

CLARK

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**

October 22, 1996

Council Liaison: Gina Janett

Staff Liaison: Joe Frank

Commission Chairperson: Jennifer Carpenter (225-0960)

SUMMARY OF MEETING: The LPC committed in-time services to the Poudre Big Thompson River Interpretive Project. Re-roofing of the house and garage at 530 Smith Street was approved for the Local Landmark Rehabilitation Grant and the State Tax Credit Program. The LPC approved a corrugated galvanized steel malt silo at Coopersmith's Brewing Co. and the applicant will continue to meet with an LPC Design Sub-Committee for further design review. Three projecting signs were approved for 201 and 223 Linden Street. Rehabilitation of the front porch and steps and interior work were approved for State Tax Credit for the Good House, 223 South Howes Street. The installation of a handicapped ramp and roof line modification were conditionally approved. The 1997 LPC Work Plan was amended and approved. The question of maintenance versus rehabilitation for projects for the State Tax Credit Program was discussed and resolved.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL: Jennifer Carpenter, Commission Chairperson, called the meeting to order 5:30 p.m., 281 North College Avenue. Nicole Sneider, Secretary called the roll. Commission members Ruth Weatherford, Bud Frick, Per Hogestad, Diana Ross and James Tanner were present. Commission member Jean Kullman was absent. Carol Tunner, Leanne Lawrie, Joe Frank and Karen McWilliams represented staff.

GUESTS: Susan Oates, Colorado State University student; Rheba Massey, the City's Local Historian; Brad Page, Brewmaster, Coopersmith's Brewing Co.; Robert Hoffert, owner of 530 Smith Street; James Lafler, Gardner Signs; Al Karahara, owner, Innovation Studios; Leslie Borstad, Empire Carpentry; Ray Gile and Andy Miscio, owners, 223 South Howes Street, The Good House.

AGENDA REVIEW: Ms. Tunner said that item number two under Discussion Items, Administrative Review, Approval of Ordinance, would be tabled because the City Attorney had not yet prepared the ordinance.

STAFF REPORTS:

Ms. McWilliams informed the Commission that the Colorado Historical Society received additional federal funds and the City will receive an additional seven hundred dollars for further work on the Central Business District Survey.

COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS:

Ms. Carpenter introduced Rheba Massey who wanted to inform the commission about the Poudre Big Thompson River Heritage Interpretation Program. Ms. Massey informed the Commission that there was a meeting scheduled Thursday, October 24, 1996 at 281 North College Avenue to discuss the historic interpretive project. Guidelines for letters in support of the grant proposal were sent to Ms. Tunner. Ms. Massey said that there were three commitments that the LPC could choose to do. The options included a cash match in the amount which would be donations, sponsorships, brochures or signs, a pledge of local funding that could be used as matching funds or in-kind services, such as participation on the committee or project work. Another option was a letter of support for the project. The key points that needed to be addressed included pointing out that the Poudre Big Thompson Interpretive Project would establish the region as a state and national leader in water development, conservation, and heritage resources. It will tell the important story of water in the West and the evolution of the river. It will educate residents, students and others about the value of heritage resources and it will help to protect and preserve the historic structures, sites and landscapes along the corridor.

Mr. Tanner moved the LPC support the Poudre Big Thompson Interpretive Project with both in-time service, some kind of cash support, and a letter of support. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weatherford, and passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The September 10, 1996 LPC minutes were corrected. Page five, second paragraph, third line should read 'be wider than ten feet, same page, first paragraph, Mr. Bicker should be Mr. Bieker. On page six, the statement by Mr. Tanner '...but Mr. Tanner felt that it was too big to be considered art.' should be omitted. Mr. Tanner said that the statement could be left as 'Mr. Tanner did not think it was art.'

Ms. Weatherford moved to accept the September 10, 1996 LPC meeting minutes as corrected. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hogestad, which passed unanimously. (6-0)

CURRENT DESIGN REVIEW:

530 Smith Street, John M. Riddle House - Re-roof Using a Local Landmark Rehabilitation Grant

The John M. Riddle House currently has an asphalt roof and the owner, Mr. Hoffert, explained that he had received a Local Landmark Rehabilitation Grant to go back to the original roof. The house has the original wood shingles plus three layers of asphalt.

He proposed to install Class C treated wood shingles. The applicant will also use the State Income Tax Credit Program for the work. Mr. Hoffert explained that the garage had not been designated so it did not qualify for the State Income Tax Credit, but he would like the garage to match the house. Ms. Carpenter commented that the garage was the same property. Ms. Weatherford suggested that the LPC make a recommendation. Ms. Carpenter suggested that the LPC give a waiver for the whole property so that the garage could match the house. Ms. Tunner will send a letter to Building Inspection recommending a Class C wood treated roof for both buildings.

Mr. Frick moved to approve the application for the wood shingle re-roof using the Local Landmark Rehabilitation Grant and the State Historic Preservation Tax Credit for 530 Smith Street, the John M. Riddle House. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ross, which passed unanimously. (6-0)

#5 and #7 Old Town Square, Coopersmith Brewing Co. - Final Review for Installation of Malt Silo

Brad Page, Brewmaster of Coopersmith's Brewing Co. attended the final design review of the proposed malt silo. Ms. Tunner explained that there were two options for the exterior design of the silo, for which drawings were provided. One was a smooth, painted surface and the other a corrugated silo, which would be galvanized and not painted. He commented that there was no definitive Old Town green color to use on the silo. He chose two greens which were both from Sherwin-Williams or a color scheme which was tan and white. The shape and design of the corrugated silo would be defined with support horizontal and vertical banding. The silo would also have the Coopersmith's logo on it. He said that the Downtown Development Authority preferred the green painted silo. Ms. Tunner presented a letter written by a graduate student from the Bioagricultural and Pest Management Department at Colorado State University outlining some concerns he had about the proposed site for the silo. A copy of the letter was given to the applicant and the LPC agreed that most of the student's safety concerns may be addressed by the Building Department or Fire Authority.

The LPC reviewed the design plans presented to them by the applicant. Mr. Hogestad said that the proposed design was not contextual and did not follow basic design theory. The silo had no relationship to its surroundings or the neighboring building. He would like to see the use of regulating lines and to have the horizontal lines or bands of the silo be visually connected to the building. He commented that the silo should be twenty feet high and in the plan the silo was drawn to be over twenty feet high. There was also a concern about lighting. Mr. Hogestad commented that the proposed lighting made the silo look more like an advertising piece, than a well designed piece to fit in with its surroundings.

Mr. Frick said that conceptually he liked the corrugated silo. He said that there was a lack of detail on the plan in terms of dimensions and attachment. He also commented that the sight lines of the building and the bands on the silo did not relate to one another. Mr. Hogestad agreed and asked what were the dimensions of the steel channel sub-structure.

Mr. Page responded that he only got a general impression of what the design guidelines should be at the previous meeting. Mr. Tanner felt that the applicant's response was reasonable given the information that the LPC provided at the last meeting. He said that they needed to be careful not to turn the project into an expensive sculpture and explained that only a certain number of design elements may be available for the silo. Mr. Hogestad responded, from a design standpoint, the silo should tie in with its surroundings by using basic, good design form. This should be established before the details are discussed, which would tie the structure into Old Town. He said that the materials were correct, but they did not properly tie into the surrounding space. Mr. Page explained that the vertical bars may need to remain where they are for structural support. Mr. Frick said that the top of the tank will help determine where the bands fall. Ms. Carpenter explained that where the top is changes the scale of the structure. From the top of the cylinder there are three feet four inches to the top of the cone. Ms. Carpenter commented that the silo was not drawn to scale with the top of the building next to it, and how it fits in with the surrounding buildings is very important. Mr. Hogestad discussed installing a curb, which would stop blowing debris. Mr. Page explained that they did need to create a slope underneath. Mr. Hogestad explained that there was a lot of empty space behind the silo and asked if the applicant wanted to put up a fence to keep people out. Mr. Tanner felt that if it were open and well lighted then there should not be a problem. Ms. Weatherford wanted the applicant to be sure not to create a dark cavern behind the silo for safety reasons.

Ms. Carpenter recommended using the Design Review Sub-Committee to continue the design review of the silo. Mr. Page requested that the LPC decide on the material of the silo, corrugated versus solid and then the sub-committee could decide on how to treat that material. Mr. Tanner explained that the LPC was split between the corrugated and solid material. The corrugated steel bin may be appropriate in an industrial setting, but it may look strange in the Old Town surroundings. Ms. Weatherford commented that a solid painted silo may be difficult to maintain and therefore hard to keep looking nice. Ms. Tunner said that the white and tan structure would look larger. Mr. Hogestad added that it may be a target for graffiti. Ms. Carpenter requested that Mr. Frick, Mr. Hogestad and Ms. Ross sit on the Design Sub-Committee.

Mr. Frick moved to approve the corrugated galvanized material for the Coopersmith's Brewing Co. malt silo. The way that the silo is drawn on the presented plan is not approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hogestad. (5-0) (Yeas: Weatherford, Frick, Hogestad, Ross, Tanner) (Nays: none) (Ms. Carpenter abstained) Ms. Carpenter abstained because she did not think any design was appropriate for the proposed silo.

Mr. Page added that a custom designed silo may be more expensive. In order to reserve himself a slot in the production of the silo he would like to order the corrugated silo without the leg support. The legs of the structure would depend on where the bands are placed on the silo. The Design Sub-Committee will meet to work out details.

201 and 223 Linden Street, Linden Hotel and Reed-Dauth Building - Three Projecting Signs

James Lafler, Gardner Signs, and Al Kasahara, Innovation Studios spoke with the LPC. Ms. Tunner explained that the LPC had already approved three window signs on the Loomis block for the Walnut Street Gallery, Satin Camisole and Timbuktu. Now they propose to install a projecting frame with the signs interchangeable. Ms. Tunner said that there was no concern over attaching the sign to the concrete piers with bolts, because if they had to be removed than the concrete could easily be repaired. Three signs are being proposed, one on Nature's Own and two on the Reed-Dauth Building (Innovation Studios and Briar Rose). Ms. Tunner expressed concern over the trend of sign installations. She explained that Preservation Brief #1 of the National Park Service discussed the number of signs. A lot signage was part of the Nineteenth Century design, but today there is a more conservative look. Signs should have a good design and compatibility with neighboring buildings and a directory of businesses was suggested. Mr. Lafler addressed the Commission and explained that they would like to create a uniformity for the merchants of historic Linden Street. He said that they have tried to follow the guidelines and attach the signs with no damage to the buildings. He added that the signs are in keeping with the historic features of the building, are in good taste and establish conformity with other merchants' signs. Mr. Kasahara said that he likes the flavor of Old Town and feels that Linden Street has good potential. He believes that the merchants of Linden Street can create their own identity, making the street comfortable and attractive, and an addition to the Old Town Plaza area. He explained that more buildings have been renovated and saved on Linden Street over the past few years and that Linden Street was still evolving into a viable commercial area.

Mr. Frick asked what would happen if awnings were to be installed on the building. He also asked what if the maximum square footage for the signs on a building or storefront

was utilized, then what about signage for the second floor businesses. Ms. Tunner said that traditionally, second floor businesses put their signs on the windows. Mr. Tanner commented that an accumulation of signs may screen off the building, but an awning would screen off the building even more. He would like to see more variety in the shape of the signs to provide more diversity. Ms. Carpenter said that she would like to see the signs in a row down the street and it was good that the signs could be changed without removing the frame from the building. She liked the idea of having some uniformity for a shopping destination.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the application for three projecting signs at 201 and 223 Linden Street. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ross, and passed unanimously. (6-0)

223 South Howes Street, Good House - Installation of Handicapped Ramp and Restoration of Front Steps

Leslie Borstad represented Empire Carpentry and Ray Gile and Andy Miscio, property owners addressed the LPC. The structure has just received Local Landmark Designation. Ms. Tunner said that on the last page of the *Estimate of Proposed Work*, the street curb was not qualified, work that has already been completed was not eligible, and there could be no credit for work on the heating system because the original radiators were removed. The items which were eligible for credit include: the front entry steps, raising the rear roof for the handicapped entrance, electrical work; interior finishings and sandblasting paint off the concrete floor, but not off the brick. There was a question regarding item #14 which is receiving State Tax Credit for window coverings. The LPC did not consider window treatments a permanent fixture in the house. Ms. Tunner will investigate whether window treatments are eligible for State Tax Credit. Mr. Miscio explained that the radiators had to be removed from the house because the weight of the units caused engineering problems. Mr. Gile recommended that when someone purchases a property, the buyer should be informed if that structure is historically significant. Ms. Carpenter suggested writing a letter to the title companies addressing possible regulations and benefits for the owners of structures fifty years and older. Ms. Tunner added that they also would have to repair the porch because a previous contractor had cut through the brick on the south side. Ms. Borstad explained that the brick would have to be re-pointed, and that new concrete steps would be poured. Ms. Tunner informed the Commission that Building Inspection would require a handrail down the center of the steps. Mr. Tanner was concerned with sandblasting the porch floor and if it would create an unevenness or roughness. Mr. Gile explained that the paint was applied in several layers, it has been chipping off at different rates and he thought that grinding would make it flat. Mr. Frick suggested using a chemical treatment called Peel-a-Way to remove the paint. Another suggestion

was to use a filler to level the porch floor and then paint it again because a painted surface already exists. Ms. Borstad suggested pouring a half inch to inch layer of fresh concrete over the existing floor. Mr. Hogestad said that it would just peel off. Mr. Frick thought that the least problematic solution would be to use a filler and then paint the floor with an additive in the paint to create traction. Mr. Tanner requested more detail for Item #12 interior carpentry in terms of not removing historical fabric and making additions. That work may not be eligible for State Tax Credit. He would like to know that everything will match the historical appearance. Mr. Hogestad added that the applicant needed to explain what new work was being done as well.

Mr. Frick said that they needed more detail for the handicapped ramp such as construction materials. Ms. Carpenter addressed the west elevation, where the shed roof was proposed to be raised. She said that the way it was proposed would disrupt the prominent feature of the dormer above. She suggested centering the roof dormer to look symmetrical. Ms. Tunner explained that the applicants have not chosen an exterior paint yet, but by the time that the paint color comes back, it could be reviewed administratively. Mr. Tanner said if less of the building is obscured by the handicapped ramp the better and a minimum number of attachments should be used. Mr. Gile said that wood was visually nicer than metal. Mr. Frick explained that details can really make the difference. Ms. Borstad said that she designed the caps of the ramp to match the design elements of the front of the building. The formation of a Design Sub-Committee was recommended to facilitate the design process.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the proposal conditionally with administrative review by staff and the design review sub-committee for the handicapped ramp and the roof placement. On the porch, filling in and painting is the first choice and the second is Peel-a-Way, for other options come back to the LPC. Window coverings should be included in the approval only if eligible for the State Tax Credit Program. More detailed drawings of the interior alterations should be submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ross, which passed unanimously. (6-0)

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1997 LPC Work Plan

Ms. Tunner gave a presentation of the 1997 LPC Work Plan which was a combined effort from staff. Added to the Work Plan was an Historic Preservation Database and also included was continuing the Tax Credit Design review, Preservation Week, the Friends of Preservation Award, the installation of plaques in the Old Town District and the Rehabilitation Grant Program. Ms. Tunner also stated that the Design Assistance Program was underway. Item #3, addressed future projects, like the Poudre Big

Thompson Interpretive Project. The work plan also included formal training programs for City Staff and amending the Demolition Delay ordinance. The LPC discussed purview over color. Ms. McWilliams thought that the LPC may review color for structures which were Local Landmarks. Ms. Carpenter requested that the process include districting and the document should explicitly state that. She also requested that there be more of a focus for Preservation Week. Ms. McWilliams explained that they had received more support from other groups in the past, but recently it has been the sole focus of the Historic Preservation Office. Ms. Weatherford suggested that staff try to get other groups involved again. Ms. McWilliams suggested that the responsibility of hosting events be rotated between the museum, the library and City Staff. Ms. Weatherford said it was a good opportunity for volunteers to get involved and suggested that they form a sub-committee and maybe work with Historic Fort Collins. Ms. McWilliams said that they could synchronize their schedule with the Fort Collins Historic Homes Tour and events sponsored by other groups. Ms. Tunner said that she would change the Work Plan to read that they will 'rethink the annual focus of Preservation Week in Fort Collins and work to team up with other historic preservation groups in Fort Collins for a focus time'. A tour of historic commercial buildings in Old Town was also suggested to help get local businesses involved. Contacting the Title companies about Local Landmark Designation and historic properties may be included under Item #1b of Identification and Awareness. It could also be included under Item #1c Development of a Database. Research Coordination with the Title companies was added to the plan. It was suggested to initiate some conversations with Title companies and to create a postcard which could be ripped off and mailed in to receive more information on Local Landmark Designation and Historic Preservation programs.

Mr. Frick moved to approve the 1997 LPC Work Plan as outlined in the memorandum dated October 14, 1996 with the friendly amendments suggested by the LPC. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weatherford, which passed unanimously. (6-0)

Administrative Review - Approval of Ordinance

Item was tabled.

Discussion of Colorado Historic Preservation Income Tax Credits - Maintenance vs. Eligible Rehabilitation

Ms. Tunner said that she called other CLG cities and the Colorado Historical Society for policies that were used concerning the State Tax Credit Program and presented the information in a memorandum to the Commission. She said that she received some clarification over the issue of redecoration versus rehabilitation. Boulder does approve re-roofing and repainting, but only when re-roofing and repainting were necessary. It

was explained that everything could be considered maintenance. Ms. Weatherford said that maintenance due to normal wear and tear was part of preservation. Mr. Tanner explained that the issue of periodic maintenance was resolved and projects were either considered redecoration or rehabilitation.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Community Initiated Workshop - Northern Hotel

Ms. Carpenter reported that the Community Initiated Development Workshop on the Northern Hotel was very interesting and she would put together some information for the LPC for education and training.

Design Assistance Program (DAP)

Ms. Turner explained that she had organized a workshop for implementing the Design Assistance Program. Local design professionals and James Stratis were invited November 1, 1996 to the Streets Department conference room at the old Sugar Beet Factory, 625 Ninth Street. Ms. Turner sent a letter to design professionals listed in the phone book and from a list at the City's Purchasing Office. A Scope of Work was also included which outlined the details of the program. They were invited to attend the workshop. She requested a letter of interest, due the Wednesday following the workshop, which outlined their credentials, availability and motivation. These categories were considered the criteria for including people on the DAP consultants' list. Ms. Turner also considered their attendance to the workshop. Ms. Carpenter was concerned about the credentials of the design professionals; she wanted to be assured that the professionals on the DAP list have degrees, and were licensed and insured professionals. At the November 12, 1996 LPC meeting, the credentials of the design professionals who were interested in the program and who responded with a letter of interest, will be reviewed.

The meeting adjourned 8:45 p.m.

Submitted by Nicole Sneider, Secretary.

Clarke

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
October 8, 1996
Council Liaison: Gina Janett
Staff Liaison: Joe Frank
Commission Chairperson: Jennifer Carpenter (255-0960)**

SUMMARY OF MEETING: The August 13, 1996 LPC meeting minutes were accepted as submitted. The re-roofing and rehabilitation of the heating system of the Otis House, 511 Matthews, was approved for State Tax Credit. The exterior restoration of the William C. Stover House, 503 Remington was approved for the tax credit and 1996 Local Landmark Grant based on a revised scope of work. The LPC recommended rescinding the Local Landmark designation of the Rosenhoff/Smith House, 508 Olive Street. The Administrative Design Review process was discussed. A complimentary design review was done of a proposed rear addition to the Watrous House, 301 S. Loomis.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL: Ruth Weatherford, Commission Co-Chairperson called the meeting to order 5:34 p.m., 281 North College Avenue. Nicole Sneider, Secretary called the roll. Commission members Ruth Weatherford, James Tanner, Per Hogestad and Jean Kullman were present. Jennifer Carpenter and Diana Ross were absent. Bud Frick arrived late. Carol Tunner, Karen McWilliams, Leanne Lawrie and Joe Frank represented staff.

GUESTS: Steve Levinger, owner of 511 Mathews Street; Don Johnson, owner of 503 Remington, Leslie Borstad from Empire Carpentry, Jeff Bridges, citizen.

AGENDA REVIEW: Ms. McWilliams said that an applicant came into the office that afternoon, for the demolition delay process. They are doing minor work to the back of their house, which is historical and in good condition. The owner would like a conceptual review from the LPC of the proposed work and they also have an interest in designating the property.

STAFF REPORTS: Ms. Tunner presented a letter from the Board of Directors of the Timber Framers Guild of North America concerning their assistance with the Coy-Hoffman barn. Ms. Weatherford asked about the time frame of the project. Ms. Tunner explained that they hoped to disassemble the frame by December. The Timber Framers regional workshop is scheduled for June 1997 and is to be co-sponsored by the National Trust.

Bud Frick arrived.

COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS: Rheba Massey presented the Poudre Big Thompson Interpretive Project to the LPC. The cities of Fort Collins and Greeley have been working on a project and have written a grant to the Colorado Historical Society. She said that Colorado State University and other entities have been cooperating in establishing an interpretive program for the Poudre Big Thompson River area, which is the same area being used for an awarded GoCo grant. Ms. Massey explained that the GoCo grant can not be used for historic sites. They are applying to the State Historical Society for a grant to complete an interpretive program for the historic site portion of the project. The money provided by the GoCo grant will be used as matching funds. She explained that they need more participation and support from the historic preservation community. One of their main goals was to create a product, such as a regional brochure as well as a web page. Ms. Massey added that Bruce Hendee has digitized all of the historical and natural resource sites which they have identified and has created a map. She requested from the LPC, a strong letter of support, at the minimum a letter of commitment for in-time services or funding. They will write a grant for between \$50,000 to \$100,000 and twenty-five percent of that would have to be cash match. Tom Shoemaker, Chris Ford, the Interpretive Studies Department at CSU and Ms. Massey are writing the grant. Ms. Weatherford asked what kind of in-kind services would they be expecting from staff or the LPC. Ms. Massey said that the main in-kind services which they needed was for further identification of sites and review of the interpretive plan. Mr. Tanner asked what was the range of sites included in the program. Ms. Massey said that what they have done is to take a huge area from LaPorte to Cameron pass and then to Berthoud and then started to interpret and identify historic sites. It was explained that the settlement of the entire area was due to the river. She said that for the brochure they would probably key in on some public sites, but would map the private sites. Also she said that no other historical group has committed their support as of yet. Ms. Weatherford said that the information should be narrowed down before it came back to the LPC or reached the public and Ms. Massey agreed.

Mr. Frick informed the LPC that the Downtown Development Authority had deferred to the LPC the final design approval for the proposed silo at Coopersmith's Brew Pub. They were concerned over the design of the silo and some members preferred a dark green. There was a proposal that came to the DDA from Linden Street for signage in the east side of Linden Street and the addition of a kiosk. The proposed locations were not provided, but the design was different from the existing kiosk. There were also concerns about City Plan and the issue of compatible mass and proportions to historic buildings.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The August 13, 1996 minutes were approved as submitted.

CURRENT DESIGN REVIEW:

1. 511 Mathews, Otis House - Rehabilitation for the State Tax Credit, Part One.

The Otis House at 511 Mathews Street is not locally designated but is on the National Register as a contributing building. Mr. Levinger would like to install a new furnace because the existing furnace is unsafe. Currently it shares a flue with the fireplace. The furnace is used for both heating the house and providing hot water. He informed the Commission that a wall in the basement would have to be removed in order to take out the furnace. He also applied for a new roof for the house. Currently three layers of shingles are on the roof which all need to be removed in order to install a new one. He proposed installing 3/8" thick decking then shingles. The application also included repainting the house with the existing colors; beige on the body of the house, pink on the trim and an accent of maroon. Mr. Tanner introduced the discussion of maintenance versus rehabilitation. The roof was forty years old and had been damaged by fallen trees. Mr. Levinger also explained that the proposed roof looks something like weathered wood and resembles the original roof of the house. Ms. Tunner reviewed the State Tax Credit criteria which include replacing a roof, reflashing and plumbing, heating and electric.

Ms. Kullman moved to approve the rehabilitation for State Tax Credit, of 511 Mathews Street, the Otis House. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frick, which passed unanimously. (4-0) Mr. Tanner abstained from the vote.

Mr. Tanner requested staff seek information from the State on the interpretation of maintenance when using the State Tax Credit program.

2. 503 Remington, The William C. Stover House - Exterior Restoration

Ms. Tunner explained that in May the LPC had approved the rehabilitation of the building. Proposed changes to the original proposal were provided by Empire Carpentry, entitled the *Revised Cost Estimate of Proposed Work*. The new proposal did not include items #7 through 14, but items #1 through 6 and 15 were proposed to be completed. The work would be done from October through December. Areas under the cornice and soffits have water damage, the soffit brackets are rotted and the gutter needs to be replaced. Mr. Johnson, owner, stressed that he would like to take care of the work which was most critical. Mr. Frick asked about the replacement of the bed mold on Wall #3 and 4. Ms. Borstad, Empire Carpentry said that they would mill an

exact duplicate of what exists to replace the bed mold on top of the cornice. He also asked what the plywood on the corner would be replaced with on Wall #10. Mr. Hogestad explained that the original construction used flanking. Ms. Borstad responded that primer will be used on the installed wood until they can paint it in the spring. The installed wood would be a higher grade wood that will not warp like the plywood. She explained that they would wait and see whether they had to rehabilitate or replace the inner soffit board on Wall #15.

Mr. Frick moved to approve the revised Scope of Work for the William Stover Building, 503 Remington, based on the *Revised Cost Estimate of Proposed Work* submitted by Empire Carpentry and the replacement of similar style boards on the soffit to match existing material. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hogestad, which passed unanimously. (5-0)

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. 508 Olive Street, Rosenhoff/Smith House (Mark Johnson) - Request to be Removed from the Local Landmark List

Ms. McWilliams presented the background and reviewed the staff report. She explained that the staff recommended approving the request for rescission of the Local Landmark Designation because the house was not a very good example of the Craftsmen Bungalow style. The enclosed porch and picture window, which were not yet fifty years old, impacted the architectural integrity of the structure. Ms. McWilliams said that the LPC should consider a request to be removed from the Local Landmark List on a case by case basis and in this case there was little benefit in maintaining the property on the list. Ms. Weatherford explained that they felt that any request like this should be reviewed case by case and one reason for designating the structure was to protect contributing structures in the neighborhood until the historic districting is implemented. A precedent was not established by the LPC because they need to deal with de-designation using a case by case approach. Mr. Hogestad said that Mr. Johnson did not have a good reason to delist, just because he has not taken part in any of the financial benefits of Local Landmark Designation. He said that nothing has changed on the house. Ms. Kullman said that if they remove the designation then the house may be altered and become non-contributing. Mr. Tanner felt that designation was not a good mechanism to use to protect the house. He said that the City has not gotten all of the information out on what the requirements and constraints are of having a designated house. He suggested that the LPC rethink their policy on designating contributing buildings as a mechanism for protection. Mr. Frank suggested that they go back and look at the HRPP and go over the available tools for analyzing historic structures. Ms. Weatherford said that their concern for protecting historic structures

and neighborhoods should come first. Mr. Frick explained that the LPC tried to encourage a design for the proposed addition which was sympathetic to the historic structure and did not want the addition to change the historic character of the house.

Mr. Bridges, during citizen input, felt that Mr. Johnson attended several meeting and that would have been a good opportunity for the LPC to work with the applicant and even though they may have tried, Mr. Johnson did not get the support he wanted from the LPC. He said that the process was too onerous and that other people would not want to go through it in the future.

Mr. Tanner said that he was not comfortable with the statement in the last paragraph on the last page of the Staff Report which stated that 'staff does not see any benefit accruing to maintaining this property on the list of individual Local Landmarks for architectural importance.' He would like to modify that statement to read that staff does not see that the benefit accruing in maintaining this property outweighs the negative impact of insisting on such designation in the face of the owner's objections.

Mr. Tanner moved to accept staff's recommendation and send to City Council a request for rescission of the Rosenhoff/Smith House. He would like to see the wording of the support for this recommendation changed in the second paragraph of the staff report to say that, the Commission does not see that the benefits accruing in maintaining this property on the list of individual Local Landmarks for architectural importance outweigh the negative impact of insisting upon such designation in the face of the owner's objections. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kullman, which passed unanimously. (5-0)

2. Item was Continued - Local Landmarks Rehabilitation Grant Program Discussion.

3. Administrative Design Review - Further Discussion of the Category, "Change Not Affecting Historic Character"

Ms. Tunner reviewed the categories for design changes, which included color, awning recovering and changes not affecting the historic character of the property. She said that only one or two administrative design reviews of the last category listed had been done in the last three years. Situations that would meet that category included applications like patios, an alley door addition, exterior lighting for the Avery House and removal of the One West awning. Mr. Frank said that they would see a pattern if a problem developed with administrative design review. Ms. Tunner suggested that she could call the Chairperson with questions and an informal report could be submitted at the LPC meeting. The LPC discussed the issue of color. Today, color is reviewed by the LPC, but in the future it may be only advisory. Mr. Tanner would like to see color

left under administrative review, unless it was an exceptional situation. Ms. Tunner said that the HRPP addressed administrative review and recommended the adoption of a procedure for the approval of minor changes to LPC approved plans. They also discussed an appeal process which would be built into the administrative review process and an opportunity for staff to defer any decision to the LPC.

OTHER BUSINESS:

301 South Loomis - The Watrous House

Ms. McWilliams explained that Ken and Suzanne Smith asked for conceptual review of a change in the roof on the rear of the building. The house has north, south and east facing dormers. They would like to put another dormer on the back side of the house, to the west. They are interested in designating the house. Ms. Tunner reviewed the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standard #2 which explained not to destroy anything historical and #9 to design compatible additions. She felt that the addition was a sensitive plan because it did not destroy historic fabric and did match the existing house. The plan would probably not impact the integrity of the house for Local Landmark Designation.

Ms. McWilliams said that the final Central Business Survey report would be provided at the next LPC meeting. She added that Mr. Marmor identified two more properties which should be included in the boundaries of Historic Old Town.

The meeting adjourned 7:30 p.m.

Submitted by Nicole Sneider, Secretary.

**Landmark Preservation Commission
Regular Meeting
September 24, 1996
Council Liaison: Gina Janett
Staff Liaison: Joe Frank
Commission Chairperson: Jennifer Carpenter (226-0960)**

SUMMARY OF MEETING: Annual Elections resulted in Ms. Carpenter as Chairperson and Ms. Weatherford as Co-Chairperson of the LPC for the next year. The July 11, 1995 and July 9, 1996 LPC meeting minutes were accepted as submitted. The LPC discussed de-listing a Local Landmark. The recovering of an existing awning for Coopersmith's Brew Pub was approved. The LPC recommended the revised rehabilitation and scope of work for the C & S Depot. The LPC gave approval for the cleaning and repair of the masonry at St. Joseph's Catholic School which had already been completed. The photo based reconstruction of the porch on the Howard House, 145 North Loomis, was approved, but the baluster may need to be higher than pictured in the 1910 photo because of current building code. The LPC conceptually reviewed the facade renovation of 208 and 214 Linden Street. The LPC discussed the recommendations of the LPC Subcommittee on Policies and Procedures.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL: Jennifer Carpenter, Commission Chairperson called the meeting to order 5:35 p.m., 281 North College Avenue. Nicole Sneider, Secretary called the roll. Commission members Jennifer Carpenter, Per Hogestad, Bud Frick, Jean Kullman, James Tanner and Diana Ross were present. Leanne Lawrie, Joe Frank, Carol Tunner and Karen McWilliams represented staff.

GUESTS: Jeff Bridges, owner of 726 Mathews Street, attended the meeting. Dick Beardmore and Jim Reidhead, A-E Design, Dave Lingle, Aller-Lingle Architects, and Jack Gianola, Project Manager, Facilities Department attended for the C & S Depot project; Karen Canino from the St. Joseph's Catholic School; Tommy Short, owner of Linden's, and Tom Kalert from Architecture Plus Partnership, the local representative for Drasin Design in Los Angeles, California, attended for the renovation of Linden's facade; and Tim Simmons attended as the general carpenter for the Howard House project, 145 North Loomis.

AGENDA REVIEW: None.

STAFF REPORTS: Ms. Tunner provided a Policy and Procedures Sub-Committee summary which included recommended changes to existing programs.

COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS: Ms. Carpenter reported that Mark Johnson, 508 West Olive wants to de-list his property from Local Landmark designation. She requested that the LPC conduct a discussion about the issue under Other Business.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The July 11, 1995 and the July 9, 1996 LPC meeting minutes were accepted as submitted.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS: James Tanner nominated Jennifer Carpenter to continue in her role as Chairperson of the Landmark Preservation Commission. The nomination was seconded by Jean Kullman, and passed unanimously. (5-0)

Ms. Carpenter nominated Ruth Weatherford for the role of Co-Chairperson for the Landmark Preservation Commission. Mr. Tanner seconded the nomination, which passed unanimously. (5-0)

CURRENT DESIGN REVIEW:

Coopersmith's Brew Pub, #5 Old Town Square - Recover Existing Awning

Ms. Tunner provided a swatch of the proposed fabric for the awning. The adjacent building has a green awning. The color for the proposed awning was Plum Fancy to match the colors of Old Town. The outdoor furniture and umbrellas are burgundy.

Ms. Kullman moved that the LPC approve Coopersmith's Brew Pub recovering their existing awning with Plum Fancy fabric. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ross, which passed unanimously. (5-0)

OTHER BUSINESS:

Discussion of De-Listing a Property from the Local Landmark List

Ms. McWilliams noted that Mark Johnson, owner of 508 West Olive, wants to de-list his house from Local Landmark designation. Ms. McWilliams also explained that the de-listing process would be like the designation process, but in reverse. She said that staff would likely make the recommendation to the LPC not to approve de-listing because nothing has been changed on the house since it was designated. Mr. Hogestad visited with Mr. Johnson to discuss the East Side/West Side Design Guidelines and plans for a one story addition rather than one and one-half story, which Mr. Johnson had proposed. Mr. Hogestad reported that Mr. Johnson had a wide lot, but not a deep lot, so it would be more challenging to design a one story addition. Mr. Johnson asked staff if the LPC would be opposed to an addition which was more than one story. Mr. Hogestad explained, after reviewing Mr. Johnson's plans, that the second half-story of the proposed addition had very little living space because of the dimensions. Ms. Tunner explained that the Design Assistance Program would be a good opportunity for Mr. Johnson to get some help with his design. Ms. Carpenter noted that Mr. Johnson would have to follow the East Side/West Side Design Guidelines whether the property was designated as a Local Landmark or not. Mr. Hogestad explained that Mr. Johnson's drawings were misleading and they needed to illustrate the mass of addition

as subordinate to the house. Ms. Carpenter said that the addition that Mr. Johnson wants can be done if it was subordinate to the house and followed the East Side/West Side Design Guidelines. Mr. Frank added that the Standards and Guidelines for Historic Properties have not been adopted yet, so they can only be used as guidance. He said that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards should be used.

Ms. Carpenter had two concerns about de-listing 508 West Olive: 1) People may designate their properties in order to receive support from programs like the Rehabilitation Grant Program and then de-list when they are not awarded a grant, and 2) This issue sets a precedent for people to de-list their property when they decide that they do not want to adhere to the requirements associated with being a Local Landmark. The issue was interpreted by Mr. Eckman, City Attorney, that Local Landmark designation could be rescinded by ordinance and the LPC would make a recommendation for or against de-designation. He also added that a legal precedence would probably not be established if the de-designation was based on a rational reason. For example, the property had been changed and was no longer considered significant. Mr. Tanner made the point that without a districting process, the LPC is currently designating properties as individually eligible which should be considered as only contributing to a district. Mr. Frank recommended looking at each property case by case. Right now designation is the best tool the city has to protect historically significant structures.

Mr. Hogestad felt that in this case, the rationale of the owner was not a good enough reason to de-list his property. Ms. Carpenter said that he should have been aware of the regulations and responsibilities involved when he applied for the designation. Mr. Hogestad explained that he still has a lot of design options, so he is not suffering a hardship. Ms. Kullman suggested trying to work the problem through with the owner and explain to him the benefits of the guidelines, like adding on to his home with sensitivity to the historic fabric. A sensitive remodel is also an economic benefit.

Mr. Frick arrived 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Frank also suggested that LPC members visit the property in an effort to work with the owner. Mr. Tanner explained that a two-story addition was feasible, but must be subordinate in mass and scale. It would be very unlikely to double the size of the house and still have the two-story addition be subordinate to the original house. Mr. Frick suggested planning an addition with the same roof line, by building a basement and a split level. He explained that there were ways of keeping the same foot print of the structure. Ms. Tunner suggested that this sort of plan would make the lower level a garden level. Mr. Frick said that In order to make the addition subordinate, one could make a connector link that would provide for a courtyard.