

## **Current Design Review Continued**

### **136 LaPorte Avenue, C & S Depot - Revised Scope of Rehabilitation**

Dick Beardmore, Jim Reidhead, Dave Lingle and Jack Gianola presented the revised plan and budget for the C & S Depot grant which was awarded from the State Historical Fund. They explained that the project has changed direction. Storm Drainage and Wastewater Management will no longer be in the depot. This change meant that the Freight Manager's Office and the interior fire doors will not be restored at this time. The addition on the east side of the building will not be completed. The project will focus on the restoration of the east gullwing roof, Annie the Dog's Grave site and restoration of the freight dock. Mr. Reidhead said that they would like to restore the character defining features of the roof, complete stabilization of the building and restore the front entrance using photo-documentation. Mr. Gianola reviewed the spreadsheet which outlined changes to the grant. Item #3, Freight Dock Restoration no longer included ADA elements, curbs and railing. Item #4, the Freight Master's Office was deleted. Item #5, Restoration of the Front Entry included stabilization of the freight doors. Changes to Item #10 allowed for a future tenant to focus on changes to the inside to meet their needs for the space. Item #12, Additional work to Annie's Grave site was added in order to protect the site.

Mr. Lingle requested that the LPC write a letter of support for redirecting the grant and the scope of work.

**Mr. Frick moved for the LPC to approve the redirecting of the grant moneys, scope of work, and letter of support for the C&S Depot, 136 LaPorte Avenue. Ms. Kullman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. (6-0)**

### **127 North Howes Street, St. Joseph's Church School - Cleaning and Repair of Exterior Masonry (Local Landmark Rehabilitation Grant Review)**

Ms. Tunner explained that St. Joseph's School was the recipient of a Rehabilitation Grant but they were confused about having to come back for final design review before completing the work. Ms. Tunner explained that they cleaned, washed, and repointed the brick and American Gutter Co. replaced the gutters. The contractor was the Q & M Construction Company. Ms. Tunner commented that the mortar mix did not quite match the original, but that the sun was already bleaching it. Ms. Carpenter commented that it should be better outlined in the Rehabilitation Grant brochure that the applicants need to come back to the LPC for design review.

**Mr. Tanner moved that the LPC retroactively approve the cleaning and repair of the masonry and the gutter replacement at the St. Joseph's School. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kullman and passed unanimously. (6-0)**

**208 and 214 Linden Street, Linden's - Renovation of Facade for Conceptual Review**

Mr. Short explained that the plans he submitted were completed before his consultant had reviewed the Historic Old Town Design Guidelines. As a conceptual review, he wanted to discuss some of the ideas which he had for the renovated facade. Ms. Tunner said that Mr. Short had proposed to repaint the building, install a canopy over the sidewalk and highlight the building with light. Ms. Carpenter requested that they review the proposed plan by each item, and suggested that Drasin Design of Los Angeles review the guidelines before presenting the next set of plans. Mr. Short said that he was researching photo-documentation of the building because he was interested in restoring the storefront. The LPC then reviewed the items included in the proposal.

1. The stars on the building already exist.
2. The proposed sign would be removable and the design has been used on a larger group of restaurants. Ms. Carpenter explained to the applicant the dimensions and number of signs installed needed to be within the sign code for the City of Fort Collins. Mr. Short said that he would return with dimensions and colors for the proposed signage. Ms. Tunner commented that a "sign band" sign location was encouraged because it would be compatible with the other signs on the block. Mr. Tanner said that an I-beam channel sign with exposed rivet heads did not seem compatible with the signage which exists on that street. Ms. Carpenter was concerned with the amount of neon lighting. Mr. Short explained that they would use back lit neon, which was very subdued. Mr. Tanner read from Guideline #53.
3. The LPC requested that the proposed twelve foot sign be anchored only in the mortar joints.
4. Ms. Tunner explained that the applicant would like to look for a way to light up and down the building, but historic features of the building should not be covered in any way.
5. The applicant would like to try to mimic the historic fabric of the building and would only anchor the sign(s) to the mortar joints. Mr. Short added that he would like to put a menu board only on the brick pillar of the Mercer Building, so that the round column at the edge of 214 Linden could be restored.
6. Item did not require review.
7. The LPC explained that they needed more information regarding the design of the lighted wrought iron hops and barley proposed for the storefront. It was explained to the applicant that this item would be considered signage and included in the sign allowance.
8. Ms. Tunner explained that the proposed gold lettered window signage with dark green cross leaves and drop shadows, was more like the traditional signage of Old Town. Ms. Carpenter again expressed a concern with the amount of signage proposed for the facade of the building. Mr. Tanner thought that the proposed signage was nicer

than many of the neon beer signs commonly displayed in storefront windows around town, but emphasized that the proposed signage needed to be compatible with the historic building and not overshadow the historic fabric of the building.

9. This item proposed a neon outline around the storefront windows. The LPC felt that there was a lot of neon on the application.

10. Mr. Kalert informed the applicant that they will try to use indirect lighting as opposed to the faux steel lighting fixture included in the proposal. Mr. Hogestad wanted to see more details. The concept of the gooseneck lighting across the top of the building was to light up the sign and not the entire building. Mr. Short said that they may find another way to do this.

11. They proposed a valence with light fixtures that would light up and down the building.

12. Ms. Tunner reported that the Building Inspection Department said that the applicant may only fly an American or Colorado flag on the proposed flagpole.

13. Again, the LPC said that the proposed signage needed to be adjusted down.

14. The proposed canopy, made of plastic and neon does not follow the guidelines. Ms. Tunner explained that in a few places tunnel canopies have received approval, but the LPC and staff have gotten a lot of complaints about them. Mr. Short said that he did not like the proposed canopy anyway.

15. A custom door pull was proposed which would be in the design of a thirty-inch long spud wrench. Mr. Short explained that the hardware on the existing door was modern, but one may be antique. Ms. Tunner suggested that if there were historic handles to duplicate them. Mr. Tanner said that the applicant was making great effort to restore the historic storefront, but a few modern elements can take away from the historic fabric.

16. This item did not require review.

17. The historic storefront transom windows and pilasters were proposed to be restored. Mr. Short said that he was researching the library for photo-documentation of the storefront. He added that a metal beam may exist, making it costly to install transom windows. He planned to consult a structural engineer.

18. The buildings would be repainted where paint currently exists with approved colors but they would attempt to remove the paint from the brick of the Mercer Block (208 Linden.) The LPC requested the color choices to be brought in for final approval.

19. Water blast techniques may not work to remove the paint, so other treatments like a chemical peel were suggested. Staff provided Mr. Short with additional information on methods of paint removal. Mr. Short explained that existing lead paint may also be an issue. Ms. Tunner suggested that if they had to repaint, the HOT guidelines suggest using a brick color.

Mr. Short concluded that they would like to restore the building to a more historic nature. He explained that the I-beam sign was an important part of their theme. He

understood that it was not something you would normally see on an historic building, but he needed to make a statement as a business.

Mr. Frick responded that there may be a sensitive way of doing that, by not attaching the sign flush to the building. He suggested bringing it out from the face of the building. That type of installation would leave room for lighting and would not obscure the historic fabric of the building.

**145 North Loomis, the Howard House - Reconstruction of Front Porch (Local Landmark Rehabilitation Grant Program)**

Tim Simmons, carpenter, provided preliminary drawings and a 1910 photograph of the porch. Allen Curtis had prepared conceptual drawings last year for a reconstruction of the front porch. A photo-reconstruction on the corner of the house will be completed. They also have a good photo of the corner post and the end of the railing, from when the Mill family occupied the house. In the photo the railing came up to the woman's knee and was approximately thirty inches high. Today, according to the building code the railing needs to be at least thirty-six inches. Mr. Hogestad said that the conservation code may apply in this case. Mr. Frick suggested a pipe railing be run along the inside of the railing. Mr. Tanner suggested adding a row of spindles and another railing so that it would look simple and contemporary. Mr. Frick suggested raising the ground level by installing planters. Mr. Hogestad said that he preferred one continuous overall design for the railing and to build the railing at the lowest height that the code would allow. He added that the applicant would still be required to add a hand rail for the steps. Mr. Bridges said that with a lower railing people tend to sit on it which causes the spindles to break and other problems. Mr. Tanner then pointed out that the way that the spindle is currently drawn it does not look like the design on the photograph. He requested that they try to match the spindles on the baluster in the photograph.

**8:00 p.m. Ms. McWilliams arrived.**

**Ms. Kullman moved to approve plans for the reconstruction of the porch of 145 North Loomis, the Howard House, with the revision of the railing heights to meet code. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ross, which passed unanimously. (6-0)**

**DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

**LPC Sub-committee on Policies and Procedures - Presentation of Recommendations**

Ms. Lawrie presented the revised application and ranking sheet forms for the Rehabilitation Grant Program. She explained that the sub-committee discussed the issue of maintenance versus rehabilitation. Mr. Tanner worked on editing the brochure

including key changes made to *Eligible Rehabilitation Projects* (a definition of rehabilitation, what was included for full funding, what was eligible for matching funds, and what was ineligible.) The information stressed that it was a competitive program. The ranking sheets were considered to be only recommendations and were very subjective. On the revised ranking worksheet presented, the definition of historic importance came from the HRPPP and staff's contacts with other cities to find out how other communities categorized the ranking. Mr. Tanner explained that each case was unique, which kept the process from being too subjective. Ms. Carpenter discussed category number 1, *Preservation Necessity*, which may be based on the historic importance of the resource. Ms. Carpenter explained that necessity means different things to different people. Ms. Lawrie said that if the building was threatened there would be a very high preservation necessity. Mr. Tanner explained that the idea of preservation necessity incorporated both the idea of historical significance and some kind of threat to the structure. Ms. Lawrie continued to explain that they also expanded the project contact section on the application. *Project Contact*, #2, included the signature of both the contact and the owner/applicant. *Cost Estimate of Proposed Work*, #5, added the question, "Would you be willing to accept partial funding for your project?" *Description of Proposed Rehabilitation /Preservation Work*, #7 noted that separate material needed to be submitted for the Rehabilitation Grant Program, including photos and slides and for the State Tax Credit Program, only photos. *Assurances*, #8, added that the owner agrees to maintain the property after the rehabilitation work has been completed. Mr. Frick asked what level of maintenance would have to be maintained and what would happen if the applicant did not maintain the property. Without any consequence the statement seemed worthless. Ms. Lawrie explained that she would return to the LPC with an amendment to the ordinance allowing people to complete the project over a number of years rather than having to go to the bottom of the application pile. The amendment will then be presented to City Council in early December.

**Mr. Frick moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the package for the Rehabilitation Grant Program as presented to the LPC with all of the recommendations of the subcommittee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hogstad, and passed unanimously. (6-0)**

Ms. McWilliams explained that the Landmark Ordinance does not say that a building has to be fifty years old. This allowed the LPC to consider historically or architecturally significant buildings for designation which were less than fifty years old as well as when they may be threatened. Until the districting process is initiated, individual designation is the only protection for contributing structures. Ms. Carpenter stressed the need for districting. Ms. McWilliams also discussed the Demolition Delay and what constitutes a demolition. It was suggested to change the ordinance to allow for the LPC to review the demolition and the significance of the structure before the issue was kicked into the

full demolition delay procedure. The LPC would like to discuss what constitutes a demolition and what penalties or fines would pertain to a demolition without a permit or review.

Mr. Bridges said that buildings exist in his neighborhood with two walls and a roof which were kicked into demolition delay and then just sat there, unstable.

Ms. Tunner and the Commission discussed the issue of Administrative Design Review. The LPC was concerned that administrative review may be too subjective. Staff wanted the LPC to come up with a specific list of categories which could be reviewed administratively. Ms. Tunner will review past applications and projects to see which ones would have been reviewed administratively. Ms. Carpenter suggested creating an historic paint pallet which was acceptable for historic properties. Ms. Tunner explained that awnings would be reviewed administratively, as long as it was an existing awning frame which was being recovered. Ms. Tunner explained that staff would use discretion over what they review. If they felt uncomfortable reviewing an application they would bring it to the LPC. Ms. Carpenter said that this process should be creating the procedure for the next generation of preservationists. Staff will return with recommendations on how to go about Administrative Design Review.

**The meeting adjourned 9:30 p.m.**

**Submitted by Nicole Sneider, Secretary.**