

LANDMARK PRESERVATION MEETING

REGULAR MEETING

MAY 14, 1996

Council Liaison: Gina Janett

Staff Liaison: Joe Frank

Commission Chairperson: Jennifer Carpenter (225-0960)

SUMMARY OF MEETING: The Neil Graham House at 811 Peterson Street, the Anna B. Miller House at 514 East Elizabeth, and the Smoke/Walker House at 423 Whedbee were designated as Local Landmarks. The William C. Stover House at 503 Remington, the Elliot/Anderson House at 308 East Myrtle, the M.G. Nelson House at 700 Remington, and the Marion Alice Parker/Frank P. Stover House at 1320 West Oak were approved for State Tax Credit. The LPC required more details and specifications for the application for State Tax Credit for the Anna B. Miller House at 514 East Elizabeth.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL: Commission Chairperson Jennifer Carpenter called the meeting to order 5:34 p.m., 281 North College Avenue. Nicole Sneider, Secretary called the roll. Commission members Jennifer Carpenter, Ruth Weatherford, Per Hogestad, Jean Kullman, Terence Hoaglund, Bud Frick, and James Tanner were present. Carol Tunner and Karen McWilliams represented staff.

GUESTS: James Stratis, Colorado State Historical Society, Leanne Lawrie, City Planner, Rheba Massey, Local History Coordinator, Scott Roark, Jeff Bridges, Bruce Biggi, homeowner of 1320 W. Oak, George Neil, owner of Peterson Canvas and Awning, Katherine Elias and son Micah homeowners of 811 Peterson St., and Margaret Marshall, homeowner of 514 E. Elizabeth.

AGENDA REVIEW: Ms. McWilliams asked to switch the discussion of the designations of the Anna B. Miller house and the Smoke/Walker House.

STAFF REPORT: Ms. Lawrie told the Commission that fifteen grants were awarded for the Rehabilitation Grant Program totaling \$41,043. The problem, which has been resolved, was that the amount was over by \$262. Ms. Lawrie suggested that the Commission and staff plan a work session to go over ranking and the application form for the Rehabilitation Grant Program. Ms. Carpenter added that the LPC needs to develop integrity standards and a basis for decision making for the Rehabilitation Grant Program and other programs and streamline the designation process in order to better manage the increased work load.

COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS: None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The January 29, 1996 minutes were accepted as submitted.

CURRENT DESIGN REVIEW:

#11 Old Town Square, the Miller Block - Code Violation on Awning Installation, George Neil, Peterson Canvas and Awning Company - owner

Ms. Tunner passed out pictures of the awning which had been installed incorrectly. Mr. Neil explained to the Commission that two holes were drilled into the sandstone with anchors. He showed samples of the anchors and explained that they can be removed. He said that there were six inches from either anchor until a mortar joint. The anchors are approximately twenty-four inches in from the awning. He found a construction site in town where similar stone is being cut. He took a sample of that powder and added glue, which could possibly be used to patch the holes. Ms. Weatherford asked if there was a better material for patching the holes. Mr. Stratis explained that usually a patch is comprised of residual from the hole itself and some latex epoxy. He suggested speaking with Chris Wolf from Restoration Specialties to find the right materials for the patch. Mr. Hogestad thought that it would be easy to fix, but questioned if the anchors should be removed only to create new holes. Mr. Frick and Mr. Tanner agreed that new holes should not be drilled into the building. Mr. Neil explained that the width of the anchor lends itself to a very tight fit into a mortar joint. Ms. Carpenter asked if a smaller anchor could be used. Mr. Neil said that an anchor with a narrower diameter does not come in the right length. Mr. Hogestad said that the stones may not be square through the joint. Ms. Carpenter reminded the Commission and Mr. Neil that this situation creates a precedent for historic buildings. Mr. Hogestad said that in the future there is a chance that the awning will be removed improperly and tear the stone apart.

The Commission discussed removal of the anchors. The holes may expand when they are knocked out because the anchor expands into the stone. Mr. Hogestad said that the anchors may be drilled into the stone. Mr. Frick suggested painting the anchor and frame so they would be obscured. Ms. Carpenter stressed that projects must be completed to specification. Mr. Neil explained that part of the problem is that important instructions were not red-lined on the bid he saw.

Mr. Tanner moved that the awning be left as it exists. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frick, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

DESIGNATIONS:

811 Peterson Street, the Neil Graham House - Jim, Katherine, and Micah Elias, owners

Katherine Elias, owner and son, Micah, attended the presentation. Ms. McWilliams provided pictures of the property. The house is historically significant for its architectural style and for its association with Judge Neil Graham and his wife Dura. Judge Graham

served as the Eighth Judicial district judge and for a short time from 1928 until 1930, as City Attorney. Mr. Bridges added that this Craftsmen style Bungalow, built in 1907, is very unique because it is different from others in town.

Mr. Frick moved to approve the Local Landmark Designation of the Neil Graham House at 811 Peterson Street. Ms. Weatherford seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

423 Whedbee, the Smoke/Walker House. Virginia Beatty, owner

Ms. McWilliams presented the staff report for the Smoke/Walker House. The house was built in 1896 in the Denver Box style, a vernacular style, of the Classic Cottage style. There was a low pitched roof addition which was added off the extension on the west elevation prior to the 1960s. All additions and alterations were completed before or during the 1960s. Mr. Bridges, representing Ms. Beatty added that this home is on the Historic Homes Tour and that Ms. Beatty has lived there for forty-eight years.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the Local Landmark Designation of the Smoke/Walker House at 423 Whedbee. Mr. Hoaglund seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

514 East Elizabeth Street, the Anna B. Miller House. Margaret Marshall, owner

Ms. McWilliams presented the staff report. The house was nominated for its architecture. It is a Bungalow built in 1924. In staff's opinion the house has been substantially altered and staff has recommended the denial of the nomination. Ms. McWilliams stated the reasons for denying the application and explained that the building could be considered to be contributing to an historic district but felt that it is inappropriate to individually designate the building. These alterations included wood grained aluminum siding, Astroturf carpet on the porch, altered window openings, aluminum storm screens, and skylights on the front of the house. All of these alterations taken as a whole affect the architectural integrity of the building.

Ms. Marshall and Mr. Bridges spoke to the Commission about the changes to the property and plans made to rehabilitate the house in the future. Ms. Marshall explained that the siding is the same shape as the original wood siding on the house so it is compatible. Mr. Bridges reminded the Commission that other houses with siding have been designated so a precedent has been set. Ms. Carpenter suggested that the LPC work through some of the issues and sought the advice of Mr. Stratis.

Ms. Weatherford understood Ms. McWilliams' reasoning, but felt that many of the alterations were not permanent. Mr. Frick also agreed that the house could be taken back to its original look. Ms. Marshall explained that she is currently renovating the interior of

the house and plans to rehabilitate the exterior, starting with the construction of wooden storm windows. She said that the original windows were not present when she moved into the property. She also explained that she has been familiarizing herself with the style of the house.

Mr. Tanner discussed that maybe the sum total should be considered, that the LPC should look at staff's recommendation, and think about establishing limitations. Mr. Frick said that by designating the property the LPC would have to review all work done on the house in the future. Ms. Carpenter said that although the property may be contributing to an historic district they are not designating districts at this time. The only way to protect the property is through individual designation. Mr. Frick added that if designated, future grant opportunities would be available to restore the house. Mr. Stratis explained that this is a local issue, but said that local landmark designation would indeed make the property eligible for funding for restoration. Ms. Massey added that according to the design guidelines sky lights on the front of the building are acceptable as long as they were flat. According to the National Register Bulletin #15, compatible siding is acceptable as long as the main features of the building are maintained. She understands that local landmark designation has a higher criteria, but until historic districts are designated, houses in the neighborhoods should not be sacrificed. The LPC felt that this was an important issue to discuss at the next work session.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the Anna B. Miller House at 514 East Elizabeth Street for Local Landmark Designation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hogestad, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

STATE TAX CREDIT REVIEW:

514 East Elizabeth Street, the Anna B. Miller House - Interior Renovation, Margaret Marshall, owner

Ms. Tunner provided pictures and explained that originally staff did not recommend approval of this application for state tax credit because they viewed the project as a kitchen remodeling after consulting with Mr. James Stratis of the Colorado Historical Society. Mr. Stratis had stressed the intent of the project and his opinion was that the project was not eligible for state tax credit because it was not part of a substantial rehabilitation. After checking the legislative act, criteria and procedure the legal language does not clearly address intent. He explained that terminology like remodeling and renovation are not represented in the law. Inherent in the term rehabilitation is an allowance to create modern conveniences while retaining historic characteristics. Mr. Stratis left the decision up to the local Commission to determine the intent of the applicant. With this interpretation, Ms. Tunner then recommended the approval of the project.

Ms. Marshall explained that she would like to make the kitchen more functional and keep

it in the architectural style of the house. Some of the characteristics of the Bungalow style included wide open rooms, craftsmen, simple cabinetry which ran completely under the windows and over large sections of wall. The existing island in the kitchen originally was a wall. Mr. Stratis believed that this additional information began to substantiate the project. Ms. Carpenter suggested to discuss at the next work session the issue of rehabilitation versus remodeling. She read the definition of rehabilitation, which stated that you do not have to go back to what was originally there. Ms. Carpenter thought that it should be made easier for people to reside in historic homes. Improvements can be made and still design to enhance and protect the historic features and style of the home. Mr. Hoaglund expressed that he felt uncomfortable with supporting this project without knowing for sure that the kitchen would be done in the Craftsmen style. Mr. Frick said that the LPC can not approve the application without any dimensioned design plans. Mr. Stratis said that elevation drawings, materials, and other specifications were necessary. The LPC tabled the application and required that the applicant return with specification of finishes, construction documents, and working drawings. Conceptually, the Commission was favorable, except Mr. Tanner would have preferred to see more of an effort of the applicant to return to a more historic configuration.

Five Minute Break.

503 Remington, The William C. Stover House - Exterior Renovation , Don Johnson and Norm Burnett, owners

Jeff Bridges represented the applicants. The William C. Stover House is in a National Historic District. The application does not include items #10 or #12 because exterior lighting has not yet been chosen and the handicap access ramp has not been designed. The applicants plan to utilize the Design Assistance Program for these items. Mr. Stratis said that one could not submit those items in phases. The Commission discussed different options for the handicapped access. There were no specifications for the masonry repair. Item #15 was for a new paint scheme, for which paint chips were provided. In general, the LPC requested more details. Item #11 was the installation of patches over two existing holes in the bead board of the porch ceiling. Mr. Tanner suggested using a filler instead of a patch, to avoid the appearance of bandaged solution. Mr. Frick suggested to smooth the holes with a hole saw and then cut another board to fit the hole and install the piece flush with the ceiling.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the William C. Stover House, 503 Remington, for State Tax Credit with the exceptions of items #10 and #12, and paint color removal, repair masonry work and methods and materials should be decay inhibiting solvents and item #11 should be solved with a smooth hole saw and replaced with a round matched piece of bead board to be installed flush. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoaglund, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

308 East Myrtle, Elliot/Anderson House - Exterior Rehabilitation of House and Barn, Helen Woodard, owner and Jeff Bridges, Project Manager

Mr. Bridges represented the applicant. Ms. Tunner presented the staff report to the Commission. The Elliot/Anderson House is on the National Register of Historic Places and is contributing to an historic district. Staff requested more information on items #10 and #8, the paint scheme and gutter replacement and system design. She explained that this project was brought in phases and the LPC should review items except #8 and #10. The applicant may utilize the Design Assistance Program, which will be implemented in the future. Ms. McWilliams discussed phasing and said that each time the \$250 fee would be waived, so this encourages phasing. Mr. Stratis explained that the intent of the program is to propose a comprehensive project and there is no provision for phasing. The project is required to be completed in two years with a one time extension for two years based upon substantiated reasons. He explained that an applicant can submit separate applications, pay separate fees, and then each project must be completed in two years. Ms. McWilliams said that the LPC proposed that each time an application was submitted the initial \$250 fee would be waived.

Mr. Bridges requested that the LPC defer design review for item #10 because they have not yet chosen the colors but thinks that they would paint the house in the existing colors. He also wanted to delay item #8 the gutter system, because it was a challenge to design one piece which fits an arch with a radius of fifteen feet for the rounded porch. Mr. Stratis explained that the applicant can define her intent and the application could be conditionally approved. Later on the details can be provided. Ms. Tunner questioned why a temporary replacement door and what it looked like. The Commission also asked what the patching material was and other details which were left out. Mr. Bridges introduced, Scott Roark who was responsible for the barn. Mr. Roark explained that their intent for the roof was to prevent water from coming in and to keep it looking similar to the way it exists now. They have planned for temporary stabilization and weather-proofing. A sliding door from the same period was donated to serve as the temporary door. It will be hinged from inside. Mr. Bridges explained that this was the last barn structure on the block. Mr. Stratis commended the plan, but explained that there could be a potential problem in the future without having specifications. Mr. Bridges responded that they are working and planning according to the Secretary of the Interior's standards. Ms. Carpenter requested that this information be stated in the documentation.

The LPC requested the following specifications: painting, a picture of the door for the barn with the size of the door and the opening, a method of preparation for painting of the house, what kind of gutter will be installed, specifications of materials used, the type of paint, and a descriptions of what methods will be utilized and how things will be done.

Mr. Tanner moved to approve the proposal for State Tax Credit for The Elliot/Anderson House, 308 East Myrtle, with the conditions outlined with regard to

specifications of materials, workmanship, and methods. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weatherford, which passed unanimously. (7-0).

700 Remington. M.G. Nelson House - Exterior Rehabilitation. Carie and Colleen Conway, owners

Mr. Bridges represented the Conways for the State Tax Credit. He informed the Commission that the interior projects for State Tax Credit have been completed. The current application was for exterior work. Ms. Tunner sent around pictures of the house and had questions for Mr. Bridges pertaining to the staff report. The first question regarded item #1, what cleaning method will be used on the old siding after the aluminum sided has been removed. For item #4 the window trim and crown molding would be replaced on the house, but not on the additions to the house unless evidence shows that it was originally there on the additions. Ms. Tunner commented that this item demonstrated excellent preservation practice. Ms. Tunner questioned what color the porch would be painted and what was the appropriate choice for a primer/sealer, in item #5. For item #6, work on the back porch was missing information. She noted that for item #8, there were different treatments for the storm windows, without reference to particular windows. For item #10 the application needed to include color chips for exterior painting. It is necessary to know what type of gutters and the material for item #11.

Mr. Bridges said that the principal problem is that there is inadequate electrical service to the north side of the house. The gutter repair on the north side of the house would include some de-icing components. He also explained that when the aluminum siding is removed they do not know what condition the wood siding will be underneath and what the appropriate treatment will be for the house. The exterior walls will need new insulation. Trim board is also missing, which is documented by photographs. Mr. Bridges explained that before the wood siding is repaired, electrical upgrades will be performed inside the wall. Concerning item #8, aluminum storm windows on the main house and the street side of the historic addition would be replaced with wood storm windows. The aluminum storm windows from all of the elevations have already been removed because they are not functional. A storm window at a lower cost than wood was being sought for the south and east elevations, which can not be seen from the street and fixed interior storm windows would be installed in the upper elevation of the addition. Item #11, the integral gutter system would be repaired, new gutters would be installed to follow the trim of the house, and rerouted to the down spouts. Item #5 addressed color which were described as teal blue on the roof and Solomon sand and white for the trim. The primer/sealer would be a metal oxide which would be a rust color or a new product by Zinger, called Bull's Eye Super which can be tinted any color. Mr. Hogestad asked how the roof would be prepared for adhesion. Mr. Bridges said they would use a brush/scrubber and only detects metal failure up against the shingles of the house which would be repaired. For item #6, Mr. Bridges addressed the flat roof at the north elevation. He explained that it needs more of a pitch, which will be created with decking, and would be de-iced. It can not be seen from the

ground or the interior windows. Mr. Stratis said that there was no photograph of this area and staff has not checked the roof on site. Mr. Frick would like to see details of where the roof would be flashed into the vertical part, how is it going to be held together, and how it will be supported and secured to the existing roof. He suggested used galvanized sheet metal. Mr. Tanner addressed item #7, the roof membrane and asked if it would have to support people standing and walking on it. Mr. Bridges explained that it was designed as a balcony. Ms. Carpenter requested detailed plans for this work and requested that more specifications and answers to questions concerning items #6 and #7 be provided.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the proposal for the M.G. Nelson House at 700 Remington Street for State Tax Credit with the following conditions: bring the LPC and staff more details and specifications on work to be done, methods, and materials where applicable. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoaglund, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

1320 West Oak, Marion Alice Parker/Frank P. Stover - Masonry Repair, Bruce Biggi, owner

Ms. Tunner introduced Mr. Biggi and passed pictures of the house around. Mr. Biggi presented the masonry repair work that was proposed for his property. The house was sand-blasted in the 1970's. The house has soft mortar joints. Mr. Biggi provided a crayon rubbing of the brick and mortar joints. He brought a sample of the mortar which contained large granules of sand. The original mortar probably contained sand from the Poudre River, and he will find a mortar which is close to the original. Sandblasting caused extensive erosion in the mortar joints, Mr. Biggi only plans on replacing the brick where it's cracked or chipping, around the planters in the front of the house. They would use old brick from Fort Collins. There is only one brick completely cracked through, but does not affect the mortar. A soft mortar will be applied to the house. An Akita 3/8" by 4" grinder will be used to clean out the joints at least to a half inch depth. Mr. Stratis described the three components of historic mortar as sand, portland, and lime, the lime being best to be a large percentage of the mix. He said that the joint depth should be 2.5 times the height of the joint and the mortar should be applied with a conventional concave strike tool. Some aspects to look at include, color, texture, concave strike, and strength or porosity. Mr. Stratis suggested mixing the mortar on site and testing it over night. Mr. Biggi said that an acid bath would be applied to clean the brick after the work was completed. Mr. Frick suggested a breathable sealer and asked what will be done with the leaking planter. Mr. Biggi said that they will pull out the existing liner, replace it with galvanized metal, and seal it off.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the Alice Parker/Frank P. Stover House at 1320 West Oak for State Tax Credit with the condition that the joints be created so that the mortar depth is one inch and a test patch will be approved by Mr. Frick. Mr. Frick seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

Landmark Preservation Meeting
Regular Meeting
May 14, 1996
Page 9

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Central Business District Survey - Review of Sixty Properties' Survey Forms

Postponed.

OTHER BUSINESS: None.

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Submitted by Nicole Sneider, Secretary

H:\ADVPLAN\HISTPRES\96_05_14.