

✓

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

**Special Regular Meeting**

**May 9, 1995**

**Council Liaison: Gina Janett**

**Staff Liaison: Joe Frank**

**SUMMARY OF MEETING:** The minutes of the February 21, March 28, and April 11 minutes were approved. The LPC gave final approval of portions of the proposed exterior reconstruction and interior rehabilitation of 518 Peterson Street, evaluated the process of the Rehabilitation Grant Program, and revisited the C&S Freight Depot Designation.

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:**

Commission Chairman Jennifer Carpenter called the meeting to order at 5:40 pm, 281 North College Avenue. Secretary Diane Slater called the roll. Commission members Jennifer Carpenter, Per Hogestad, Jean Kullman, Carl McWilliams, James Tanner, and Ruth Weatherford were present. Bud Frick was absent. Joe Frank and Carol Tunner represented staff.

**GUESTS:** Steven and Kate Malers, owners of 518 Peterson; Theresa Lucero, City Planner.

**AGENDA REVIEW:** None.

**STAFF REPORT:** Ms. Tunner updated the Commission on activities during upcoming Preservation Week and announced that the three Friend of Preservation Award letters are going out tomorrow morning. The Designs for History Workshop will require extra help with the LPC table and Ms. Tunner will be giving a presentation that afternoon. The Walking Tour will be a good opportunity to see the interior of the upstairs of Stone Lion and Life of the Party before they are remodeled.

The Eastside-Westside Design Guidelines discussion will be postponed until the next meeting when Draft #3 is available. The LPC felt they may have already passed a resolution of support.

**COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS:** Ms. Carpenter reported that Prof. Paulson, CSU Dept. of Landscape Architecture, would like a member of the LPC to attend a student presentation of schemes for the C&S Depot site but no one from the Commission will be able to attend. Ms. Tunner will be there.

Ms. Carpenter received a letter from the Poudre Landmarks Foundation requesting a letter of support for a grant from the Colorado Historic Society for the Old Waterworks. The LPC agreed to support the project and Ms. Carpenter will send a letter of support.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The Commission approved the February 21, 1995 minutes as read. Mr. Tanner amended the March 28, 1995 minutes to remove "the" on page 5, paragraph 6 so the sentence reads without (the) "They are not doing any other work and (the) they are not replacing with a wood roof." Ms. Weatherford moved approval of the minutes as amended and Mr. Tanner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. The April 11,

**1995 minutes were approved as read.**

**CURRENT DESIGN REVIEW:**

**518 PETERSON, RECONSTRUCTION OF PORCH AND INTERIOR REHABILITATION,  
CONCEPTUAL REVIEW**

Steve and Kate Malers were the recipients of a Rehabilitation Grant and will be applying for the State Tax Credit. The exterior work was reviewed first and will be done first. The roof requires repairs to the flashing on the side of the chimney; closure of an abandoned vent pipe; addition of 3 soffit roof vents; and guttering of north side of house and garage. The original front porch was demolished and they plan to recreate the original front porch as much as possible. They will add a wood porch skirt, which was inadvertently left out in the grant submittal. Mr. Hogestad suggested that a horizontal sleeper be installed on which to nail the skirt, which would then be set 4" above grade. Ms. Tunner suggested the applicants consult with Mr. Jeff Bridges on how to do this. Mr. Hogestad said they should paint the concrete a darker color and use the photo to recreate the same look. He said they could build the panel and nail in into the sleepers as unit.

The Malers will be using Silverton wooden balustrades for the porch. Mr. Malers will custom make the scroll brackets for the porch so they will fit correctly.

The original front door and screen door did not exist. In looking at other foursquares in town, Ms. Malers found that they commonly use a large rectangular pane of glass with a recessed or raised panel at the foot of the door. She would like the screen door to echo the porch brackets. They will need to get a building permit for the porch.

The porch rail is to be coped in. The applicants will need to look carefully at these intersections. The handrail may or may not need to come in on the square part of the post. The wires and cables are being removed from the building exterior.

The siding is badly deteriorated and some boards will need to be replaced due to holes in the boards. Mr. Tanner suggested sawing the board in half with a shallow setting of the circular saw and letting both halves fall out.

It is difficult to establish if the first floor windows over the porch are original. Mr. Hogestad asked if there was no sash and felt that it must have rotted away and not been replaced.

The applicants will be attending Mr. Martin's Paint Workshop. At present they are planning to use Downing Straw on the body and Prickly Pear for the trim. The accent will be either Indian Red or Fawn. They need to keep in mind the green roof. Mr. Tanner suggested that they paint a large section and evaluate before painting the entire house and feels that the proposed body color could

be too dark. Mr. Hogestad said he thought that the latex paints are as good as oil paints now. Mr. Tanner said that when thick layers of paint are peeling off, the problem could be moisture coming from the inside rather than the outside. Mr. Hogestad said there is no barrier so the moisture could be migrating out. He suggested discussing with the painter on the possible causes of paint failure on the house. Mr. Tanner suggested that the decorative scrollwork would be more appropriate if it were simpler than what is shown in the drawing. Ms. Malers said it will be smaller and simpler.

The Commission then turned to the interior conceptual review. The rooms need extensive plaster patching. The lowered ceilings either have been or will be returned to the original height. The archways will be reconstructed. Missing woodwork must be replaced with reproduction woodwork. The heat register is blocked by carpet and a grill cover will be installed. A built-in bookshelf which is a later addition will be removed. It may have originally been a doorway to the kitchen.

Ms. Tunner said that the proposed work all seems to be eligible for the state tax credit and the proposed materials are appropriate. The LPC thought the project was commendable. Ms. Malers will return in 4 weeks for final review. The Commission would like more information about the proposed window replacement, the porch, columns, balustrades. They could immediately take care of the roof ventilation, stripping, and wires.

**Mr. Tanner moved final approval of the proposed roof repairs; rerouting of north facade wires and cables; guttering; repairs to wood siding; removal of later additions shutter and awning. Ms. Kullman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

##### **REHABILITATION GRANT PROGRAM**

Ms. Theresa Lucero distributed a list of discussion items. First, does the LPC want construction scale drawings of proposed work. Mr. Tanner said he would like detailed scale, accurate drawings of proposed work but not construction drawings. They may do the work and bring in drawings later though. In the future, the LPC would like to emphasize funding projects with a high preservation necessity. The rating scale currently assigns a weight of 3 to preservation necessity which the Commission felt was appropriate. Mr. Frank thought that the public should be made aware of the importance of this evaluation criterion. Ms. Carpenter said she would like to emphasize the effort to save threatened structures rather than maintenance in the brochure. Also, the LPC will not accept Polaroid photos because they do not reproduce well. Regarding the application form, one applicant said he had done other work on the house but did not include it in his application. Mr. Tanner noted that work done earlier is not a part of the application. Mr. Frank suggested that roof repairs could be placed in the matching funds category since it is more of a maintenance issue. Mr. Tanner and Ms. Carpenter agreed that it would solve a lot of problems. Mr. Tanner said the preservation requirement could be made plainer in the brochure. The LPC agreed with sending individual letters

of rejection which specify the reasons for denial, as was done. Ms. Lucero asked if the LPC decided if structures that are contributing to a national district are a lower priority than individually landmarked structures or if they are equal. For example, some applicants were not in a district and there was a question if they would be individually eligible although they would be a contributing building if they were in a district. Ms. Weatherford recalled the issue had to do with protecting districts so that contributing structures would not be lost. They do contribute when they are within a district so their value must be acknowledged before the district exists. Mr. Frank said in the HRPP the priority is local landmarks. Ms. Lucero pointed out that contributing buildings in districts not yet designated will not be eligible for grants. The LPC concluded that structures contributing to a district will have the same consideration for a grant as landmarked structures. However, structures that are contributing to a National Register district are not automatically eligible for local designation, although they may be found to be eligible. Roof replacements are eligible as matching funds only, although the Commission may review this decision for cases in which the applicant would like a fire-retardant wood roof or the roof would save the structure. The Commission agreed that emphasis should be placed on returning the structure to its original appearance and that the program should prioritize threatened structures. When reviewing applications, the Commission would like to see a staff synopsis of the application. Ms. Carpenter suggested that the application specify no continuation sheets. Ms. Massey, Local History Coordinator, told Ms. Carpenter that what is eligible for the State and Federal Tax Credits is different from what the LPC is allowing for grants. She felt that what qualifies and doesn't should therefore be very clear in the brochure. Ms. Tunner suggested that the brochure should include a statement that it is better to repair historic material rather than replace it, for example, windows. Mr. Hogestad said that often restoration is possible without replacement. Ms. Carpenter would like to include under hard costs that in certain cases like restoration, windows may qualify. Mr. Frank suggested adding windows under "Does Not Include." Ms. Kullman said the brochure should be clear that this is a competitive application and that the award is not guaranteed. Ms. Tunner suggested adding wording from the Secretary of Interior standards about preservation or rehabilitation. Mr. Frank suggested that under "Selection and Award Procedures", #4, the brochure could discuss the competitive nature of the grant. Ms. Carpenter said this could also go under the "Purpose" section. Mr. Frank said that the brochure should let applicants know that they must go through the design review process if they do receive a grant. The LPC decided to not look into financial necessity as a criteria for the grant.

The Commission then reviewed the Applicant Survey Summary, an attempt to measure the performance of the Program from the perspective of grant applicants. Regarding ways to advertise the program, the applicants suggested notifying neighborhood groups. They felt the brochure could explain the criteria that the Commission used to judge the applications better. Some applicants asked for more information about the status of their application, if they could attend the meetings, and be notified of the time of LPC deliberations on their grant, and Mr. Frank said all LPC meetings are open meetings. Ms. Tunner noted that at CDBG meetings the applicants may attend but not speak. A special meeting is scheduled for the applicant to present their case. However, since the LPC meetings are publicized, no notification would be necessary. Ms. Carpenter suggested that staff send a letter

to all applicants stating that the application was received and that the LPC will be deliberating on certain dates. Ms. Kullman remembered that the LPC had at some points desired more information from the applicants. Ms. Carpenter suggested that a list of questions be submitted to staff for answers. Mr. Frank said that applicants should be allowed to speak at the final hearing before decisions are made. Mr. Tanner said that staff should let the applicants know when meetings will be held and let applicants attend if they wish. Mr. Frank said that questions could be handled through staff. Ms. Lucero said some residential applicants felt they were competing with the commercial applications and the LPC said there was no bias. All applicants except those not receiving grants felt the process was fair. Some are confused about when the designation will take place. Applicants reported a wide range of time spent on the application form. Many took less time but some applicants took as much as 80-100 hours to fill out the application. Ms. Carpenter said the Commission only needs the information necessary to take it through designation and design review. It usually takes 2-3 pages for designation and for design review, they need scale drawings, pictures, and materials information. Ms. Carpenter suggested looking through old designations to find a good example of the amount and type of information needed. Ms. Tunner suggested that applicants should be told to make an appointment with Ms. Massey rather than just showing up. Ms. Kullman and Mr. Tanner pointed out that most applicants didn't have a problem filling out the application. Ms. Tunner suggested that she could have an intern available to help out those who need help. Mr. Frank said that most comments were very positive for a first effort. Mr. Tanner suggested changing the list approach so that applicants would read the whole brochure. He volunteered to review the brochure for wording.

Mr. Frank asked about what action was taken about publicizing the winners and suggested a press release at this time, describing the program, changes and its successes for City Council and a shorter announcement for the press.

#### UPDATE ON C&S FREIGHT DEPOT

Mr. Frank said that legally the LPC cannot expand the area of the designation to include all of the depot freight dock, so it must return to the LPC. The City is concerned that a future LPC will not allow them to remove the dock. Ms. Carpenter said the City must set a good preservation example by not tearing down an historic structure for a parking lot. Mr. Frank said he understood that the LPC would entertain the notion of removing it for an approved plan. Ms. Carpenter would like for them to entertain the notion of incorporating the dock into a future plan. Mr. Frank said they may propose an agreement whereby a portion of the dock is not designated but they will not make any changes without permission from the LPC. Ms. Carpenter asked if it could be a part of the record and Mr. Tanner said he could understand the discomfort about future controversy. Mr. Frank said the City has other ideas about putting in a park and some historical interpretation as part of the re-development.

**OTHER BUSINESS:** Ms. Tunner said that she spoke with Mr. Chuck Bowling, who said that Mr.

Stan Whitaker of G.T. Land, a British company, has said that the Preston Farm must go because the parent company wants the corner clear and will not donate the farm. Mr. Bowling said Art Wilcox from Lee Martinez Park is interested in moving the granary.

Mr. Frank said at the next LPC meeting the Loomis and Linden facades will be up for final approval. Mr. Frank told Mr. Veldman that the LPC would like to review a punch list rather than make a site visit. Ms. Carpenter asked about the sandstone. A stone sill was grouted on top of the sandstone sidewalk. Ms. Carpenter specified that the sandstone must not be chipped out from under the sill and the sill must be removed to get the stone out. It was decided that the stone has already been removed.

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 pm.

Submitted by Diane Slater, Secretary.