

LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
December 12, 1995
Council Liaison: Gina Janett
Staff Liaison: Joe Frank
Commission Chairperson: Jennifer Carpenter - 225-0960

SUMMARY OF MEETING: Ms. Tunner announced that the National Trust has offered to co-sponsor the Timber Framing Workshop to be held as part of the Coy/Hoffman Barn restoration. A new awning was approved for Suehiro's Japanese Restaurant at 223 Linden Street. A remodel of the Sportsman's Bar for the expansion of the Silver Grill to 210 Walnut Street was approved with the requirement to paint any aluminum trim around the windows. Consultant, Sherry Albertson-Clark presented a copy of her report, a recommendation for the LPC, and a Resolution to designate public rights of way as part of the Historic Old Town Fort Collins Landmark District. This Resolution was approved by the LPC and will be presented to City Council for review and adoption. A draft document titled Anticipated Process for District Designation was discussed by the Commission and was open to public input. An open house welcoming more public opinion will be held January 16, 1995. Ms. Tunner also presented a CLG grant that she proposed for installing informational plaques at major entrance points into the Old Town District. The Commission was informed that the owner of 620 South Sherwood is seeking pre-approval for demolition of the property.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL: Commission Chairman Jennifer Carpenter called the meeting to order at 5:36 p.m., 281 N. College Avenue. Secretary, Nicole Sneider called the roll. Commission members Ruth Weatherford, Jean Kullman, Terence Hoaglund, James Tanner and Bud Frick were present. Per Hogestad was absent. Carol Tunner and Karen McWilliams represented staff. Joe Frank, also representing staff, was in attendance for the first hour.

GUESTS: Jeff Bridges, citizen; Sherry Albertson-Clark, consultant; and George Neil from Peterson Canvas and Awning attended the meeting.

AGENDA REVIEW: None.

STAFF REPORT: Ms. Tunner attended the recent designations meeting at the Colorado Historical Society. Seven Colorado State University buildings were placed on the State Register. The Wurl Ranch in Livermore was also added to the State Register of Historic Places from Larimer County. The site is a wonderful collection of old log and farm ranch buildings which are still in use.

The Assistant Director of the National Trust, Rocky Mountain Region, Mary Humstone, contacted Ms. Tunner concerning a Barn Again Program in Colorado and about sharing sponsorship of a workshop. They discussed the Coy - Hoffman Barn Grant and a Timber Framers Workshop being organized tentatively for next fall. The Timber Framers Guild of America has been invited to participate in this workshop about mortise and tenon construction. The National Trust would like to be a part of this program, put their name on it, and help publicize the project nationally. Mr. Frank also added that the city would like to be involved with the Coy - Hoffman Barn Project.

Ms. Tunner is discussing with Mr. Frank about a Certified Local Government grant proposed due Friday, December 15, 1995. Ms. McWilliams informed the Commission that the City will resubmit the East Side/West Side Survey Grant request to the State Historical Fund again. Ms. McWilliams learned from Lane Ittleson, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, why the grant had been turned down. He explained the grant proposal was not specific or explicit enough. He was under the impression the reconnaissance survey would only be conducted from the windshield of a car. He also informed Ms. McWilliams that only the cover sheet and the budget sheet are reviewed during the final rounds of awarding the CLG grant. He strongly suggested they reapply for the grant.

COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None.

CURRENT DESIGN REVIEW:

223 Linden Street (Reed - Dauth Building), Suehiro's Restaurant - New Awning

George Neil from Peterson Canvas and Awning presented that the awning is tubular construction aluminum and will be inserted into the arch of the door so as to not cover the transom glass. The new construction provides a much less imposing design than the previous awning. The awning is 60 inches by 30 inches high with a valence of 12 inches leaving the transom glass over the door visible. Mr. Neil would like to utilize lighting fixtures and the electrical connection which already exist under the awning. The light will be mounted onto the awning frame. Upon review of the design Mr. Frick discovered, that according to the measurements, the valence would indeed hang over the transom glass. Mr. Neil thinks he may have made a mistake on the drawings. He does not believe the way in which he intends to install the awning would cover the transom glass. He explained that the spring line of the awning, at approximately 30 inches, will be designed to meet the spring line of the window above the door. That bar should be where the valence ends. Mr. Frick explained the valence would hang between 13 to 14 inches down with the scallop design. Mr. Frick stated it's a question of where the valence hangs. Ms. Tunner

requested that the design be illustrated correctly on the approved plans. Mr. Frick added that a 12 inch valence, hanging below the spring line would work because from a human's perspective you can still see the numbers. Also, when the spring line of the awning matches the spring line of the other windows on the building it would reinforce the upper line of the windows along the facade for a better design. Mr. Neil's preference is to show the transom glass, but he believes he had illustrated the design incorrectly. The awning frame bar should be shown at the bottom of the valence just below the transom bar at about 42 inches so the glass will be exposed. Ms. Tunner requested the right dimensions from Mr. Neil as soon as he can measure and call them in.

Mr. Tanner moved to accept the proposed awning at Suehiro's Restaurant as amended by the modified drawings, seconded by Ms. Weatherford. Yeas: Tanner, Weatherford, Carpenter, Hoaglund, Kullman. Nays: Frick.

210 Walnut Street (Silver Grill, former Sportsman's Bar) - Storefront Renovation

Mr. Bud Frick moved to serve as the applicant's architect. Ms. Tunner reviewed the elevation drawings and spoke with the owner, Mr. John Arnolfo. The legend items to be reviewed and approved this evening include #2 and #3. Items #1,4,5,6 will be done next year. Mr. Arnolfo wants to just open his business and provide more natural light in the restaurant. Mr. Frick stated there is nothing significant about the Miami Brick on the front of the facade of the building and explained that larger windows would provide more light for the restaurant. Steel lintels exist over the windows which are hard to saw through so it would be expensive to make the windows taller. This may be done in the future in an overall renovation back to the original Uneeda Lunch Building. There is nothing historic about the building today. It would be much easier to extend the windows down to provide more light. The door which exists is proposed to stay there with the aluminum frame but the wood paneling would be removed and replaced with glass. This change is addressed on the plan but is not described in the legend. Ms. Tunner noted that it should be added to elevation legend to cut in new windows in the doorway with tempered glass in an aluminum frame to match height and details of the front windows.

Mr. Tanner expressed the concerns of the Commission about the color of the aluminum around the window and adding more aluminum material to the windows. The height of the window was less of a concern for the commission if it means tearing out the steel lintels. Ms. Carpenter questioned whether the building is contributing or non-contributing. Ms. Tunner explained one map showed the building as historically significant and another map showed it with secondary importance. It is an historically contributing building but the facade has been altered. It was determined that the building should still be considered a contributing building. Mr. Frick explained this is only enlarging windows on a non-historic storefront. Mr. Tanner explained that under Section #1 of the guidelines, if it is a contributing building then criteria #36 applies for color which should be compatible and

create a unity in the design. If the building falls under Section #2 as new construction or a renovation of an existing structure that is not designated as historic, then the only criteria which applies is #42 where maintaining the storefront is optional. Mr. Tanner is concerned with allowing more aluminum to be added when the commission has been discouraging the addition of more aluminum.

Mr. Hoaglund believes the aluminum will not show up too much. Ms. Tunner explained the aluminum can be painted. Mr. Frick pointed out the aluminum does match the existing windows on the Silver Grill. Ms. Carpenter said this was irrelevant when you are introducing new materials. According to the map on the inside of the Historic Old Town Guidelines it is a contributing building so this proposal should be considered under Section #1.

Mr. Frick pointed out there is an existing aluminum frame on the door and he does not want to see the metal door with non-matching painted metal trim on the windows. Ms. Carpenter suggested to paint the aluminum door as well. Mr. Frick said this may cause a maintenance problem. Ms. Carpenter explained the project still falls under Section #1 of the guidelines. Mr. Tanner explained the building is contributing to an historic district and relates to the character of the district. Materials and design as referred to related buildings or the original construction should be used. He said it is important to not set a precedent in approving the alteration of a contributing building in a way in which it will not fit in with the character of the street. The paint that will be used will match the white color used on the existing Silver Grill.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve items #2,3,7 on the application for the remodeling of 210 Walnut Street with the requirement that the aluminum windows be painted white, seconded by Ms. Kullman, and passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Historic Old Town Boundaries - Sherry Albertson-Clark, Consultant

Ms. McWilliams introduced Ms. Albertson-Clark to present the findings of her study concerning the HOT Boundaries. Public rights-of-way were never designated. In 1979, in the original designation, the map included in the ordinance showed the public rights-of-way. According to the City Attorney's office it was really the legal description which controlled the districting and it showed only lots as designated. Ms. McWilliams explained that to clear up any confusion, all public rights-of-way should be designated.

Ms. Albertson-Clark's research indicates that the typical way of doing business in the district has been for the LPC to review projects which affect the right-of-way. These projects include proposals such as the Food Co-Op adding planters and benches, the Old

Town Square in its entirety, and the plaza area. Over the years, it was assumed these areas were included in the district. This proposal to designate the public rights-of-way and to incorporate them in the district would not change how business is being done there now or the way in which the LPC reviews projects in those areas.

Notices were sent out to all property owners in the district and they were invited to attend an open house on December 5, 1995. One person attended, Bob Smith, Director of the Storm Water Utility. He was concerned if this would have an impact on his ability to do storm water projects. Ms. McWilliams said no one has called her since the open house. Ms. Albertson-Clark explained this resolution formalizes a process which has already been happening for a number of years.

It will be recommended to Council to adopt the resolution for district designation. This designation will not include lots that were originally not included. These lots can be designated individually by each owner. Ms. Alberston-Clark did recommend setting up a procedure to amend designations in the future. Ms. Albertson-Clark provided a copy of her report and recommendation to the LPC, the resolution to be presented to council, and a legal description of the HOT Fort Collins Landmark District, which was changed to read "curb-line" instead of "face" of the sidewalk.

Mr. Frick moved to approve the resolution designating certain public rights-of-way to become part of the Historic Old Town Fort Collins Landmark District, seconded by Ms. Weatherford, and passed unanimously.

Districting Process for Local Landmark Districts by Karen McWilliams

Ms. McWilliams presented for discussion the draft of the Anticipated Process for District Designation. At this time this process does not require a motion, but was open to questions and suggestions. Mr. Tanner requested a description, from the last page of the document, of "what constitutes an individually eligible, contributing, or non-contributing building". He asked what constitutes enough of a difference to make a building contributing or individually eligible. Ms. McWilliams stated that under individually eligible buildings there is minimal alteration and contributing buildings may have experienced more alteration. She stressed that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards are open for interpretation. Ms. Carpenter stated that these guidelines only seem to address architectural significance and not historic significance or integrity criteria related to historic significance. Ms. McWilliams agreed and said she would keep the same guidelines for architectural integrity and she will add a section on historic significance. She will try to use the same categories including property that would be individually eligible, contributing, and non-contributing. She will see if she can apply those same three levels to historic significance. Mr. Tanner assumed this process may be leading up to a document which staff would be sending out to residents and that's why some clear examples should be

provided in the documentation. Ms. McWilliams said this will be the process which goes to Council and will be adopted with the East Side/West Side Design Guidelines and Standards. She would not like to see many examples in here because it will be included as part of the ordinance. Instead, this information may be included in a brochure which could provide clear examples and explanations for the reader. Mr. Tanner noted under "why should I want my eligible property designated" in the document, there was an omission of what some of the negative impacts may be. Ms. McWilliams stated that the protection measures are the downside. The document explains that before a property owner makes any changes he/she must come to the LPC for review. This requirement protects the structure from being altered inappropriately. The document was written not to create restrictions but at the same time not to ignore that there is some level of review and approval to be sought by the property owner. Ms. Carpenter reminded the Commission that this document is not the education process, but lays out the process for designating districts. Council wanted this process to be considered along side the East Side/West Side Design Guidelines.

Ms. Carpenter discussed character areas with the Commission. In conversation with Ms. Rheba Massey it was discovered that #2 in the draft document covers character areas and they are also covered in the East Side/West Side Guidelines. Character areas should be discussed carefully. For example, when you suggest an area is important because of the homes being significant because they are predominately from the 1920's, there may be individual homes from other dates on the same block. Important historic features need to be identified for all styles in order to solve this problem. Character areas help to show what characters should be included in new construction on an infill structure. Ms. McWilliams did not want to put too much emphasis on labeling character areas which may take away significance from a residence which does not necessarily fit in with the others around it. Ms. Tunner added there are always intrusions and no character areas can be considered pure.

Mr. Jeff Bridges provided citizen input to the discussion. He suggested establishing a hierarchy of classification for historic designation which explains the criteria of significance. This may help residents better understand what is historically significant and what is worth saving through non-consensual designation. His classification system includes these categories in hopes to maximize what you can consider contributing: Individually Eligible, Qualified, Established, Potential, Complimentary, and Non-Contributing. For example, qualified means the structure meets three standards for significance and potential means the structure is non-contributing in its present state but can be restored to be contributing. Mr. Bridges feels people can better understand these descriptions to know where they stand and how they can be designated. He also addressed the issue of protection. People should be educated about what they can gain from protection around their individual lot and that they are not just being restricted. For

example views from your own property may be protected. It was also suggested to include notification when people are closing on property in an historic district.

Ms. Carpenter responded to Mr. Bridges that significance will be determined during the survey. She also suggested that advantages of protection measures will be addressed in the education program. Ms. McWilliams informed the Commission that historic designation is recorded on the title of the property and a designation carries on through different owners. Ms. Weatherford suggested that real estate companies can also be educated about historic significance and designation. Ms. Carpenter summed up the discussion by expressing that the Commission and staff feel more comfortable with using the guidelines and standards that were created by the Secretary of the Interior and are being used all over the country. This system has been time tested and you don't want to open yourself up for legal problems. Ms. Weatherford feels education is the solution, this way everyone will understand the language and process.

Ms. Carpenter informed the Commission that there will be an open house January 16, 1995 where this information will be available to the public. She also suggested making a work session in January into a meeting in order to get more public input before the LPC finalizes the process and votes on it.

OTHER BUSINESS:

HOT District Plaques

Ms. Tunner plans to apply for some money to do some plaquing for the Historic Old Town District. Large plaques will be installed on posts reading "now entering historic district" with a map. It will also provide information on when the property was designated as a Local Landmark or as a National Register District. The plaque will also read "design review administered by the Landmark Preservation Commission". The Commission was very pleased with this idea and feels it will help to provide more education on historic districts for the community and visitors. The plaques will cost \$1500 each and are made of cast bronze. Some areas for the plaques include major entrance points at the Northern Hotel, the Avery Building, and the Union Pacific Depot. One problem to be considered is that the National Register District extends past the Local Landmark District. The Commission also pointed out that over time as the National Register District or Local Landmark District change, the maps will no longer be accurate. Mr. Frick suggested eliminating the map from the design of the plaque to avoid this problem.

620 South Sherwood

Ms. McWilliams said the owner of this residence is anxious to demolish the building. He has requested that the LPC consider preliminary approval for demolition. He is seeking pre-approval so that he has some assurance that the LPC will not pursue non-consensual

Landmark Preservation Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
December 12, 1995
Page 8

designation of the property. Mr. Hoaglund stated that the code is very clear and they can not give pre-approval. The LPC declined to hear the owner's case without the process being followed through. The process is to hear the demolition request after the applicant has an approved plan.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Submitted by Nicole Sneider, Secretary.