

LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

July 9, 1996

Council Liaison: Gina Janett

Staff Liaison: Joe Frank

Commission Chairperson: Jennifer Carpenter (226-0960)

SUMMARY OF MEETING: The LPC approved the April 23, 1996 and May 14, 1996 meeting minutes. The LPC approved the Old Town Wall Mural at 200 Linden Street which was presented by Mike Powers, CLRS Director and Maggie Kunze. The porch rehabilitation for 525 Smith Street was approved. The LPC gave their final review and approval for State Tax Credit for exterior rehabilitations of 700 Remington and of the house and barn at 308 East Myrtle. Rehabilitation of the Carriage House at 700 Remington was approved for State Tax Credit.

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, Ruth Weatherford, Per Hogestad, Jean Kullman, James Tanner, and Diana Ross attended. Bud Frick arrived at 5:50 p.m. Carol Tunner and Karen McWilliams represented staff.

GUESTS: Mike Powers, CLRS Director; Maggie Kunze; David Wilkins, owner of 525 Smith Street; and Jeff Bridges, project manager for 700 Remington and 308 E. Myrtle.

AGENDA REVIEW: None.

STAFF REPORTS: Ms. Tunner provided an updated LPC membership list and an article from Style magazine on the renaissance of Old Town.

COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS: Ms. Carpenter welcomed Ms. Ross to the Commission. She also added a discussion of the basic criteria that the LPC should adopt for eligible local landmarks. One issue she wanted to address was whether a property in the National Register of Historic Places should automatically be eligible for Local Landmark Designation. Ms. Carpenter then informed the LPC about the proposed three Civic Center Plans and encouraged Commission members to visit the models of these plans which are on display in the Larimer County Courthouse.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The April 23, 1996 and the May 14, 1996 LPC meeting minutes were accepted as submitted.

DISCUSSION ITEMS: Old Town Wall Mural at 200 Linden Street - Mike Powers, CLRS Director, and Maggie Kunze

Mr. Powers and Ms. Kunze updated the LPC on the downtown mural project and provided additional information on Darrell Anderson, the artist. The Fort Collins Museum has displayed Mr. Anderson's work in the past. He works with the young participants from the conception of a design through the actual mosaic construction. Twelve local artists were also participating in the project. The mural would focus on the theme of downtown. The design would portray outdoor activities, music, and free speech. Ms. Kunze explained that while working with the kids, Mr. Anderson demands respect for the community and for the project. Funding for the mural came from Fort Fund, the Fort Collins Police Department, and the private sector. The project would be open to community participation and the meeting times for the program would be advertised. The mural would be completed in small panels and then would be clipped to the building so that it would not be permanent. It was believed to be a four to six week project and they would like for the mural to be completed by the New West Fest. Ms. Carpenter explained that they have no problem with the concept, but the LPC would like to know what the mural is going to be. Ms. Weatherford and Mr. Hogestad explained that the mural needed to be compatible with Old Town, but can still be a contemporary piece. Ms. Kunze said that it was expressed to Mr. Anderson that the flavor of Old Town needed to be preserved in the mural, but he could work with the kids to come up with the design along the process. Ms. Kunze said that Mr. Anderson would be in town July 19, 1996 if any of the Commission members would like to meet with him. Mr. Hogestad asked how the mural would be attached to the building. Ms. Kunze said that the panels would have a metal strip along the edge which would be clipped onto the side of the building. Mr. Anderson had discussed the installation of the mural with Steve Slavek. Ms. Kunze added that the artist had not come to the LPC regarding the installation because the Wright Life building was not a contributing historic building. She did explain that the mural would be installed sensitively around the stone window sills currently left on the building. Ms. Weatherford suggested creating a sub-committee that could be kept apprised of the progress of the program. Mr. Powers said that they would relay the Commission's concerns to the artist and that Commission members were welcome to participate in the project with the children. Mr. Hogestad felt confident that projects like this could work and referred to many like it in the Denver area. He said that he still needed some more information like the dimensions of the mural. The mural would create a visual piece in a prime location and would have a major impact on downtown. He suggested that Mr. Anderson illustrate some conceptual sketches which would give the kids some direction for their design. Mr. Powers requested that member(s) of the LPC participate in the project along with other people from the city and the Poudre R-1 school district. He and Ms. Kunze explained that this project was very open to the community and they would like to establish a precedent of acceptable artwork so that in the future more projects like this could be planned with the kids.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the Art in Public Places in Old Town. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tanner, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

CURRENT DESIGN REVIEW:

525 Smith Street, George W. Coffin House - Porch Rehabilitation Design Review

David Wilkins, owner, described the configuration of the front porch. The small door to the side of the main entrance served as a separate entrance for the inhabitants of the home. Ms. Tunner said that it was called a coffin or pastor door. During the Depression, 1934 - 1939, the house was subdivided into separate living quarters. He explained that it may not have been the original intent, but during that time it was used that way. Mr. Wilkins said that in a picture from 1948, there were no railings around the front porch. He would like to repair the structural damage to the porch. He has started by replacing the gutters and installing new redwood sheathing. In order to make the house look as it did, he also removed the baluster and railing. Mr. Hogestad said that red cedar was probably more common than redwood. Mr. Wilkins asked the Commission's opinion on the exterior lamp which he chose for outside. It is a simple design similar to the gooseneck lamps in Old Town. Ms. Tunner added that the porch ceiling and decking would also be replaced and the side door would be enlarged to get furniture in and out. Mr. Wilkins would also like to replace two columns on the porch which have rotted out or are missing. He would replace them with whole columns instead of half columns and would install them close enough to the house in order to get a paint brush behind them. The roof of the porch would be stained the same color as the door and the decking would be painted the same color as the house.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve David Wilkins' request for the porch rehabilitation, 525 Smith Street. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kullman, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

308 East Myrtle, the H.F. Elliot/Carl Anderson House - Exterior Rehabilitation of House and Barn, Final Review for State Tax Credit

Ms. Tunner explained that the LPC had approved this project for State Tax Credit, at a previous meeting, based on the condition that the applicant would provide additional information. Mr. Bridges described the porch rehabilitation. He explained that, structurally, there was a boxed beam around the porch which allowed for no load on the columns. They re-configured the framing so the porch rested on all the columns for support. Then, they created false framing to put the rafters back out to where they were. Structurally, all the columns and rafters are now tied together but the porch still looks the same on the outside. Mr. Bridges showed slides of the work and the water damage which was caused by a poor gutter system.

Ms. Weatherford moved to accept the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kullman, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

Mr. Bridges provided a picture of the recycled Carriage House door which would be installed in a fixed manner on the barn. A door on the side of the barn would allow access into the building. The five window openings would be boarded up from the inside and painted black. Some window sashes exist in place, but the glass panes are broken. The roof of the barn won't be reroofed at this time because of lack of funding. There were no drawings of the door for the barn, but it was confirmed in a slide that it was larger than the opening. The door would be mounted on the existing rail or screwed down and the hardware on the door would be modified for the installation.

Mr. Hogestad moved we accept the proposal for the replacement of the barn door and the covering of the windows. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kullman, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

700 Remington, Final Review of Exterior Rehabilitation of House for State Tax Credit.

Ms. Tunner showed the Commission samples of the proposed roofing material. The Commission discussed the flat roof on the north side of the building, which was item #2 of page #2 of the letter from Jeff Bridges addressing the project. Mr. Hogestad and Mr. Frick suggested hanging the roofing over a beveled edge, creating an overhang, resulting in a drip edge which would keep water from backing up. Mr. Bridges explained why some windows were being treated differently. The addition on the back did have the same foundation as the rest of the house, but had different window treatments. On the second level, it was originally proposed to install windows from the inside, but they would like to now construct wood framed storm windows. Details for the rest of the windows were discussed. The windows would be installed flush inside and out and the applicant intended to use original hardware. All external wood screen and storm windows would be painted white, except for the window on the south facade. Item #7, page #3 was then discussed. Mr. Bridges explained that the trim board on the south balcony would be reflashed with metal flashing. It would be 1 inch by six inches to match the siding, have a ten degree beveled edge, and would be painted the trim color. The flashing would be installed underneath the bottom siding, between the roof and the bottom siding.

Mr. Frick moved that the LPC accept the proposal for the north and south porch roof and window storm and screen replacements as proposed. Ms. Weatherford seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

700 Remington, Rehab of Carriage House for State Tax Credit

Mr. Bridges showed a photograph of the house and carriage house from the 1906

Democrat. He discussed evidence of where doors and windows may have existed on the building. He then discussed the changes that they would like to make. On the north and east elevation they would like to add a vent pipe and move the small window over on the east side. The window would be boarded up if they could not move it. The window does not have any sash or glass. The Commission discussed whether there may have been some other use for the opening. The smaller window was 24 by 27 inches, while the other windows were 24 by 54 inches. The larger windows were consistent with the other carriage houses around town. Mr. Bridges added that he did not think that the barn doors were original. He then described the interior and stated that the baseboards inside the carriage house were the same as the baseboards inside the house. They were able to salvage more baseboards like them from the house next door to the south to repair the inside of the carriage house. He explained that a foundation would be added to the building to support the outer walls. Mr. Hogestad asked if the existing concrete floor would be taken out. Drawing #5 illustrated the foundation plan. Mr. Frick and Mr. Hogestad reviewed the foundation plan in terms of structure and support. A window would be added to the west side as well as two windows in the roof. Mr. Frick also suggested to check the stairs to make sure it meets code. Mr. Bridges explained that the reason they did not use a winding staircase was because they wanted to make the stairs look like they were built into the building and were compatible with the cabinetry and bead board paneling. Mr. Frick and Mr. Hogestad had some concerns about the diagonal tread in the staircase.

The Commission then discussed the document created by Mr. Bridges titled *Rehabilitation Materials Specifications*. They requested that the applicant explain and define which approach would be used for a project, rather than submitting a list of possible methods ranging from gentle to more aggressive. Mr. Frick explained that the National Park Service has already defined specifications for rehabilitation which should be followed and are widely understood and accepted throughout the historic preservation community. Mr. Bridges' argument was that different areas of a building, because of conditions like weather damage, would require different treatments for proper rehabilitation. Mr. Frick suggested diagramming the building and illustrating which specifications and methods would be used where. The LPC urged people to use the National Park Service Briefs as a source for information because they are widely accepted and understood. A new hierarchy of information, presented as a list of options could be very confusing. Mr. Bridges' references in his packet were changed to refer to National Park Service Brief #10.

Ms. Kullman moved to approve the plans for 700 Remington for the rehabilitation of the Carriage House for State Tax Credit, with the change in Item #16 to be in accordance with National Park Service Brief #10 replacing THMN Specifications. Mr. Frick seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

OTHER BUSINESS:

The Commission discussed to what level the Laurel School National Register District was surveyed for historic structures. Ms. McWilliams explained that the properties in the National Historic District were researched and described minimally. There were only two or three sentences to describe each building. Ms. Carpenter concluded that with such little information it would be hard to justify a property as being automatically eligible for local landmark designation.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Submitted by Nicole Sneider, Secretary.