



Ron Sladek, Chair
Doug Ernest, Vice Chair
Meg Dunn
Bud Frick
Kristin Gensmer
Per Hogestad
Dave Lingle
Alexandra Wallace
Belinda Zink

City Council Chambers
City Hall West
300 Laporte Avenue
Fort Collins, Colorado

Cablecast on FCTV Channel 14 and
881 (HD) on the Comcast cable system

The City of Fort Collins will make reasonable accommodations for access to City services, programs, and activities and will make special communication arrangements for persons with disabilities. Please call 221-6515 (TDD 224-6001) for assistance.

Regular Meeting September 28, 2016 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Sladek called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

- **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Dunn, Zink, Wallace, Gensmer, Ernest, Sladek
ABSENT: Lingle, Frick, Hogestad
STAFF: McWilliams, Bzdek, Bumgarner, Yatabe, Schiager, Shepard

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

Ms. Bzdek explained that Item #3, Living Oaks, 221 E. Oak, was pulled from the agenda.

- **STAFF REPORTS**

None.

- **PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

None.

● DISCUSSION AGENDA

[Timestamp: 5:32 p.m.]

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 14, 2016 REGULAR MEETING.

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the September 14, 2016 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

Mr. Ernest moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the Consent Agenda of the September 14, 2016 regular meeting as presented. Ms. Wallace seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

[Timestamp: 5:33 p.m.]

2. THE STANDARD - DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This is a proposal for a student housing development composed of two buildings, one (Building A) facing Prospect Road and the other (Building B) facing Lake Street, on 4.23 acres. Building A is proposed to be a 5-story structure with three south-facing courtyards. Building B is also a 5-story structure and includes structured parking on the south side of the building. Building B will also include a rooftop clubroom and outdoor pool terrace of approximately 10,000 square feet combined. The total number of units for both buildings combined is 245 units in configurations of one to five bedrooms. There are 800 bedrooms and 600 parking spaces in the proposed project.

APPLICANT: Landmark Properties, Athens, Georgia

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek made some brief introductory comments about the project. She noted that the Applicant had not yet submitted a formal Project Development Plan to the City, so the Commission may offer preliminary comments on the project, but will not make a recommendation or establish the area of adjacency at this time. She explained that after the formal application is filed and the design is nearly final, the Applicant will return to the Commission to request a recommendation to the decision maker based on LUC 3.4.7(6).

Applicant Presentation

Linda Ripley, Ripley Design, Inc., began the Applicant presentation by reading a statement summarizing the legal interpretation of LUC 3.4.7(F)(1) with regard to the area of adjacency for the project provided by their attorney and included in the packet. The statement suggested that five of the six properties put forward by Staff for consideration should not be considered.

Andrew Young, Landmark Properties, provided some background about their company, explaining that their properties are self-managed.

The architect for the project, Jason Gadson with Dwell Design Studio, provided an overview of the features of the project design. He summarized the process they have followed thus far, including a neighborhood meeting, and a meeting with the Plymouth Church. He discussed the massing of the project in relation to the Sheely District, the CSU Stadium, The Slab and Lake Street Apartments. He reviewed the site plan, pointing out the visual and pedestrian connections as well as the streetscaping.

Mr. Gadson displayed a diagram showing the distances between the buildings of their project and the properties deemed historic by Staff. He discussed height, setback and width in relation to LUC Section 3.4.7.F.1 and explained how they intend to comply with setback & step back requirements.

Jay Silverman, Dwell Design Studio, talked about how they have complied with the zoning (HMN) requirements for the project, as well as the West Central Area Plan. He also discussed the exterior design, explaining their efforts to relate to the craftsman and mid-century homes in the area, pointing out some specific design elements that were incorporated for the purpose of addressing the requirements of LUC 3.4.7.F.2. He reviewed the proposed materials and landscaping preservation.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Sladek asked if Staff had any comments. Mr. Yatabe discussed the issue of the Applicant's interpretation of the LUC with regard to the area of adjacency, noting that this will be discussed further, but at this time, the Commission will not be making a determination on the area of adjacency. Ms. Bzdek explained that a non-binding determination is a preliminary review, and can be made official later as needed.

Chair Sladek pointed out that three Commission Members who are absent are all architects, but noted that Ms. Zink is an architect and is present.

Mr. Ernest asked for clarification on the "not to scale" notation on the Section Cuts page. Mr. Silverman explained that the drawing was reduced to an arbitrary scale, so you can't measure the scale with a ruler, but the buildings are drawn to scale to each other.

In response to a question from Mr. Ernest, Mr. Silverman explained that the pedestrian connections are for public use.

Ms. Gensmer asked about the dimensions of the courtyards shown in the south elevation of Building A. Mr. Gadson said they are 50' wide, and vary between 90' and 50' long.

Ms. Dunn asked about materials on the Plymouth Church. Mr. Silverman said it is primarily red brick. Ms. Dunn referred to the stone on Building A as shown in the perspective along Prospect Road, and inquired as to whether there were any historic stone structures in the area. Mr. Silverman said that while there is some stone used in the neighborhood, this stone was specifically selected to complement the campus area. Ms. Dunn commented that it looked very "districty".

There was some discussion of the type of stone being used. Mr. Silverman said it is a Random Ashlar and sandstone (not dry stack stone) and is not planned to be cultured stone at this time. Chair Sladek said it was an attractive treatment.

Ms. Zink asked what elements relate to the mid-century modern style. Mr. Silverman pointed to the use of masonry, horizontal lines, materials and colors, deeper eaves and lower sloped gable roof forms. Ms. Zink said the columns or pilasters and colored spandrels between the windows give it a commercial look, despite the residential-style windows. She also found the two white cornices on the corner bays to be out of place with the other arts and crafts and mid-century modern elements. Mr. Silverman said they would note that comment, but explained that they were looking for a balance between the historic requirements and the district requirements, adding that the purpose of those elements was to vary the treatment of the façades. Ms. Zink commented that the combination of the vertical look of the windows and spandrels above each of the bay ends look more commercial than the other punched openings. Ms. Zink stated that it was a massive building.

Chair Sladek said it was of a similar scale and massing as The District on Plum Street, but pointed out that the setback of this building from the sidewalk, and that fact that it is on a major street, give it more breathing room. He added that next to the stadium, everything looks small. He said the courtyards help break up the massing. He said he could see Ms. Zink's point about the building having a commercial feel, but also sees it as a 20-30's classical building style.

Ms. Zink said that how the buildings relate to the campus isn't really the concern of the Landmark Preservation Commission, but rather the area of adjacency on Prospect. Chair Sladek said the Commission's comments will be based to a great extent on the area of adjacency, and since that has not yet been determined, it puts up a roadblock to their ability to comment on the project.

Ms. Wallace wondered if reversing the two building designs would help them to relate better to the surroundings. Chair Sladek noted that depending on how the area of adjacency is resolved, it might allow the design to be even more modern. Ms. Zink said the link to arts and crafts is tenuous. Chair Sladek pointed out that Sheely is post-war and the church is also postmodern. Mr. Silverman added that they also have to comply with the architectural language of the District guidelines.

Chair Sladek suggested that the Commission could have a more robust conversation with the Applicants after the area of adjacency questions are resolved. Mr. Silverman asked what the impact on the conversation would be if they assume they need to address all the properties deemed historic by Staff. Chair Sladek referred to the purpose and general standard of LUC 3.4.7 and said the main consideration for him is whether the project diminishes the historic properties. He added that such impacts might be mitigated by adjusting setbacks, step backs, and height along the edges of the new building. He noted that The Slab will help to create a buffer between Building A and 730 and 720 West Prospect, while there may be more impact on the church. Ms. Dunn said the church is closer and more visible from Building A. Chair Sladek noted that the driveway to the church, and the setback on the west side of Building A help to create a buffer to the church.

[Timestamp: 6:32 p.m.]

3. LIVING OAKS, 221 E. OAK - DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

This item was pulled from the agenda by the Applicant.

4. Discussion on the Landmark Preservation Commission Work Plan for 2017

Staff Report

Ms. McWilliams presented the staff report.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Sladek suggested there may be a number of items, such as the Design Assistance Program, that will carry through from year to year. Ms. McWilliams said it was up to the Commission to determine whether they would like to simply state that they would continue their ongoing programs, or whether they would like to detail each of those, which may make the document more cumbersome.

Chair Sladek said one item he would like to highlight is survey work. He said getting those underway seems to be a very slow process. He asked about the timing of the Loomis survey, and Ms. McWilliams said it should be concluded in the Spring of 2017. Chair Sladek asked if they can start planning for the next survey. Ms. McWilliams said that based on previous discussions with the Commission, Staff is already working on a survey plan. She said many of the areas at the top of the list are those facing intense development pressure. Chair Sladek would like to see comprehensive survey of Mountain Avenue. Ms. Dunn would like to see the Laurel School District resurveyed. Chair Sladek suggested due to its size, it might have to be a reconnaissance survey primarily based on the architecture. Ms. McWilliams pointed out that the Laurel School District was surveyed in the 1997-2001 timeframe as part of the larger Eastside/Westside Historic Neighborhoods survey. Ms. Dunn inquired about whether that survey was online, and Ms. Bzdek said it was not.

Chair Sladek said most of the 2016 items on the work plan should be continued to 2017. Ms. Dunn asked about clarifying specific code sections. Chair Sladek said the revisions made in 2014 have now been tested due to redevelopment pressure which has exposed some weaknesses. He asked whether the consulting services were part of the Historic Preservation Ordinance Review BFO offer, and whether that was necessary since the code was overhauled in 2014. Ms. McWilliams explained that the City is moving toward using an outside consultant to review the code and compare it with other communities' best practices.

Ms. Dunn asked if LPC members could meet in small groups with Council members to talk about what the LPC does. Mr. Ernest said some years ago, teams of LPC members met with some of the Councilmembers and Mayor for that purpose. He felt that was a useful exercise and would be willing to participate in it again.

Mr. Ernest drew the Commission's attention to the Design Review statistics on packet page 81, noting that of the 794 design reviews for the fiscal year, 775 were reviewed by Staff only. He expressed appreciation for the amount of work Staff is doing.

Ms. Dunn pointed out that the responses on packet pages 79 & 80 were truncated on the form. Ms. McWilliams said that was an unfortunate byproduct of the State's form design, and was unfortunately not something Staff is able to fix.

Chair Sladek said meeting with Councilmembers in teams had been a worthwhile endeavor in the past, and supported doing that again. He said last time they had given them a packet of information which was probably too much, and that this time maybe just one sheet with an introduction, brief goals and accomplishments would be sufficient.

[Timestamp: 6:56 p.m.]

- **OTHER BUSINESS**

Ms. Dunn asked about the "re: Denver" program last week. Ms. Bzdek said she would send out the schedule of upcoming events, the next of which is November 15th, with another one coming up in January. She described the session she and Ms. Bumgarner had attended last week was a presentation by Jim Lindberg with Green Lab on the topic of the streetcar commercial districts of Denver, as well as "older, smaller, better" districts.

Mr. Yatabe announced that there will be a meeting of the Ethics Review Board at 4:00 p.m. on October 4th which will be a continuance of the discussion regarding ethics opinion they issued earlier this year. He doesn't have any information about Council action beyond that.

- **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Sladek adjourned the meeting at 7:02 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Gretchen Schiager.

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on

Oct 26, 2016


Doug Ernest, Acting Chair