

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
AUGUST 13, 1996**

City Clerk

**Council Liaison: Gina Janett
Staff Liaison: Joe Frank
Commission Chairperson: Jennifer Carpenter (225-0960)
Minutes Approved: 10-08-96**

SUMMARY OF MEETING: The June 11 and June 25, 1996 minutes were approved. The Diamond T Fire Truck was designated as a Local Landmark. The addition of roof gutters for the Fort Collins Museum, 200 Mathews Street, as well as painting for the C.M. Smith House, 622 Remington were approved. A new awning and frame were approved for 118 Trimble Court. The installation of silos at Coopersmith's Brewing Co. was discussed. Deni La Rue, Courthouse Expansion Project Coordinator, presented the project plans and, as LPC training, Dale Heckendorn, National Register Coordinator for the Colorado Historical Society, discussed National and State Register regulations.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL: Jennifer Carpenter, Commission Chairperson called the meeting to order 5:30 p.m., 281 North College Avenue. Carol Tunner called the roll. Commission members Jennifer Carpenter, Ruth Weatherford, Jean Kullman, Diana Ross, and Per Hogestad were present. Bud Frick arrived late. Ms. Tunner, Karen McWilliams, and Joe Frank represented staff. Laura Demko was acting secretary.

GUESTS: Dale Heckendorn, National and State Register Coordinator for the Colorado Historical Society, and Dennis Palmer from the City Facilities department attended the meeting. Terry Acker represented Trimble Court Artisans; Mary Harnett, owner 622 Remington; Brad Page, Brewmaster and Treasurer, Coopersmith's Brewing Co.; and Deni LaRue, Courthouse Expansion Project Coordinator, were also present.

AGENDA REVIEW: None.

STAFF REPORT: None.

COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS: None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: "Conceptual Design Review" should be noted in the heading of items #5 and #6 in the June 11, 1996 LPC meeting minutes. **The June 25, 1996 LPC meeting minutes were accepted as submitted.**

Mr. Tanner moved to accept the June 11, 1996 minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weatherford, which passed unanimously. (6-0)

CURRENT DESIGN REVIEW:

200 Mathews, Fort Collins Museum - Addition of Roof Gutters, Final Review

Dennis Palmer, City Supervisor of Maintenance, explained that he was confident that the gutter can be installed with the crown molding dropped down. The gutter will slide up behind the existing drip edge. He then described how the contractor will mount the gutter with hidden gutter hangers secured into a 2x6 attached to the fascia. The crown molding would be toe-nailed in underneath. Mr. Palmer explained that a 1x10 fascia exists now. The wood that will be installed, will be painted to match the existing green. Mr. Hogestad asked if they had investigated to see how easily the crown molding could be removed. Mr. Palmer said that if the existing molding did not come off intact, then they could replace it with a matching molding or use a 2x6. Mr. Hogestad stressed that the crown molding be replaced with a molding of the same profile.

Mr. Tanner moved to approve the proposal with the provision that the crown molding be lowered and replaced. Ms. Weatherford seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. (6-0)

118 Trimble Court Street, Trimble Court Artisans - Install New Awning and Frame

Ms. Tunner explained the project. The awning frame over the door will be replaced with a new similar frame covered with Sunbrella acrylic "green fancy" #4754.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the proposal as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kullman, which passed unanimously. (6-0)

622 Remington Street, C.M. Smith House (Mary Harnett, owner): Roof, Gutters, and Paint, Exterior Rehabilitation for the Colorado Historic Preservation Income Tax Credit

Ms. Tunner explained the items #1 roof replacement and #2 exterior paint and repairs which were listed in the application for State Tax Credit. Mr. Tanner raised the question of whether these items were routine or periodic maintenance. Ms. Tunner explained that any work done that would be associated with the physical preservation of the property was eligible. This included repointing and flashing. Mr. Frank explained that routine maintenance is approved for this program if it is part of an overall rehabilitation. There are two different standards for State and Local programs. Local funds are more limited so stricter criteria are necessary. Ms. Carpenter requested that staff consult with James Stratis on the question of eligibility for this type of work.

Ms. Tunner described the replacement roof and passed out samples of the material which was a white/gray color. Ms. Harnett, explained the work she had done to the property in 1980 - 1981. She said that originally she wanted to install a white roof, but has since decided on a color more like wood. The shingles will have to be completely removed and

a snow and ice shield has to be added. Ms. Harnett was open to suggestions on paint color scheme. Mr. Tanner and Mr. Hogestad suggested that the attic vent be moved in order to preserve the roof more. Ms. Tunner's recommendation was to paint the stone a natural stone color. The Secretary of The Interior's Standards for masonry cleaning suggested cleaning and re-pointing the stone. Ms. Harnett was concerned that the paint would peel off and expose the white underneath. She added for the record that the proposed roof material was manufactured by Tamko and are three-tab roof asphalt shingles in a Tweed Blend or Weathered Wood color. She also expressed a preference for using the color called Cottage for the trim color.

Ms. Kullman moved to approve the 622 Remington design proposal. Ms. Carpenter added a friendly amendment that the final color decisions are to be provided to staff for both paint and roofing. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ross. (5-1) Yeas: Carpenter, Kullman, Ross, Weatherford, Hogestad. Mr. Tanner abstained from the vote because he did not have enough information from the Colorado Historical Society on what is routine maintenance.

Local Landmark Designation: Diamond-T Fire Truck, Fort Collins Museum

Mr. Tanner was not in favor of designating the Diamond-T Fire Truck as a Local Landmark. From his interpretation of the code, we should be designating structures, not objects. Ms. Tunner explained that the National Register designates these properties as structures, and the City has designated a stagecoach and trolley.

Ms. Weatherford moved to nominate the Diamond-T Fire Truck a Local Landmark. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hogestad. (5-1) (Yeas: Carpenter, Weatherford, Kullman, Hogestad, Ross and Nays: Tanner)

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

National and State Register Regulations - Dale Heckendorn, National Register Coordinator for the Colorado Historical Society

Mr. Heckendorn explained that the "eligibility" of a project is determined by its "significance" and "integrity" and the four National Register criteria which exist. Seventy percent of the National Register properties are significant in a local context, the other thirty percent have State or National significance. The State Register uses the same four criteria. Mr. Heckendorn described history as a time and a place. Commemorative properties are difficult to list. For properties which are less than fifty years old, more time is often needed to decide what occurrence or use would be considered significant.

Integrity of a property is defined by what characteristics convey importance. 1) Location - was the property moved? 2) Setting - i.e.: town or rural? 3) Design - any character defining features 4) Materials - i.e.: original roof, gutters, stone? 5) Workmanship - original materials means original workmanship and how that workmanship was maintained. 6)

Feeling - For example, if it is early agriculture, then does the property convey that feeling?
7) Association with an event, person, or property. The period of significance and the integrity of the property may apply to more than one time period.

The integrity of the property is determined for each case. For instance, in agriculture and farm buildings an irrigation system may no longer exist, but the fields may be conserved as open space and have integrity in terms of its use for recreation. In this case, whatever existed prior, for instance farming on the land, no longer has any integrity. Ms. Carpenter asked what if a structure exists and it is the only one left for its period. Mr. Heckendorn said that you need to ask if the site **conveys** its significance, does it convey a feeling. He stressed to define and look for the character defining features based on what was left of the property, which is an interpretative process.

Alterations and their effect on integrity were discussed next. Mr. Heckendorn provided a graphic example of an 1890's downtown building architecturally significant for its late nineteenth century storefront which was a five & dime on the first floor and the town's first hotel upstairs. In the 1930s, the owners remodeled the upper half of the building in the art deco style. Architecturally, it is a hybrid and no longer conveys the feeling of a hotel. It may have significance on the first floor as the first five & dime and it still conveys that feeling. One needs to decide if the upper level changes have diminished the first floor's significance. A different scenario exists if in the 1930s the first downtown diner (stainless steel and streamlined) went into the storefront with the upper floor the same historic first hotel. The building may not be able to convey its significance as a 1890s downtown commercial structure, but character defining features still exist for the hotel upstairs. Between the two floors there may not be any sympathy at all. Architecturally, the building would not be considered significant. But, is it significant for it being the first downtown hotel and diner? It may be eligible for many things like the remaining character defining features of that hotel or other things like its association with the town's remodeling period. Mr. Heckendorn added that properties with a negative association, like slaves' quarters or W.W. II internment camps, should be listed as well. Ms. Carpenter stressed the point that it is important to find what significance the property conveys today rather than just its history.

Mr. Heckendorn said that the significance of the property may go through a transition. He explained transition in terms of a district, which includes large houses, 3-story apartment buildings, and high rises. The transition started when the 3-story buildings were erected. The high rises, built most recently, represent a new period and are less than fifty years old. Building transition was also discussed using a small cottage as an example. There are two scenarios, one when a service station is added; or two, the cottage is converted to a convenience store. If the cottage conveys its association, it could be significant for the entire transition period. If the cottage was extensively remodeled, it does not convey the feeling of the original cottage. Local authorities decide their own criteria for eligibility for local designation programs. The National Register criteria is based on what the property or structure looks like right now. You also need to look at context and if the

property is one of the better examples in town. Districts have more flexibility when trying to convey a feeling of the district.

The Commission reviewed slides. Joe's Fireside Cafe, Poudre Valley Appliance, and Don Q's were all automobile dealerships. Do the buildings today convey the original purpose? It was discussed that they are not eligible for the National Register because there is little integrity and buildings must be intact at the time of the nomination. The City Drug building has a 1940s facade. It originally was a drugstore, but not continuously and not the first one in town. It may be eligible for the National Register for its 1940s facade. The Subway sandwich shop was discussed next. It was asked if it was the best example of that brickwork and stucco in town. If a building is considered to be a contributing building to a district, the "condition" need not be as good as if it was a single nomination. For the Robert Trimble Block on S. College, it was asked what was underneath the awning. It was suggested that the Nightwalker Building would be better as a district building with the depot nearby. The concept of it being a unique building may be important if it was the last surviving of its kind. Mr. Tanner made the point of the LPC deciding on what they are going to fight to preserve.

Mr. Frick arrived at this time.

Courthouse Design - Deni La Rue, Courthouse Expansion Project Coordinator

Ms. La Rue described the Block 31 justice center and the area of historic structures which would be impacted. Ms. Tunner asked what would happen to the trolley barn. She asked if it would be moved or destroyed. Ms. LaRue said that they would bring the trolley down further to the corner of Mountain and Mason. Ms. Carpenter was concerned about the design and said that it needed to fit in and not overshadow the rest of town. Mr. Tanner expressed that the busyness bothered him. He described the masses and shapes in Old Town as simple. He said that the planes, bricks, roof and shadow lines were out of touch with the spirit of Old Town. Ms. LaRue explained that they wanted to denote the themes of civic, justice, courts, and government. Mr. Hogestad said that the building design should be timeless instead of post-modern and should incorporate elements of Old Town to establish that look.

#5 and #7 Old Town Square, Coopersmith Brewing Co. - Conceptual Review for Installation of Two Malt Silos

Mr. Page explained that the motivation for this addition was economic. There was discussion of the number and size of the silos. The LPC had a problem with the structures being thirty feet high and possibly wide enough to interfere with traffic flow. They also discussed the fire hazard, which Mr. Page will research. Mr. Hogestad asked if there were plans for signage. Mr. Page said that they did not plan to put signage on the silos. He said that they came white, but could be painted any color. Mr. Hogestad said that the signs on a silo in Denver, at LoDo, work well. Mr. Tanner explained that this is not an industrial area so the silos should be designed as smooth and low as possible. Ms. Carpenter felt that the proposal did not fit in with the entrance of Old Town and asked if

there was an area inside a building that would work. Mr. Page explained that practically that suggestion would not work. Mr. Frick asked if there is a preferred color. Mr. Hogestad said that he would like to see it bright, rubbed stainless, or galvanized. Mr. Page said that it would be removable in the future. Mr. Tanner and Mr. Hogestad then discussed possibly removing the kiosk, which has always been in the way, and the problem of graffiti. Ms. Weatherford suggested that Mr. Page comes back with heights, widths, and information on whether or not the silos will be painted. Mr. Page asked the Commission if they would like a fence around the bottom. The LPC had a consensus of no to the fence and felt that the structure should be close to the building and they probably should not fence it. Mr. Page will return to the first LPC meeting in September with further conceptual plans.

OTHER BUSINESS: None.

Meeting adjourned 10:00 p.m.

Submitted by, Nicole Sneider