

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

**Special Meeting**

**July 6, 1995**

**Council Liaison: Gina Janett**

**Staff Liaison: Joe Frank**

**SUMMARY OF MEETING: The LPC discussed the East Side/West Side Design Guidelines.**

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:**

Commission Chairman Jennifer Carpenter called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m., 281 North College Avenue. Staff, Carol Tunner, called the roll. Commission members Jennifer Carpenter, Terrence Hoaglund, Per Hogestad, Jean Kullman, James Tanner, and Ruth Weatherford were present. Bud Frick was absent. Council liaison, Gina Janett was present. Joe Frank, Carol Tunner and Karen McWilliams represented staff. Ms. Rheba Massey, Local History Coordinator, attended.

**STAFF REPORT**

Ms. Tunner reported that the Coy/Hoffman Barn has been placed on the State Register. She also reported on a proposed handicapped ramp between the street and sidewalk in front of the Avery Carriage House. Because it is outside the landmark boundary, it is not necessary to bring it to the LPC for review, but Wendy Irving-Mills, Planner/Architect from City Facilities, wanted Ms. Tunner to discuss it and see if any Commission member wanted to comment. Ms. Irving-Mills is willing to make a presentation if required.

Ms. Tunner described the proposed ramp as going in on the north end of an existing old driveway cut in front of the carriage house. Using the cut already in place when the building was a carriage house is cost effective and least obtrusive historic character of the building. Ms. Tunner recommends the project and has advised Ms. Irving-Mills not to destroy any historic fabric of the driveway cut that might preclude coming back later and using the cut as a carriage way to the Avery Carriage House. Ms. Tunner believes that the Poudre Landmarks Foundation has a long-range plan to reconstruct the exterior appearance of the house as a carriage house. The Commission members present had no concerns about the current proposal to use the driveway cut for a handicapped ramp.

**COMMISSION MEMBERS REPORTS**

There were none.

**EAST SIDE/WEST SIDE DESIGN GUIDELINES**

Mr. Tanner began the discussion by going through the guidelines and noting where he thought changes should be made. He will make his corrections available.

The Commission then discussed where they might be in agreement on the guidelines and

discussion focused on the historic section. Color was an issue that was not of much concern because it was reversible.

Ms. Janett suggested beginning with a clean slate over the historic district boundaries. She wanted to see boundaries linked with a process and criteria that still needs to be developed. A process and criteria was then the center of discussion.

Ms. Massey suggested a system of review that they had used at the Wyoming State Historic Preservation office. This rating listed major contributors, contributing, non-intrusive, non-contributing, and non-contributing because of age. Buildings that were high style evoked full review for any changes, those that were classified as vernacular only had review of major additions. She will provide a copy of their system. The LPC was in agreement that the East Side/West Side Guidelines document needed major editing to make the document clear and consistent, and that three levels of review seemed appropriate: individually eligible, contributing, and non-contributing.

The commission discussed doing a reconnaissance survey of the East Side and West Side Neighborhoods to include photographs, survey report with how many of each type style, and a field assessment of integrity. Ms. McWilliams stated that for 3,000 structures at \$25 each, a survey of that magnitude would cost \$75,000.

Mr. Tanner said that the ES/WS document was so specific and detailed; he was concerned that “we” understand it but to people who do not know about preservation, it may be jumbled. Ms. Janett told the commission to think about the market for the document and consider if this was the place to put in this level of detail. Ms. Carpenter agreed and stated that the public couldn’t reach a level of comfort with the document because they couldn’t determine how they would be affected by it. She questioned if different levels of review would be desirable, but conceded that it could lessen the workload and be less restrictive. State tax credit and grant program applicants would be submitted to the higher level of review.

The commission focused on what presentation they would make to the City Council at the scheduled worksession on the design guidelines to be held July 11. The following changes/recommendations were noted:

1. Make editorial changes including consistent use of terms, get rid of references to specific districts. Chart A and Chart B to be deleted.
2. Recommend that paint color and landscaping be voluntary compliance.
3. Add a definition of contributing/non-contributing and modify the document by adding a three level system of review: individually eligible, contributing to a district, and non-contributing. The introduction to the historic guidelines section should be expanded and incentives emphasized. The goal is to offer the most incentives with the least amount of regulation possible but still give protection to historic structures.
4. Perform a reconnaissance survey of the ES/WS neighborhoods by December 31, 1996, including field assessments of eligibility. Part of this recommendation would be to include the funding to do this residential survey.

5. Recommend a code change to lay out a district designation process (with sample) and include the caveat of no non-consensual district designations.
6. LPC recommends City Council extend the alley house moratorium pertaining to minimum lot size in the NCM zone.
7. The LPC does not want to see the historic and non-historic buildings sections of the document separated. It would make the program lose momentum and because they were written together, they were meant to be adopted as a unit.

The commission was in agreement on these points. Ms. Janett recommended selling the program on the incentives, that is, offering the most incentives with the least regulation possible.

Mr. Hogestad moved approval of the listed recommendations to City Council on the East Side/West Side Design Guidelines. Mr. Hoaglund seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Frank pointed out that at the next Tuesday night LPC worksession with City Council, this item would be second on the agenda so the LPC should adjourn their July 11 meeting at about 7:00 p.m. to attend the worksession at City Hall.

The LPC discussed changing their meeting date so that the Council Liaison could attend and Mr. Frank would not have the similar conflict. First and third Wednesdays were not available for Ms. Janett. Second and fourth Wednesdays were suggested. After discussion, it was decided that no change could be made to the meeting date.

Meeting adjourned 8:15 p.m.

In the absence of a secretary, the minutes were recorded by Carol Tunner.