Chapter #7 applied to residential buildings and the Committee felt that the chapter went beyond the requirement of minimum standards for

existing buildings. These chapters were omitted because they felt it was inappropriate to imply standards on existing buildings, but the chapters still serve as guidelines.

Jean Kullman arrived 5:25 p.m.

Mr. Lee explained that different provisions in the Code existed for Historic buildings. Ms. Carpenter explained that the LPC was currently concerned with guard and hand rails. Chapter #6, page 18 addressed designated structures and provided some flexibility for the existing spacing. Mr. Lee said that the chapter did make a reference to Chapter #4, which had been excluded from what was adopted, but it still served as a reference. Ms. Carpenter quoted from Chapter #6 and interpreted the chapter to mean that the inspector would have some leeway on standards for historic structures. Mr. Lee explained that property owners must go to the Building Inspection Department and apply for a waiver. Each case is reviewed individually by the department. Mr. Lee recommended that the LPC use 405B page 10 and generally Chapter #4, because anything less than what was addressed in Chapter #4, the Building Inspection Department would probably not have a good rationale to support. Mr. Hogestad asked if the standards applied to an existing condition. Mr. Frank referred to the example of a porch reconstruction which already existed. Mr. Lee explained that if the structure was changed from a residential to a commercial use then the porch railing would have to be brought up to thirty-six inches in order to meet code. Mr. Lee reiterated that each case was reviewed on an individual basis. The location of the porch on the house would be one factor to be examined, but while reviewing a railing less than thirty-six inches on an historic structure the historic considerations may be preeminent over standards. The LPC discussed informing the Building Inspection Department whether they were an advocate of a certain position on behalf of the owner and Mr Lee said he would consider their input.

CURRENT DESIGN REVIEW:

622 Remington St., C.M. Smith House - Part 2 Completion of Colorado Historic Preservation Income Tax Credit

Ms. Turner explained that the work had been completed on the house, including reroofing and repainting. Four added unapproved items were incurred in the course of the work. Ms. Turner recommended that reglazing the windows was not eligible because it had not been submitted. The building and installation of storm windows, would be eligible under Item #2 Repair Wood. Washing the windows would be considered ineligible because it was normal maintenance. Repair of the gable soffit was eligible because it was included under Item #1, Restore Roof. Mary Harnett, the applicant explained that they had not determined a need to reglaze the windows at the time they submitted the application. Ms. Carpenter asked what would happen if in the

midst of a renovation the applicant discovered that additional repairs or work was needed. Ms. Weatherford asked if there was any way that the grant could include the windows at this point. Ms. Harnett said that during a renovation of an historic property it seemed there was commonly something else discovered in the process that needed repair. Ms. Carpenter explained that work needs to be approved beforehand and the applicant should come back to the LPC. Ms. Tunner said that she would check with the Colorado Historical Society to see what to do in this situation where changes occur between Part 1 and Part 2.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve Mary Harnett's application for 622 Remington Street, the C.M. Smith House, Part 2 completion of the Colorado State Tax Credit with the exception of the extra items window glazing and washing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frick, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

208/214 Linden, the Mercer and Bernheim Blocks (Linden's) - Facade Rehabilitation

Kristen Krueger from Architecture Plus represented Linden's at the meeting and provided details on the application. Ms. Tunner explained that they would replace the stucco on the back of the building and remove an existing small structure in order to build a new one. Ms. Carpenter asked if the structure was historic. Ms. Krueger explained that it had been built in the last five to ten years. On the left side of the back of the building a Glycol kettle boiler would be placed on top of the small storage space. The building has a parapet and the boiler would be built up to the roof line. Ms. Krueger pointed out the plan on the submitted side elevation.

Ms. Tunner explained the changes which were made to the proposed signage on the front of the building. She described a projecting sign band which stretched across both of the buildings. On the right building (#208) the sign was drawn to be sticking out six inches and on the left building (#214) the sign was proposed to be lit from underneath and protrude three feet out. Staff recommended not to install the proposed sign band on #208 because it would cover historic fabric on the building. The left building had already been altered, but Staff recommended that the sign band be mounted flush on that building. Tom Kalert and Bill Warren explained that they pulled the sign board out to illuminate the cornice of the building. Mr. Kalert said that they would like to install new glass on the front of the left building, #214, which would be illuminated at night and during the day would appear to be a transom glass. They intended to highlight building #208 by installing a light to shine up on the building from the Wright Life building. Mr. Tanner asked if the lettering proposed for the window was in gold and done in an old fashioned design. Mr. Kalert explained that they were looking for an old fashioned lettering from a California company. Mr. Tanner added that the I-beam, metallic, riveted sign was not compatible with the historic features of the buildings. Ms.

Weatherford identified the proposed signage as a problem and asked if there were any other options. She explained that she objected to the way it covered up the building on the right and how it was projected outward. Mr. Kalert said that it had been recommended to float the sign away from the building so that the historic elements of the building could still be viewed from the sidewalk and it was concluded that the historic fabric on building #214 had already been altered. Ms. Carpenter explained that she was in agreement with staff's recommendation, that the industrial design of the signage was not compatible and covered up the historic fabric on the building. Mr. Kalert described the sign to be bolted with a rivet head with thread and a nut and was made of rubber and painted with a metallic brush gray. Mr. Hogestad recommended a compromise to allow the sign panel on the left side, but not on the right side. He thought that a better solution would be to install the signs on the windows and illuminate one building to get the patrons' attention. Mr. Kalert said that they had plans to light up both buildings in the same manner. He said that they wanted to create an inviting area for the pedestrian from Old Town Plaza with lights and signage. Ms. Carpenter explained that part of the charm of Old Town was not having everything lit up, especially blank building walls. Mr. Kalert said that the illuminated sign band also helps them to have their corporate identity recognized and that the proposed sign was an important part of that identity. Mr. Tanner said that he understood the need for corporate identity, but did not see the I-beam sign as being compatible with the building or the block. He suggested not installing the signage on the Mercer Block. Mr. Hogestad said that the I-beam may not look so odd if the sign did not stick out as far as was proposed. While reviewing the plans, Mr. Frick compared the plans to the picture of the existing building and pointed out that the transom glass on the new construction was higher.

Mr. Tanner moved to approve the facade rehabilitation proposal with the exceptions of items #1, #9 and #10. Item #1 is to be re-submitted with the signage on the Mercer Block to be (altered to be more compatible) with the architecture and the facade of the building. #9 and #10 are not complete submittals yet.

Mr. Hogestad: Friendly Amendment #1, I-beam piece be deleted on #208 Linden and any other signage or lighting would have to be re-submitted. Explore the possibility of setting the existing transom windows into the building instead of installing the transom windows by surface mounting onto the building (for Item #2, The Shadow Boxing, the Bernheim Building).

Mr. Hogestad: Friendly Amendment #2, the design team should explore the possibility of reducing the overall projection of the sign panel.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Weatherford, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

100 West Mountain Avenue, the Welch Block (Saltillo's) Awning Recover, Signage and Window Painting

A. B. Tellez, Operator Manager of Saltillo's Grill attended the meeting to discuss the window panel painting. Ms. Tunner said that she had noticed that they had painted the awning frame black and then had painted the window panes orange and fuchsia without LPC design review. She explained that the materials for the awnings had not been decided on yet. Ms. Carpenter said the DDA had a facade easement on the building and she had received several complaints from DDA members. Ms. Tunner added that she had also received complaints about the windows. Mr. Tellez explained that they painted the windows because radiation from the sun was entering the restaurant and making the temperature uncomfortable and difficult to regulate. He said that they were going to install awnings, but they had not decided on anything yet. The paint which was used is a water based paint. Mr. Tellez said that they had also tried hanging serapes in front of the windows to block out the sun, but the serapes were trapping the smoke from the bar. Ms. Carpenter asked when the awnings were going to be installed. Mr. Tellez responded that he had heard dates from three weeks to three months away. Mr. Frick asked where the original awnings were. Mr. Tellez explained that he had sold them. Ms. Carpenter said that they must address the changing or removal of the paint, because without a definite date for the awning installation they could not consider the paint a temporary solution. She asked if the corporate owner, Pour La France could help install the awning. Mr. Tellez explained that they were only part owners. Mr. Hogestad said that even after design approval of the awnings there was still at least thirty more days until installation. Mr. Tanner urged Mr. Tellez to address the paint on the windows immediately because there was a lot of disapproval from the community. Mr. Frick suggested removing the paint and hanging a temporary blind, shade or fabric inside the window. Mr. Tanner agreed that there were other inexpensive temporary solutions.

Mr. Frick moved concerning the painted windows at 100 West Mountain Avenue, that the paint on the upper square transom glass windows be removed within ten days. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weatherford, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

145 North Loomis, Howard House - Porch Railing Treatment to Meet Building Code and Rehabilitation of a Second Porch

Ms. Tunner discussed the porch railing height, which had been addressed earlier in the meeting by Felix Lee. She explained that the railing was reconstructed at the historic height, according to photo-documentation. Mr. Lee said to add an upper railing at thirty six inches high to meet code.

Ms. Tunner said that on the left hand side of the building, a new screened-in porch was included in the original plans, but the applicant now wanted to enclose the porch with glass. John Morley, applicant, said that his office sits above the porch and he needed to get the porch enclosed because the office space was cold. He explained that there was a stone foundation under the porch, so no lattice work would have to be done as shown. The stairs were wider than the set on the northeast porch, so he proposed to cut them down to be the same size. Mr. Morley also said that he liked the idea of using transom glass, which was drawn by Curtis Allen in the original LPC approved porch plans. Mr. Hogestad asked if the glass in the wall could be recessed back from the face of the porch and the columns. Ms. Tunner explained that the LPC had originally recommended recessing the screened-in porch and would recommend the same for the glass enclosed porch. Mr. Morley explained that the left hand porch had been added on the house in 1925 and the windows on the 1925 additions did not match the windows on the original house. Ms. Carpenter said that the proposed new windows should be compatible with the original house or the 1925 addition. Mr. Frick suggested installing window walls which were the width of the opening and not have filler panels, but recess them. Mr. Morley said that he had already purchased a casement window because it was less expensive than four double hung windows. Mr. Tanner asked if the porch had ever been enclosed. Mr. Morley explained that it had been a landing with a foyer to the upstairs. The foyer had a single double hung window on the south side which did not match any other part of the house. Ms. Weatherford said that she had no problem with new windows because it was a contemporary addition. Mr. Hogestad asked what the filler piece would be around the windows. Mr. Morley thought that it might be beadboard, but the architect had drawn flat board. Mr. Hogestad asked if Mr. Morley could disassemble the window and put spacers in between. It was thought that the window may have been individual pieces which had been mullied together. Mr. Frick requested dimensions, details of the trim and a section through the wall. He commented that he needed more information and the submittal materials were not complete. Mr. Hogestad added that he would like to see details of how the window would be installed, how it related to the front porch and the proposed sight lines. Mr. Frick concluded that the enclosed glass porch would read completely differently from the screened-in porch. Mr. Tanner commented that beadboard was more common on screened-in porches around town and was a more summery material. Mr. Hogestad suggested using a synthetic stucco, which was compatible with the house and capable of relaying the shape of the trim. Mr. Morley said that he was on a limited budget and proposed to get the porch enclosed and later finish it. Mr. Hogestad was concerned that the porch would not be weatherproof. Mr. Tanner suggested that the applicant do the best he can with the information he has to create a plan that works. He added that Mr. Morley could try to work the window, which had already been purchased, into the plan.

Mr. Frick moved to table the submittal for 145 North Loomis, the southeast porch. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hogestad, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

Staff recommended that the Design Review Sub-Committee meet to discuss this proposal on site.

OTHER BUSINESS:

EAST SIDE/WEST SIDE SURVEY. Ms. McWilliams reported that separate Requests for Proposals would be issued for the surveys on the East and West sides of town. Sixty-four percent of the lots were located on the West side and thirty six percent of the lots were located on the East Side. The RFP will be reviewed by the Colorado State Historical Society and proposals will be due January 10, 1997. The survey was proposed as an architectural survey, documenting the date that the building was built, the style, any alterations, the type of building with black and white photographs, its architectural integrity and a determination of its historic eligibility based on significance and architectural integrity. Ms. Carpenter suggested appointing two or three people to review the RFP and the new architectural survey form. The LPC will participate in reviewing the responses to the RFP. Mr. Frick and Mr. Hogestad will review the architectural survey form. Ms. Carpenter will review the RFP.

DAP. Additional design firms, Dick Hill and James Martin of The Color People applied to be included on the list of consultants for the Design Assistance Program. The LPC reviewed their credentials.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve Dick Hill and James Martin of The Color People to be included in the Design Assistance Program list of consultants. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frick, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

The meeting adjourned 7:30 p.m.

Submitted by Nicole Sneider, Secretary.