

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**Special Regular Meeting**  
**June 27, 1995**  
**Council Liaison: Gina Janett**  
**Staff Liaison: Joe Frank**

**SUMMARY OF MEETING:** The LPC approved the historic designation of 628 West Mountain, the Sadler House; heard a conceptual review of 425 East Elizabeth, the Spencer House; and approved the work to be done at 2513 West Prospect, the Brown Farm and Cunningham Corner Barn as part of the Rehabilitation Grant Program and for State Tax credit. The Commission then discussed the East Side/West Side Design Guidelines.

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:**

Commission Chairman Jennifer Carpenter called the meeting to order at 5:35 pm, 281 North College Avenue. Secretary Diane Slater called the roll. Commission members Jennifer Carpenter, Bud Frick (arrived at 5:55 pm), Per Hogestad, James Tanner, and Ruth Weatherford were present. Mr. Frank arrived at 6:05 pm. Jean Kullman was absent.

**GUESTS:** Randy Rahne, owner of 628 West Mountain Avenue; Rheba Massey, Local History Coordinator, Library; Karla Oceanak, owner of 425 East Elizabeth; Brad Pace, owner of 2513 West Prospect.

**STAFF REPORTS:** Mr. Carl McWilliams was found to have a conflict of interest by the Ethics Board because his wife, Karen McWilliams, is now a City Employee making staff recommendations to the LPC, so he is no longer a member of the LPC effective immediately.

**AGENDA REVIEW:** Ms. Carpenter moved on to 628 West Mountain Avenue first. Reports and minutes were heard later in the meeting.

**APPROVAL OF APRIL 25, 1995 MINUTES:**  
Minutes were approved as read.

**DESIGNATIONS:**

628 WEST MOUNTAIN

Ms. McWilliams gave the staff report.

**Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the local landmark designation of 628 West Mountain Avenue and Mr. Hogestad seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**DESIGN REVIEW:**

**425 EAST ELIZABETH, GEORGE AND ANNIE SPENCER HOUSE, KARLA OCEANAK**

Ms. Tunner said that the Commission could consider this a conceptual or pre-conceptual review. Ms. Oceanak said that she would like a final review by mid-July. She presented plans for the proposed porch reconstruction. She showed photos from 1908 and 1938 on which the porch drawings are based. They are removing the current stoop but would like to maintain a side entrance as well as maintaining the main entrance. There will still be a small side entrance for daily access since there is a sidewalk which accesses the side porch. They will be doing some landscaping, probably with flagstone. Mr. Frick asked about the materials and Ms. Oceanak said they will use redwood, the floor will be tongue and groove fir, cedar roof shingles on the front part where there is a steeper pitch, and a roll roof further back where it won't be seen. Mr. Frick asked if they had considered other roofing than roll roofing and she said she was relying on her contractor. He suggested two alternatives: a tin roof standing seam or rubber membrane roof, sheets which are welded together (EPDM). Mr. Tanner said roll roofing will not last and Mr. Frick said they should spend more on the roof to preserve it better. She said they have four and one half inch diameter posts and will be putting on gutters. Mr. Frick asked if they would be regular or round gutters and she said they had not yet decided. Ms. Tunner said that half round gutters tend to trap water which freezes and pulls off the gutter. Ms. Oceanak showed the molding details. The drawing shows the upper and lower balusters, and will be using 2 inch stock. The fretwork is of separate pieces, as are the icicles. Mr. Tanner asked about the railing height and she said they would need a variance to change it. The lower porch will be 30 inches off the ground so therefore does not require a handrail or balustrade.

Ms. Oceanak said they took off the aluminum siding last year. They picked neutral complementing colors. The colors to be used are Nimbus White for the second story gable end; Foothills Brown for the main trim; Pink Beige for the body; and the sash will be Rookwood Red. They will use lighter colors for the body, a grey and an off-white for the trim. She is undecided about painting the detail work. Ms. Tunner suggested approving the body and trim color and placing the trim color at the owner's discretion. Ms. Carpenter requested that Ms. Oceanak let people know that this work is a reconstruction of what was there rather than a new non-historic addition.

Ms. Massey asked if she would like to re-apply for the state grant program (S.H.F.) and Ms. Oceanak said they need to proceed with the work now. She asked about suggestions for lighting fixtures since they were not used then but would like the porch to be well lit. She is considering mounting some downward point fixtures with a globe of etched glass on either side of the front door, at either side of the window by the front bay, and having a drop fixture over in the seating area. Ms. Carpenter suggested an obvious contemporary fixture rather than a Victorian type fixture. Ms. Oceanak said the contemporary fixtures seemed inappropriate. Mr. Tanner suggested recessed lighting. Ms. Oceanak said she liked the look of lighting along the face of the porch. Ms. Carpenter said down-lighting can be warm. Mr. Tanner suggested a low profile light with a colored glass. Ms. Tunner said that the Guidelines say that either simplifying details or using new materials which do not call attention to themselves is recommended. Ms. Oceanak said her preferred fixtures are rather

simple. Mr. Frick asked about location and said that he would suggest being decorative where there would have been a light, such as by the door, and using the more subdued or recessed light at other spots. Mr. Hogestad did not want to use cans and suggested globes. Ms. Carpenter agreed that was what she had in mind.

No landscape plan is required for the LPC or the state tax credit. Mr. Hogestad said he thought the proposed materials seemed appropriate. Ms. Carpenter asked if anyone had a problem with the proposed lighting. Ms. Oceanak would like the front door lit, which is on the east side, as well as a light on either side of the front door. Mr. Hogestad said he recommended decorative fixtures such as she has selected by the west front door and some more recessed sort of lighting for the rest of the porch. The LPC agreed this would be the best solution. Ms. Weatherford said she felt that too many fixtures would look cluttered.

Ms. Oceanak will return next month with the site plan. Mr. Frick said she will need a site plan for the building permit. The LPC would like to see vertical dimension lines, a colored elevation, and 3 copies of the site plan.

#### 2513 WEST PROSPECT, BROWN FARM, CUNNINGHAM CORNER BARN

Mr. Pace is the recipient of a Rehabilitation Grant. The barn windows and trim will be Clovelly Mist and the panels for the doors of the barn will be Berber Ivory. The porch deck, which is now painted gray, will be Coffee Rose. Three doors on the barn will be replaced--a damaged back door and the two front doors. The sliding door will match the one on the other side. The tracks are not running well so he will fix those so the doors will slide. He proposes to match the slider door concept with vertical tongue and groove on the door, which currently does not match since it is more recent. The opening above the door is 48 and a half by 46 and a half inches and is a loft window which swings open. The plan is to hinge it in two places on the right side so it will swing in for access. It will also have hinges across the center with chains so the top half will fold in for ventilation. Usually, it will hang open to cool the loft. Mr. Tanner asked if it will have glass and Mr. Pace said it will have four square lights and be cedar since the siding and doors are cedar. Mr. Frick asked if it will have a glazing compound. Mr. Pace said the door will not be glazed and thinks probably this one will also not be but could be. Mr. Frick said if it is not glazed in then the water will get between the glass and wood so Mr. Pace said he thought glazing was a good idea. Ms. Carpenter asked what was there originally and Ms. Tunner asked if he had any historic pictures. He said he looked at other barns to see what they did and he found the four panel windows on other barns. There are other windows on the second floor of the barn. This four panel look will match the other existing windows. Mr. Frick said he didn't think originally there would have been a window there but rather that this opening would have been added later and is not an original barn opening. Ms. Massey said that some Wyoming barns have openings which would have a little wood door on them. Some may have panes but are stationary windows. Mr. Pace is discussing a hopper window, which she has not seen on a barn. Mr. Pace said the purpose is to let in ventilation and light to the upstairs, which is quite dark. The cupola will provide air flow. Ms. Massey said she thought using a door would be more

provide air flow. Ms. Massey said she thought using a door would be more appropriate for a barn. Mr. Pace is concerned about a door since children will be using the loft and Mr. Tanner and Mr. Frick said that they were concerned about glass with children. Mr. Frick suggested a Dutch door. Mr. Tanner suggested wired glass. A Dutch door would look similar to what would have been there. The door would have allowed a conveyer belt access. Mr. Hogestad felt the board in back style of door would match the other doors.

Mr. Pace said the other windows on the barn are 20" x 24". Half of the windows still have frame remnants with mullions which were smashed but apparently were vertical, with two glass panels. The horizontal mullion was false and placed on the inside of the window. Mr. Tanner said if Mr. Pace is to rebuild it like it was then that would be fine. Mr. Frick said he would make it four lights and glaze it. Mr. Pace said he would want hoppers on the window.

Mr. Pace said two repairs are being done to the porch. The front 23" of the floor deck is rotted on the outer side. Most of the deck was previously replaced in the front portions only and he proposes to replace the entire front of the first 23" on the decking. Mr. Frick asked if he could do every other board so the joints are staggered. He suggested maybe a 36" stagger on every other board. Mr. Hogestad said they would probably need to add blocking to stagger the board. Some boards could be at 18", some at 36" and others a third length so it would look like the entire porch was of a piece. The joists are installed perpendicular to the deck. Mr. Pace said he does not want to tear up the siding since these are tongue and groove. Mr. Frick said that if the top boards are rotted then the underneath rim joists could be needing replacement. He thought it might be faster to replace all the boards, check the structure and replace framing members and put new boards on. Mr. Pace said the boards are solid beyond that line and it would be easier to not tear it all up. However, there are many coats of paint on the house and if it would not be possible to salvage the two bottom boards on the house then he would look differently replacing boards on the house but he hoped to avoid replacing boards on the house. Mr. Hogestad said it will be obvious when he takes the porch apart how much work needs to be done. Mr. Frick said he could add ledger boards onto the existing house wall and nail the tongue and groove onto the siding. The problem is to get the decking out since it may be nailed to a ledger board, which may be set further back. Mr. Tanner said he could make a less noticeable seam by cutting the boards at an angle. Mr. Frick asked what the Guidelines recommend. Mr. Tanner said they should repair rather than replace. Ms. Tunner said that repairing is preferable and Mr. Frick said other visual qualities should be considered.

**Ms. Weatherford moved to accept the applicant's paint choices and Mr. Frick seconded the motion which passed unanimously.**

Ms. Tunner said regarding the loft door that this is a new use and replacement with glass panels will give light. Ms. Massey said there are wood surrounds with a casing for the glass. Mr. Pace would not want one big piece of glass like a picture window. Mr. Frick said there could be a railing on the inside. He would prefer the four panel window but could put in a solid door for a second choice. Ms. Weatherford said a new use would be okay and could be changed.

**Mr. Frick moved to approve the application for the windows and that the glass be glazed and the 48 inch window have tempered glass on all lights. Ms. Weatherford seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**Mr. Frick moved that the porch floor be repaired with staggered boards rather than a single cut such as 18", 36", and 20". Mr. Hogestad seconded the motion. Mr. Pace asked how to do that without cutting into the boards next to it. Mr. Hogestad thought a saber saw could do it. Ms. Weatherford said adding additional blocking could be a problem but Mr. Frick said being over blocking is not necessary if it is staggered. The motion failed, 2-3. Ayes: Frick, Hogestad. Nays: Carpenter, Tanner, Weatherford.**

**Mr. Tanner moved that the LPC leave the option open to the owner to do either a straight cut, staggered, or replace the porch. If the straight cut is most economical, he could do it that way with a provision to make the seam as unnoticeable as possible. Ms. Weatherford seconded the motion. Ms. Carpenter said if the blocking and joists work then he could do that. The motion passed 4-1. Ayes: Carpenter, Hogestad, Tanner, and Weatherford. Nay: Frick.**

#### EASTSIDE/WESTSIDE DESIGN GUIDELINES, ISSUES

Ms. Carpenter reported on the meeting with Mr. Blanchard, Mr. Frank, Ms. Oceanak, and Ms. McWilliams. There will be a work session on July 11 with City Council. Council would like to work out issues before that meeting. Ms. Carpenter said she would like to have correct information available. The memo in the packet lists issues which must be clarified before the meeting on July 11. The issues include: the need to develop standards and define what constitutes contributing and non-contributing buildings; define the process of creating an historic district, define the review process; how the public should be informed; should the building color and landscaping issues be made advisory for historic properties; and need to have LPC/Staff representation at all meetings, rewrites, and decisions. Ms. Carpenter feels the landscaping will be burdensome for homeowners.

Mr. Frank said the May 23 minutes in which the LPC discussed the Guidelines are added to the memo for discussion purposes only since they have not yet been approved. Regarding the first point, Ms. Carpenter said it is important to have criteria for what is contributing and non-contributing but there are currently no code guidelines so the LPC has been making evaluations based on the National Register Guidelines. Mr. Tanner said the word historic is used ambiguously and inconsistently in the document and the authors have not responded to his previous suggestions. Ms. Carpenter said the document must clarify historic.

Mr. Tanner feels that the problems are fundamental to the last section of the guidelines. The memo takes for granted that the districts will be created. Ms. Carpenter said the guidelines will apply even if the location of the districts are not known. She feels the LPC can say what the standards are for a district. She does not want to see the historic section pulled from the Guidelines. Mr. Tanner is not sure he can support the document since it is not well put together. Ms. Weatherford agreed, since

the LPC will have to deal with the consequences. Ms. Carpenter said she would like to see if it can be cleaned up. Mr. Frank said that "historic" is defined as those structures so designated by the City. Mr. Tanner said that in other places in the document, the term is used differently. The term historic includes locally landmarked buildings. Historic buildings which are not designated should be called potentially eligible buildings. Mr. Frank said it is not a fatal flaw but should be remedied. Therefore, the LPC feels that this should be done. The word "eligible" or "potentially eligible" should be used instead. Ms. Massey said historic should be defined by the concept of significance. Mr. Frank said it says "designated" but Ms. Massey said an historic building is more than just one which is designated. Ms. Carpenter said that undesignated structures can still be historic. Mr. Tanner said the designation criteria, the process of doing a landmark designation, and the review process are left out of the introduction. Mr. Tanner said that page 71 is a hodgepodge of standards that do not explain the process of designation and how it applies to an individual or how the Fort Collins Guidelines relate to the Secretary's Standards.

Ms. Massey said the guidelines are not part of the districts. She feels that the guidelines should be written for historic districts. There may be a few that this document does not apply to. Mr. Frick said they began the document by saying they didn't know if it would be mandatory or advisory. Mr. Tanner feels the guidelines will help. Ms. Massey said the guidelines should state that the goal is to preserve the integrity of the neighborhood and the buildings. Mr. Tanner said the neighborhood plans say this. Therefore, the guidelines will apply to all buildings, except for the minority of buildings which have been vastly altered so the only way the guidelines would be applied is if the proposed alterations would have a negative impact.

Mr. Frank said people are wondering what is non-contributing and what is contributing. Ms. Massey said most buildings are contributing. Ms. Carpenter said there are no criteria. Ms. McWilliams said up to now we have used the National Register Criteria. Following that, then almost all properties will be landmark or contributing. In 1977, 549 out of 665 on the Eastside were considered contributing. Laurel School has only 6 percent non-contributing. She feels it is representative of the other districts. Ms. Carpenter asked if the definition will help and Mr. Tanner said this won't help people know whether or not they are contributing.

Ms. McWilliams said the criteria need to be established, the survey needs to be done, and then boundaries drawn. Mr. Hogestad asked why the boundaries are there. Mr. Frank said the neighborhood groups were interested initially until the general public began to raise questions. The guidelines should be in place in case districts happen and to have the benefit of using local guidelines rather than using the national guidelines.

Mr. Hogestad asked what opportunities are here for change. Mr. Frank feels the guidelines could be cleaned up and adopted but should avoid the district discussion. Ms. Carpenter said to make it clear that this applies to no one except local landmarks and the guidelines are needed for review of these landmarks. If there should ever be districts then these guidelines would apply. Mr. Frick said that if there is no district, then the guidelines only apply to landmarked buildings. These guidelines would

then apply if a district came on line. Mr. Frick said it is educational and Ms. Carpenter feels they are helpful. Mr. Hogestad said people want to know about the personal impact and this document doesn't tell them. Ms. Carpenter said it has no impact unless you have a landmark. Ms. Carpenter said to pull the map. Mr. Hogestad said not to worry about where the districts should be. Ms. Oceanak said people are mostly comfortable with the document except for the landscaping and color. Also, people want to know if they are in the district and if they are contributing. Ms. Carpenter said people feel that the district process is already determined. We need to make it clear that there would be a long public process of negotiation.

National Register District nominations are defeated if a majority of property owners register a negative vote. Ms. Massey said that if the LPC makes the back part of the document regarding guidelines apply only to designated landmarks and not districts, and the front part regarding standards apply to the historic neighborhoods and districts if designated as a district, then that will be as it is now. Ms. Massey feels the second part should apply to landmarks but not districts. If the homeowner wants a grant, they may apply to be designated. If the LPC wants designations, then they should relax standards on local landmarks and designate structures as significant because they contribute to the historic neighborhood. She feels that people will then want to designate for the benefits of the state tax credit. The LPC could have the guidelines apply and give up the survey and district. If the LPC gives up the districts for historic areas, then only the front part of booklet will apply. Only homeowners who want the incentives will come under the back of the booklet. So, if a homeowner wants state tax credit, they must landmark individually. If, for example, 15 neighbors on a block wanted the benefits, they can apply as district for state tax credits. She recommended not pushing districts but individual guidelines and having the city respond to neighborhoods that want districts. The policy should be, if they want it, we will respond.

Ms. Weatherford said that the City will lose some neighborhood buildings since some will not qualify for designation on their own. Ms. Massey pointed out that the LPC makes the criteria for designation. Ms. Weatherford asked what if developers want to demolish houses. Ms. Massey said that the City has the demolition ordinance and if the homes are part of an historic neighborhood and have integrity, then they cannot be torn down. Mr. Hogestad said he felt that designation on that basis would require a leap. Ms. McWilliams said that would constitute a nonconsensual designation. Ms. Massey said the LPC already has historic surveys. Ms. Tunner read the definition of landmark and noted that "geographic" refers to a structure being designated "due to its unique location". Ms. Carpenter asked what if, for example, a bungalow is contributing, the block is intact with the same setbacks, the house itself has integrity but it is just a plain bungalow. Mr. Frank said currently the Demolition Delay Ordinance would apply and the City would hold hearings to make a determination, decide if it is a landmark, and then have the option to non-consensually designate if it was. If this document was in place, but the home was not in a district, then the general guidelines would apply.

Ms. Massey said individual structures can be torn down so that the neighborhood itself will be lost without the districts. Once these contributing and non-contributing structures are torn down, the neighborhood is lost. Mr. Tanner commented that we need to educate the public and this has not happened. Then the designations will happen.

Ms. Carpenter said instead of putting in money for districting, they could put the money in for surveys so when permits are requested, the Commission would know what's there in case of a demolition request. After surveying, she would recommend proceeding with finding out who wants districts, then identifying potential districts, and then looking at public education.

The LPC must come to some agreement before the meeting with City Council. They want the Guidelines in place for new development. They could suggest taking the back part out, meeting with Mr. Winter, and just doing the front part. They could take Mr. Tanner's comments and the issues added tonight and include them in the document. Ms. Massey said there are three levels needed to define criteria (landmark, contributing, and noncontributing): landmark-- it must be over 50 years old, and any building that represents an architectural style and retains its major original exterior features, such as siding, scale, design; contributing--structures are the same except it has lost some integrity, has been altered on the exterior, such as siding, windows, doors, additions, porches, but can be restored to original condition; and noncontributing --- clearly altered, such as the roof popped up to where it is unrecognizable, is not over 50 years old, no representational architectural style, alterations which cannot be reversed. She agreed there is a need to educate the public about districts. Ms. Weatherford asked if it would be better to support the guidelines now and work toward districts later. Council wants answers but Ms. Carpenter feels they want clarification of the process and if the LPC were to say we are not going to district now, but this is the process for the future, then the public will not feel that it is being shoved down their throat and it will be done if the neighborhood wants it. Ms. Carpenter said they need to define what is real and what is not and must be able to give City Council the answers at the meeting on July 11.

Mr. Tanner said Chart A and Chart B regarding work done in and outside districts at the beginning of the document makes the whole document seem to be based on districts so he recommended removing the two charts.

Mr. Frank listed the options which have been mentioned so far.

Option 1--make changes to the guidelines, define contributing and non-contributing using Ms. Massey's definitions given earlier, remove review of some changes such as roofing material, color and vegetation, remove maps of districts at back and the two pages in front, review only major alterations, define historic, delete emphasis on districts, and adopt it.

Option 2--layout the process for Council and in the document as to how districting will be done, spell out the criteria (eligible, potentially eligible, and not eligible), do the survey, define boundaries but do not pursue districting for now, explore designation of a local district such as Laurel Street Historic District, which includes meetings in 1996 with organized neighborhood groups to explore designation, put markers on houses. Not do all three districts at once but pursue the one to see how it goes. This would require amending the landmark code to include districts.

Option 3--provide protection from demolition in these areas such as no demolition of contributing



and historic structures. This would include eligible structures in neighborhoods and amending the demolition Ordinance so that no structures in the Eastside/Westside Neighborhoods could be demolished until there are districts. This would be a temporary measure. It would have a smaller impact on people in the neighborhood and the exception would allow demolition of incompatible additions. The criteria would be based on architecture rather than districts and once again use the three levels mentioned by Ms. Massey for historic, contributing, and noncontributing.

Option 4--delay historic guidelines and adopt general guidelines.

Option 5--continue incentives, add a sales tax waiver for historic structures and institute the design assistance program in 1996, have a program of historic markers for houses, increase Rehabilitation Grant Program.

Option 6--lay out the process for designation.

Option 7--drop historic guidelines altogether but enact Demolition Ordinance with the contributing and noncontributing structures included and keep the general guidelines.

Mr. Frank asked the Commission to vote on which options they preferred. Members may vote for more than one option.

Four members favored Option 1.

Three members liked Option 2.

Three members liked Option 3.

One member liked Option 4.

Four members liked Option 5.

One member voted for Option 6.

Option 7 received no votes. Ms. Carpenter asked why no one voted for this one and Mr. Tanner said if a demolition is denied, the LPC must be able to tell people why they cannot demolish a building if it is non-contributing. He pointed out that an historic neighborhood is one in which more than 50% of the homes are more than 50 years old. Ms. Weatherford said because they need to define the criteria for an historic neighborhood. Mr. Hogestad thinks there would be opposition to this proposal.

Mr. Frank summarized the results by noting that the LPC could recommend to City Council that they:

1--make some minor changes to guidelines and standards and adopt them now. Changes would include:

define contributing, noncontributing, and historic  
delete color and vegetation criteria and others mentioned  
tone down emphasis on districts

2--lay out designation process and direct exploration of designation of the Laurel District in 1996 and do a reconnaissance survey of all structures for architecture and survey a broader area to determine possible district areas. A reconnaissance survey of 5000 properties easily could be done in a year.

3--as an interim measure, permit no demolition of eligible, contributing structures in the Eastside/Westside neighborhood until surveys are completed. The problem is what will the LPC be doing meanwhile and for what period of time would the demolition not be allowed. The LPC would also be conducting a reconnaissance survey during this time.

4-- continue and expand local incentives which include:

Rehabilitation Grant Program  
Design Assistance Program  
Sales tax waiver  
Historic Markers

Options 1 and 4 had the most agreement.

Mr. Tanner will make editorial changes.

There will be a meeting July 6, 5:30 to go over the recommendations.

Ms. Tunner said that Mr. Strouse, owner of 224-227 Jefferson, has talked to a lawyer and will be coming back to the LPC and, possibly to City Council in an appeal of his Code violation. Ms. Tunner suggested that the LPC consider letting him take out the wooden panel and put in glass like a transom since the building and block are not pristine. Mr. Hogestad does not like the precedent. Staff would recommend, at this time, to accept the glass. The matter will come back to LPC and must be recorded verbatim.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 pm

Submitted by Diane Slater, Secretary.