

LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

September 12, 1995

Council Liaison: Gina Janett

Staff Liaison: Joe Frank

SUMMARY OF MEETING: The Commission approved replacement transom windows for 221-227 Jefferson Street (the Jefferson Block), the masonry cleaning for 201 S. College (the Old Post Office) and a rear brick patio at 243 Jefferson. The Commission reviewed the local landmark eligibility of 508 W. Olive. The Commission approved door and porch skirt changes to a renovation at 518 Peterson which is a State Tax Credit proposal and is receiving a Landmark Rehabilitation Grant. The Commission approved an awning recover at #23 Old Town Square.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

Commission Chairman Jennifer Carpenter called the meeting to order at 5:37 pm, 281 North College Avenue. Secretary Kristen Krueger led the roll. Commission members Jennifer Carpenter, Per Hogestad, Jean Kullman, James Tanner, and Terance Hoaglund were present. Ruth Weatherford and Bud Frick were absent. Joe Frank, Carol Tunner and Karen McWilliams represented staff.

GUESTS: Mr. Jake Strouse, owner of 221-227 Jefferson; Mr. Dick Hill, architect for the Old Post Office project; Mr. Jeff Bridges, a member of the Centennial Neighborhood Association; Wally Walberg, owner of 243 Jefferson and Ms. Kathryn Malers, owner of 518 Peterson.

AGENDA REVIEW: No changes.

STAFF REPORT:

Ms. Tunner announced that a community reception for NEH scholars will be held Thursday, September 28th in the Museum courtyard from 5:15 to 6:30. The objective of the NEH scholars' visit is part of a grant the Fort Collins Museum received to establish permanent exhibits in the museum dealing with the history of Fort Collins since World War II. All LPC members are invited.

Ms. Tunner distributed information from the City Clerk's Office requesting a 1996 work plan for the LPC and on amendments to the charter as proposed by a Charter Review Committee. The LPC is invited to make suggestions for changes to the charter.

Ms. Tunner also distributed the annual Board and Commission manuals

Mr. Frank reported that the City Manager's recommended budget for 1996 includes \$80,000 for historic preservation. This is the amount that had been recommended by the LPC; \$40,000 will be used for survey and landmark designation of the East Side/West Side Neighborhoods. The remaining money will be earmarked for continuation of the

Rehabilitation Grant Program, Design Assistance Program, education and awareness programs and additional survey, identification and prioritization of historic structures. The LPC was encouraged to mobilize support to speak in favor of this recommended budget at the budget hearing.

At the next work session, the LPC will be taking a visual preference survey which will take about an hour.

Ms. McWilliams reported speaking to Stan Whitaker from G.T. Land and Eldon Ward from CityScape. Both will attend the LPC meeting on September 26 to discuss their plans for the Preston Farm. Ms. Carpenter mentioned that the Historic Fort Collins Development Corporation Board will also be attending the meeting to hear the presentation.

COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS: None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

July 25th meeting, change on top of page 2: Mr. Frank (not Mr. Tanner) announced ribbon cutting ceremony.

Page 5- The vote was not unanimous as recalled by Mr. Tanner.

Ms. Kullman made the motion to approve the July 25th meeting minutes as corrected, Mr. Tanner seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

CURRENT DESIGN REVIEW:

221-227 JEFFERSON-TRANSOM WINDOWS REPLACEMENT

Plans for transom windows to be installed above new Anderson windows on the second floor of 221-227 Jefferson were presented by the building owner, Mr. Jacob Strouse. These seven transom windows are replacements for wood infill that was recently placed above the new Anderson windows when they didn't properly fill the historic window frames. Mr. Hogestad said that from just looking at the plans they appear to really be lacking some dimensions and that the plans are only showing a general profile with no details. Mr. Hogestad said that he could not tell from the drawing if the transom windows would match the Anderson windows below. Mr. Strouse assured him that the transoms would match exactly. Mr. Hogestad then asked how the sill of the transom would fit on the Anderson window. Mr. Strouse referred to his plan which showed two alternatives. He explained that he built the first sill with a 15 degree pitch to match the sill of the Anderson window; Mr. Strouse said that it looked terrible and did not have the strength the window needed so he abandoned the first alternate. He then built the second alternative which is identical to the jamb and the head of the Anderson window. Mr. Strouse then presented a prototype

of the transom. Ms. Carpenter asked what the variances would be on the transom. Using the prototype, Mr. Strouse explained that the transom window replacement would have variances less than 1/8", 3/16" at most. Mr. Strouse pointed out that the Anderson window has a special groove for a screen; he did not put this groove on the transom because it would weaken the wood frame and no screen would be installed on the transom. Mr. Strouse explained that the sill of the transom essentially matched its jamb and head except for a 5 degree bevel for drainage. The frame will be 1-7/8"; a reveal along the side of the transom is similar to the Anderson window within 1/8".

Mr. Strouse then explained that the Anderson window has a brown plastic 1-1/8" seal for its glazing. If the transom window is to match the Anderson window, a brown border will need to be painted on the glass. Mr. Strouse explained that a moulding has been set at the top of the transom. Ms. Carpenter asked if the face of the glazing on the transom is in the same plane as the glazing of the Anderson window. Mr. Strouse said that the face of the glazing and the face of the frame of the transom are identical to those of the Anderson window.

Ms. Carpenter and Mr. Hogestad expressed concern in not having reliable dimensioned drawings to document the existing conditions for comparison with the plans for the new transoms. Mr. Hogestad asked Mr. Strouse to make a note on his plan to assure the LPC that the transom would match the Anderson window. Ms. Carpenter also requested that Mr. Strouse make a note that the planes of the glass and frame in the transom be flush with those of the Anderson window. Mr. Hogestad asked Mr. Strouse to include that the reveal match the Anderson reveal as close as possible. Ms. Tunner asked if the brown painted strip around the transom will be hard to maintain. Mr. Strouse pointed out that paint on glass is very long lasting.

Mr. Hogestad asked if the glass was tinted in the Anderson window. Mr. Strouse said that it was not.

Mr. Hogestad moved that the application be accepted with notations that the profile of frames exactly match the Anderson window, the plane of the glazing is aligned on both the transom window and Anderson window, that the jambs (or rails) be aligned as close as possible, and that a brown 1-1/8" strip be painted around the windows to match the "stop" on the Anderson windows.

Mr. Strouse reiterated that the modifications to the style do not match the Anderson window sill exactly. This statement was positively acknowledged by the LPC.

Mr. Hoaglund seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

201 S. COLLEGE, OLD POST OFFICE - MASONRY CLEANING

Mr. Dick Hill, architect for the OneWest Art Center, had previously submitted a multi-part application to the LPC for repairs and restoration of the Old Post Office (August 8, 1995.) Now he was presenting a limestone cleaning proposal for the building. His specifications call for compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Ms. Carpenter said that the proposal was self-explanatory. Mr. Hill indicated that he understood that sandblasting was not an acceptable procedure for cleaning masonry as stated by the Secretary's Standard #7, and that there would be no sandblasting used on this project. He indicated that the type of masonry cleaning that is specified for this project is Sure Klean Limestone Prewash, a ProSoCo product, or its equivalent (as per the submitted product data sheet.) He explained that it is a detergent type cleaning agent that will gently be applied with a light spray from a pressure washer with a fan tip. The Sure Klean will be used to remove the soil from the stone; it is specially formulated for brick granite, and limestone. The prewash will be used on the most heavily soiled portions of the building. The whole building will be washed with the limestone restorer or afterwash which will clean and brighten up all of the limestone. No post wash is needed.

Mr. Hill said the granite base was covered with earth before 1975 and there is still a soil line on the stone. He said that the base would all be cleaned with the Sure Klean Restoration Cleaner. It is a heavier washing agent than the prewash and it will fortunately be used below the limestone which it might damage. Mr. Hill noted that his specifications provide for protection of vegetation at the base of the building and for cars parked near the building during the cleaning process. Mr. Hill stated that the firm who applies the product must have three years experience in this process and five jobs equivalency within those three years.

The mortar that will be used to repair mortar joints will be a prepackaged colored mortar specifically designed for restoration work. The holes that had been drilled for the post office sign will be patched with this material. Mr. Hill stated that the color of the mortar will have to be an exact match before he allows any patching to be done. He mentioned that the large chip in the cornerstone will not be patched because it tells the story of how the building was almost demolished.

Stripable masking will be used on the windows and specific weather conditions will be required for building cleaning process.

Mr. Tanner moved approval of the cleaning process. Mr. Hogestad seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

243 JEFFERSON, MARLEN'S TIRE - Rear Patio Addition

Ms. Tunner introduced Wally Walberg form Marlen's Tire. Ms. Tunner distributed pictures

of the back of Mr. Walberg's building. She explained that Mr. Walberg is proposing to turn the rear portion of the building into an apartment for himself and then build a brick patio around the back of it that will be similar to the patio next door to the west.

Mr. Walberg said that he basically wants to put up a brick patio like the one next door to his building using the same brick. Ms. Tunner mentioned that one difference will be that Mr. Walberg's patio will have an arched door and gate going into it, as shown in the submitted drawings.

Ms. Kullman moved to accept the application to build the brick patio. Mr. Hoagland seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

508 W. OLIVE, PRE-CONCEPTUAL MEETING FOR POSSIBLE GRANT APPLICANT

Ms. McWilliams presented the LPC with photos and a survey of this property for evaluation of eligibility for local landmark designation. She explained that the owners are interested in local designation, and in applying for a rehabilitation grant and the State Tax Credit.

Ms. McWilliams explained that the house has not been altered very much. She said that the front porch, which may appear boxed-in and not original in photos, appears to be original when studied in the field. It has the original siding and window treatments just like the rest of the house. It is possible that the porch was boxed-in not long after the house was built. A muntin in the central window has been removed causing the window to not appear as it originally did. The inappropriate shutters have been removed. The house next door has the same floor plan but does not have an enclosed porch as this one does.

Ms. Carpenter mentioned that we must be careful not to water down the designation process by designating buildings that are not individually eligible but would contribute historically to a district, but she also felt that if the house was eligible it would be protected which might be helpful in designating that neighborhood.

Mr. Tanner mentioned that this may be a way of protecting the neighborhoods because of the unlikelihood of a district being formed. He said this may be the only alternative to saving the neighborhoods because of the difficulty of districting.

Mr. Hogestad said that if it is eligible it will be eligible because of its architectural style.

Mr. Jeff Bridges mentioned that the owners bought the home with intentions of protecting its historical integrity.

Mr. Tanner mentioned that something does not have to be exceptional to be made a landmark, but that there must be a reference point to base the designation on. Ms. Tunner read the definition of landmark from the Fort Collins Code .

Ms. McWilliams proposed the possibility of various thematic designations based upon architectural styles.

The house was built in 1927, and Mr. Bridges suggested finding the 1948 photo which should be at the library.

Ms. McWilliams said the owner wishes to put gutters up to protect the foundation. The owner had asked how to do this without covering the rafter tails which are an element of the style of the house. Mr. Hogestad mentioned that you would not see the ends of the rafter tails if gutters were applied, but that they are necessary. The LPC discussed the application of different gutters and Mr. Hoaglund suggested perimeter drains as featured on a This Old House episode.

Ms. McWilliams mentioned that the owner would also like to apply for the rehabilitation grant monies to restore the garage as well.

518 PETERSON, B.F. AYERS HOUSE - CHANGES TO COMPREHENSIVE REHABILITATION

Ms. Tunner explained that there were necessary changes that needed to be made to the LPC approved rehab project at 518 Peterson, which is a Landmark Rehabilitation Grant and State Tax Credit project. She referred to the letter submitted by Ms. Kate Malers. Ms. Tunner said that the changes are self-explanatory and simple. She recommended their approval by the LPC, but that they might give the applicant some direction on the porch skirt.

Ms. Malers stated that the approved door is not in keeping with the style of the house, and she has found a more suitable alternate. She showed drawings that she had done which made it clear that the screen door and approved front door would not be compatible. Ms. Malers proposed taller glass in the front door because it is what most foursquare houses in town have and is more acceptable than the originally approved door.

Ms. Malers said that they had gotten into the project and discovered that the fascia boards on the porch were rotted and needed to be replaced while they were accessible. She explained that she needs to use the grant money for the fascia now and work on the proposed and approved picture window at a later time. They have not made a decision on attic ventilation at this time.

Damaged siding has been replaced and the corner boards are being put back together. The crown mouldings under the roof cornice do not match on all four sides of the house, and that will need to be fixed so that all four sides are the same. The moulding under the gutter may give the answer for choosing the correct crown moulding.

Ms. Malers said they are having a problem with covering the concrete slab foundation of the porch. Ms. Carpenter suggested plantings around the slab (possibly Honeysuckle). She is proposing to do a painted porch skirt on the concrete. Mr. Tanner suggested that painting might make it appear too busy and suggested just planting flowers around it. Mr. Hogestad suggested painting one strip along the top of the concrete to give the appearance of a board. Mr. Hoaglund agreed with plantings. Mr. Tanner suggested keeping it simple.

Mr. Hoaglund made a motion to approve the project revisions. Mr. Hogestad seconded the motion. Ms. Carpenter stated that she was concerned about painting the porch skirt. The application passed with a unanimous vote.

#E-23, SUITE #153, COOPER AND COOPER FINE JEWELERS' - AWNING RECOVER

Ms. Tunner showed the LPC a sample of a burgundy fabric that would be installed at the entrance to the Cooper and Cooper Fine Jewelers store. It is an existing awning frame recover.

A motion was made by Mr. Tanner approve the proposal as submitted. Ms. Kullman seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Ms. Carpenter said that she was asked to attend a meeting once a month for planning for the new civic center. Ms. Carpenter cannot attend and asked for a volunteer. Mr. Hoaglund said that he was already on the committee and would represent the LPC.

The meeting adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

Submitted by Kristen Krueger, Secretary.