

LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

June 13, 1995

Council Liaison: Gina Janett

Staff Liaison: Joe Frank

SUMMARY OF MEETING: The Commission made a site visit to the Linden Hotel regarding the sandstone sidewalk panels. The LPC designated the C&S Freight Depot, including the docks on the west and approximately 40 feet of the docks to the north; 613 South College Avenue, the Frank Corbin House; 425 East Elizabeth, George and Annie Spencer House; 725 Mathews, Littler-Baker House and Carriage House; and 518 Peterson, B.F. Ayers House and garage. The Commission also gave final approval of the proposed reconstruction of porch and interior rehabilitation of 518 Peterson.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

Commission Chairman Jennifer Carpenter called the meeting to order at 5:45 pm, 281 North College Avenue. Secretary Diane Slater called the roll. Commission members Jennifer Carpenter, Carl McWilliams, James Tanner, and Ruth Weatherford were present. Bud Frick, Jean Kullman, and Per Hogestad were absent. Joe Frank and Karen McWilliams represented staff.

GUESTS: Jim Reidhead and Dick Beardmore, CSU Center for Stabilization; Dave Lingle, Aller-Lingle, Architects; Jack Gianola, Special Projects Manager; Bob Smith, Stormwater Utility Manager; Debra Passariello, Facility Services Director; Pete Dallow, Director of Administrative Services, all of the City of Fort Collins; Jeff Bridges, owner of 725 Mathews; Frances James, Jeff Bridge's mother; Scott and Karla Oceanak, owners of 425 East Elizabeth; Clyde and Karen Canino, owners of 613 South College; Steven and Kathryn Malers, owners of 518 Peterson.

AGENDA REVIEW: The C&S designation was heard before Agenda Review, Staff Reports, and Commission Members Reports. The approval of the minutes was removed from the agenda since they had already been approved.

STAFF REPORT: Mr. Frank welcomed Ms. Karen McWilliams as the new Historic Preservation Specialist. Ms. McWilliams distributed a press release on the Old Fort Collins High School from Linda Saferite with information on the feasibility study for library expansion.

COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS: None.

Mr. Tanner said he would like to see the memorandum to City Council mentioned in the memo from Mr. Bob Blanchard regarding funding for Guidelines.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None to approve.
Landmark Preservation Commission

DESIGNATIONS:

C & S FREIGHT DEPOT

Dave Lingle, architect for the project, introduced the proposed plan. An addition is to be sited to the east of the structure. They are recommending that the site of the old passenger depot which was demolished in 1952, on the southwest corner, eventually be redeveloped as a public building. Proposed parking is primarily for the use of the Stormwater Department, which is re-locating in the freight depot. A handicap accessible ramp will be added to the front, at the traditional entrance. A future City Administration Building of 60,000 sq. ft. is planned to the north of the depot. The building would have a series of setbacks to open the view corridor of the depot and dock. The height is stepped down to the south. A surfaced parking lot is proposed as part of Phase One of the C&S Freight Depot Project since much of the current parking to the south will be displaced by the green space. This green space would be seeded to save it for the long term. Future development will require adjacent parking. The new parking to the north will be used by 281 North College and as public parking until the time that the planned parking structure is built. There is no development proposal for this. Mr. McWilliams asked about the timeline for the building to the north. It would be 8-10 years. They are also suggesting public improvements for the alley and would like to convert it for pedestrians and service vehicles by installing brick pavers. The pedestrian link will be continued along the south side of 281 N. College. A formal alley will lead from the entrance of the depot south to Laporte Avenue. Ms. Carpenter asked where the dock is shown on the proposed plan. It is currently shown as the edge of the parking lot and a tree median strip. A section of the old track will be reconstructed for an old railroad car.

Mr. Reidhead said that they were working from old photos taken from the tower of the old Courthouse which show the view corridors. He said they felt it is important not to "max" out the site with a 3 story building on the south of the lot. They want people to understand the freight depot's significance to the community so the depot will have co-equal status with the other buildings on the site. They would like to designate the site of the dog's grave. He said that when James Stratis visited the site, while not thrilled about the addition, he was realistic, and is supportive of the location of the addition. Regarding the current canopies, a large cricket to shed water will be added since the roof extensions head back into the building. They would like the roof to read as gull-wing but it will be redesigned to shed water since there has been significant damage over the years. James Stratis was concerned about preserving part of the docks but not the whole length, although Mr. Reidhead acknowledged that the LPC may have different standards. He thinks that the proposed railroad car will help explain the context. The dock will need to have a railing added to meet state requirements. HABS/HAER documentation will be done on the depot and docks. He noted that James Stratis was not excited about the proposed addition to the east of the depot but understood the need for more space. Mr. McWilliams asked about the addition. Mr. Reidhead said there are not yet plans. Mr. Lingle said they have had some discussions and feel that since the freight depot is about one and a half stories tall, the addition should be 2-3 feet shorter. Materials and band coursing lines should be preserved, as well as the way in which corners are turned. Steel trusses will be exposed on the interior. The ridge skylight will be maintained, with conventional ceilings of 9 feet tall compared with

13 feet in the original. The connecting wall is to be a series of pilasters where the freight doors are now. Brick piers and pilasters will be retained on the interior. The wall is recessed on the alley and the window pattern is repeated. They will pick up on the shape of the window arches. Mr. Reidhead said they feel it is important not to recreate the old building.

Ms. Weatherford inquired about the car wash, which is to be to the east of the depot and to the south of 281 North College. Mr. Gianola said it will be next to the Boys and Girls Club, with a storefront on College Avenue which will have an historic look.

Mr. Beardmore said the reason they are drawing a property line through the building has to do with different ways of financing different projects and the need for a legal description. Ms. Carpenter asked about the practice of making legal descriptions that bisect a building. Mr. Reidhead said that commercial buildings are commonly divided. The money is from Stormwater and not from the General Fund. Ms. Carpenter asked who owns the property and Mr. Bob Smith said that Stormwater money cannot be used for general city use. Mr. Gianola said the block is being replatted. It will then be broken into lots when it goes through the PUD process. Ms. Carpenter asked if they can replat through a structure and Mr. Beardmore said it could be done.

Mr. Tanner said he did not have a problem with the overall concept but asked why, if there is a 5-10 year gap for building the new Administration Building, is it necessary to tear down the dock now instead of leaving it for a firmer decision since things change and all that would be needed is a redesign of the parking lot. He asked if it is possible to redesign the parking lot to allow the dock to stay until the building is planned, and he objects to destroying the dock now and then waiting 10 years for something to happen. He would like to see an alternative and asked if re-using the dock had been considered and what the reasons were for not doing so.

Mr. Lingle said they had looked at the possibilities of a 60,000 square foot structure with the dock in place and discussed an open area with cored parking and an administrative building on the western end of the lot. However, they felt it was out of context with the historic structure so they came back to massing the building in stepped sections. Also, the budget is \$35,000 to bring the portion of the dock to be demolished into code conformance. The dock needs to be rebuilt, the decking needs to be replaced and guardrails need to be added. They would prefer to use the money for fixing up the gull wing roof and other building reconstruction and felt it was a better use of funds rather than spending money for something that will be there for only 10 years. Mr. Gianola showed a master plan which shows a block for the 60,000 square foot building. Mr. Tanner noted that footprints can change. Mr. Lingle said the percentage of steps would be locked in. Ms. Carpenter asked if attempts were made to design around the dock, would they need to be done now or could they be incorporated later. Mr. Lingle said the stepped in shape will be shown in the preliminary PUD submittal. Mr. Reidhead said that what is gained by saving the dock is lost with the sightlines and said they were influenced by the costs of leaving it in place. Mr. Reidhead and Ms. Passariello said that the money for doing the project must compete with other general fund monies for other projects and suggested that preservation funds could be used to make the dock safe. Ms. Carpenter noted that the LPC is specifically charged to not consider the cost of a project in making decisions but must consider it in

reality.

There was no citizen input.

Ms. Weatherford moved approval of the C&S Freight Depot and Mr. McWilliams seconded the motion. Ms. Weatherford said she appreciated the constraints but wanted to go on record as regretting that it was not possible to retain the dock. Ms. Carpenter said she will be unable to support the motion since she cannot vote to tear the dock down for a parking lot. Ayes: McWilliams, Tanner, Weatherford. Nay: Carpenter. The motion passed 3-1.

LOCAL LANDMARK DESIGNATION OF 613 SOUTH COLLEGE, THE FRANK CORBIN HOUSE, Clyde and Karen Canino

Ms. Karen McWilliams introduced the discussion. The nominees are recipients of the Rehabilitation Grant program and the LPC has already determined them eligible for designation. Ms. Carpenter asked for discussion by the board, the public, or the applicants. Mr. Canino expressed his appreciation and asked if consenting to designation obligated them to a set of rules which apply to historic buildings. He felt that they have tried to be compatible with the historic nature of their property in the past, for example, they repaired the old gutter boxes rather than replacing them. The LPC said in the future, he will need to have LPC review the plans if they do any exterior work, unless it is a replacement, or repainting the same color. Mr. Tanner said that the LPC only reviews exterior work, not interiors. Mr. Canino asked if he can make a statement of participation in the project. Mr. Frank said they will help write it up and noted that some people do plaques and the Planning Dept. will be happy to help with verbiage. After the designation is approved by City Council, the Planning Dept. does give a statement suitable for interior display. Ms. Canino said that they now have asphalt shingles- and asked if they can replace it with the same. Ms. Weatherford said while that would be okay, they like to see historic materials and the Canino's are allowed to put on wood shingles now that the building is designated..

Mr. McWilliams moved approval of Canino's designation and Ms. Weatherford seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 4-0. Ms. Carpenter asked if they have a list of regulations. Mr. Frank said to call Ms McWilliams or Ms. Tunner to find out when review is needed.

LOCAL LANDMARK DESIGNATION OF 425 EAST ELIZABETH, GEORGE AND ANNIE SPENCER HOUSE, KARLA OCEANAK

Ms. Weatherford moved approval of the application as submitted. Mr. Tanner seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Oceanak asked about the description of the house since it will be different once the work is done and Mr. Frank said since the work will go through the Design Review process, all work added to the house will become part of the

record.

Ms. McWilliams said they are the first of three houses in the Centennial Neighborhood to be designated as a Local Landmark.

LOCAL LANDMARK DESIGNATION 725 MATHEWS, LITTLER-BAKER HOUSE AND CARRIAGE HOUSE, JEFF AND VICKIE BRIDGES

Ms. McWilliams noted that this is the first property for landmark status that includes more than just the residence. This nomination includes the carriage house.

Jeff Bridges said they have a 7 year plan that they are working on. He would like to see the designations appear on the Council Agenda to draw attention to the family residences which are now being designated since he feels they are a significant step and will also help explain the need for the East-side/Westside Guidelines. He suggested that it go in with the C&S Depot designation. Ms. Carpenter said that currently they appear in the proclamation section of Council's Agenda.

Ms. Weatherford moved approval of 725 Matthews Street as submitted and Mr. McWilliams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Oceanak asked about publicity and Mr. Frank said that the Planning Dept. could do a press release. Ms. Weatherford suggested that citizens can do it also. Ms. Oceanak thought a piece on the process would be an appropriate newspaper article.

LOCAL LANDMARK DESIGNATION OF 518 PETERSON, B.F. AYERS HOUSE AND GARAGE, STEVE AND KATHRYN MALERS

Ms. Malers asked about adding a small dormer to finish the attic. Ms. Carpenter said the LPC would need to see the plans. Mr. Tanner said there is not a "no dormer" rule and said they should see that it would not overshadow the front of the building. Ms. Carpenter said there may be a new commission, they would need plans, it must be in keeping with the style of the home, and the LPC would review the proposal according to the Secretary of the Interiors Standards.

Ms. Weatherford moved approval of the application and Mr. Tanner seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. McWilliams said there is a garage nominated as a part of the designation.

CURRENT DESIGN REVIEW AND STATE TAX CREDIT APPROVAL:

518 PETERSON, B.F. AYERS HOUSE, STEVE AND KATHRYN MALERS, FINAL REVIEW OF RECONSTRUCTION OF PORCH AND INTERIOR REHABILITATION

Ms. Malers reviewed changes to earlier plans. She showed the detail of how they propose to put the porch together and how the handrail will attach into the balustrades. The manufacturer has changed styles so now the railing is up to code. Her mother would like a newel post on the steps and Building Inspection says she doesn't need a Building Permit for the porch since it is a replacement.

Ms. Malers said that windows that are well made are difficult to find but said she is considering the Marvin Windows Tilt-Pack, which was demonstrated at the Designs for History Workshop in May. Mr. Tanner asked about checking salvage yards. Ms. McWilliams can give a list of places to call so that the replacement window will match the other window more closely.

Ms. Malers said she planned to use a two-thirds or three-quarters light door however, beveled glass is very expensive. Therefore, the door will need to be made and she passed around a drawing of the proposed door, which has thin muntins. Mr. Tanner remarked that it looked like a craftsman style door.

After she attended the color workshop by James Martin, Ms. Malers looked at value placements of light and dark first as he suggested, and picked the submitted value placement. Downing Straw is half strength of what was shown before because she felt it was too dark. Ms. Weatherford liked the value differentiation. Ms. Malers said she still needs to try out the colors on the house. She is considering a greenish gray for the body and a cream for the sash. She is concerned that after she puts the green-gray on the house, it may be too olive and she may need to change it some. Ms. Malers said this is also a review for state tax credit as well as landmark review of reconstruction. She now has better documentation on the interior bookshelf and archways.

Mr. Malers asked about the color of the garage on the property line. Next door is a lime sherbet colored house. They do have a problem with the neighbor's sprinkler degrading their garage paint.

Mr. McWilliams moved approval of the reconstruction as submitted with the owner's discretion on the front windows and Ms Weatherford seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Ms. Malers said they will be using a slightly smaller shoe on the porch railing--from ss to gs.

Ms. Weatherford moved approval for the state tax credit and Mr. McWilliams seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. (This is the first review for a state tax credit done by the LPC. Mr. Frank suggested that someone from the state come to give a presentation on the state tax credit process for the LPC.)

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mr. Tanner said he interviewed for reappointment on the LPC, and that he was asked mostly about the Eastside/Westside Design Guidelines.

EASTSIDE/WESTSIDE DESIGN GUIDELINES

Ms. Carpenter said she is concerned about the misunderstandings which have been expressed. She suggested that perhaps they should look at different standards for different buildings so some structures are contributing without the stricter guidelines. Another suggestion is to have the survey specify what parts of the structure are significant, but that would be expensive. She is concerned that they are now reacting to a crisis. Ms. Carpenter will meet with Mr. Frank, Ms. Oceanak, Mr. Blanchard, Ms. Weatherford, and whoever else is interested for further discussion.

Mr. Tanner would like to see the historic guidelines part taken off for now and added later after further deliberation. He proposed cutting the last section for now with the proviso that more information about designated structures be added. However, Ms. Carpenter said it may be too late to do this since the Guidelines have already gone through Planning and Zoning. Most people seem to be concerned about the incentives and the loss of those incentives such as the tax credit. There are people who want those provisions left in the document. Ms. Carpenter said she is particularly concerned about the misunderstandings. For example, there are currently no rules and regulations about invoking an historic district but there was no one at the Planning and Zoning meeting to explain that. Ms. Carpenter suggested that there be an outline of what the process would be. Ms. Weatherford said that it is important that the LPC have a Council liaison able to attend the LPC meetings so the meetings. The meeting night might need to be changed so that City Council members can attend. Mr. Frank said we cannot get this room any other night.

Mr. Frank said there appears to be a fear of the unknown. The HRPP has noted this tendency and recommends a concerted public education effort. There may be nothing wrong with the standards but a fear of the districts. For example, the four people being designated all asked about what rules they would be subject to. Guidelines are liked but not the districts. Mr. Tanner feels that the districts should not be in the document. However, people attending the public meetings wanted the districts, although it can't be forced. Mr. Frank said that too much work has gone into the districts to pull it out at this point. He suggested that the districts could be adopted but not go into effect until the district process is complete, which is what P & Z recommended. Ms. Carpenter wants to see the process described on paper so that people can better understand it. The issue is district designation rather than extending the process. Mr. Frank feels the guidelines have been well-received but the districts are controversial and doesn't think there is enough time to do the districts.

Ms. Carpenter said that the LPC must be involved in the process so that Historic Preservation is in charge of the project rather than Current Planning so that someone who knows the HRPP and preservation is responsible for it. She feels that whatever happens with the Guidelines must go through this office so that the LPC and Planning Dept. will know when meetings are happening and be able to answer questions.

Ms. McWilliams said that in other areas where districts have been done, the procedure is that more than 50% of the people must oppose the proposed historic district for the district to be defeated. Mr. Frank suggested that funding be for 2 years so the designations are not rushed. He noted that the project would be quite time consuming for staff even if there is a consultant doing the survey work.

Ms. Carpenter said there must be participation from the historic preservation office at all meetings. Mr. Tanner said he has concerns about this level of micro-managing the historic properties. If the City needs to review 2500 landmarked buildings, it may not be as positive. Ms. Carpenter said this was discussed at the neighborhood meetings and asked how the review process works. In Boulder, the Commission does the reviews. Ms. Carpenter said there is a design sub-committee that does weekly reviews and makes recommendations. Mr. Frank said that the Planning Dept. may need a full time person to do the work required and suggests looking at the impact. Ms. Oceanak said there should be a different standard if the building is individually landmarked vs. a contributing structure. The review process should be just for the landmarked structure. Mr. McWilliams said there is a need to establish criterion for determining between eligible and contributing structures.

* * * * *

SANDSTONE SIDEWALK PANELS, LINDEN STREET

Prior to the regular meeting, four LPC members met at the Linden Hotel. Those present were Ruth Weatherford, Jim Tanner, Jennifer Carpenter, and Carl McWilliams. Staff present were Joe Frank and Karen McWilliams. Guests present were Jan Meisel, Parks Planner; Todd Juergens, head inspector for the project, Engineering Department; and Joe Crabill, inspector, Engineering Department.

The meeting was held on-site at the Linden Hotel for the LPC to examine and express preference for methods used for cleaning historic sandstone.

A cleaning process was explained for using pressurized water and soap solution with either no buffer, a non-abrasive brush buffer, or with metallic brush. **Moved by Ms. Weatherford and seconded by Mr. Tanner to use pressurized water and soap solution with wire brush, if needed, to remove tar and gum, using the least abrasive method possible to achieve the desired results. The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.**

The next issue discussed was achieving desired appearance on the edges of historic sandstone that needs to be recut to fit a new location. Fewer than 50% of the edges will need to be cut, but no more exact estimate could be made.

The historic technique involved a machine used in the field to break the stone. This method is no longer used.

The technique specified in the plans was to do a chisel cut. The City is recommending hammering the cut edges by hand with a two pound hammer to achieve a more compatible appearance with the edges that do not need cutting.

A discussion was held as to how much irregularity would remain in the old sandstone. Mr. Juergens said there was latitude in the code for leaving irregularities up to 3/4 inch deep. **Moved by Mr.**

Tanner and seconded by Ms. Weatherford to hammer cut the edges by hand, cutting the sandstone only when necessary. The motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

The next discussion was regarding change orders dictated by Council because funds for the project were cut.

Originally, there should have been pavers of modern sandstone laid with the historic sandstone. This was changed to colored concrete in the pedestrian crosswalks, with no use of modern sandstone, only historic.

Concern was expressed about the process of change orders in the field. The Council decisions concerning changes were made in March and April, and LPC was not notified. LPC had no chance for input and was not involved in making decisions about what aspects of the project could be cut, and what the priorities were, despite a lengthy process involving meetings with the LPC and Downtown/Old Town merchants to make the original recommendations to Council about the project. Jan Meisel took full responsibility for mix-up and will send a follow-up memo about budget cuts and explain this and other change orders.

Ms. Carpenter said that the change in plans should have come back to the LPC and she was unhappy that staff had ignored the other staff and committee efforts to reach a solution. There were to be different sandstone pavers than what was installed..

* * * * *

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm.

Submitted by Diane Slater, Secretary.