



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

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

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.

Video of the meeting will be broadcast at 1:30 p.m. the following day through the Comcast cable system on Channel 14 or 881 (HD). Please visit <http://www.fcgov.com/fctv/> for the daily cable schedule. The video will also be available for later viewing on demand here: <http://www.fcgov.com/fctv/video-archive.php>.

Regular Meeting April 19, 2017 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Dunn called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

- **ROLL CALL**

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

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

There were no changes to the posted agenda. Ms. McWilliams briefly reviewed updates to the packet since the work session.

- **STAFF REPORTS**

None.

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

None.

- **CONSENT AGENDA**

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 8, SPECIAL MEETING.

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the March 8, 2017 special meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

2. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 15, SPECIAL MEETING.

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the March 15, 2017 special meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

3. 225 MAPLE STREET - APPLICATION FOR FORT COLLINS LANDMARK DESIGNATION

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This item is to consider the request for a recommendation to City Council regarding landmark designation for the Continental Oil Company Property, a collection of twentieth-century industrial buildings that are significant for their connection to the oil industry in Fort Collins and architecture.

APPLICANT: Kenneth Mannon, Operations Services Director

4. 212 LAPORTE AVENUE - APPLICATION FOR FORT COLLINS LANDMARK DESIGNATION

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This item is to consider the request for a recommendation to City Council regarding landmark designation for the Dairy Gold Creamery Laboratory, a midcentury commercial building that is significant for its connection to the dairy industry in Fort Collins and Gogie-style architecture.

APPLICANT: Kenneth Mannon, Operations Services Director

5. 300 LAPORTE AVENUE - APPLICATION FOR FORT COLLINS LANDMARK DESIGNATION

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This item is to consider the request for a recommendation to City Council regarding landmark designation for the Historic Fort Collins Municipal Building, an International-style municipal building that is significant for its connection to the growth in Fort Collins post-World War II, notable local architect William Robb, and architecture.

APPLICANT: Kenneth Mannon, Operations Services Director

In response to a question by Mr. Lingle, Ms. McWilliams clarified the City's desire to designate only the footprints of the three buildings.

Mr. Ernest moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission accept the Consent Agenda of the April 19, 2017 regular meeting as presented. Ms. Zink seconded. The motion passed 8-0.

- **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

6. ALTA VISTA NEIGHBORHOOD HISTORIC SURVEY - PROJECT RESULTS

The purpose of this item is to provide the Commission and citizens with information regarding the Alta Vista Neighborhood Historic Survey Project. The survey has been conducted by Colorado State University historic preservation graduate students, working under the direction of Dr. Sarah Payne.

Staff Report

Ms. McWilliams introduced the item.

Student Presentation

The graduate students gave a presentation about the survey work they had completed, including the methodology used, findings and next steps. *[Secretary's Note: The presentation has been added to the online packet.]*

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Ernest asked whether the students had received any feedback from the Alta Vista residents with regard to the possibility of a landmark district designation. One of the students responded that the reactions of the residents were varied, and that there were questions about what a designation would mean to them.

Mr. Lingle inquired about evidence that flat roofs had been converted to gable roofs. A student explained that those findings primarily came from historic records they had located.

Mr. Hogestad suggested that when the nomination is prepared, it would be beneficial to include information about vernacular add-ons, economic drivers, and how various trends in the neighborhood evolved. He stated it would be interesting to follow up on the open courtyards or haciendas, and the organization of the outbuildings around them, as part of the nomination process.

Mr. Ernest commented that the oral histories of Hispanics in the area told stories of discrimination, including use of discriminatory signs at businesses, but it has been difficult to find any actual documentation, photos, or evidence of that. He encouraged the students to be on the lookout for anything of that nature.

Dr. Payne acknowledged the great work of the students. She noted that historical isolation and insulation of this community were recurring themes in their research. Another student added that Hispanics had started their own American Legion post because the establishments wouldn't serve them.

Ms. Wallace asked about connections to Andersonville and Buckingham. A student responded that a strong tradition of earthen architecture was common among the Germans from Russia, as well as the Hispanic immigrants.

Chair Dunn commented that the Alta Vista community had historically been unrecognized and pointed out the importance of this study.

● **CONSENT CALENDAR FOLLOW UP**

Chair Dunn explained she had unintentionally skipped this section of the agenda earlier. She explained the purpose of it was to allow the Commission Members to comment on the items on the consent calendar without opening them for discussion.

Mr. Hogestad commented that 300 Laporte Ave. was a textbook example of International style, and he was pleased that its designation as a local landmark was on the agenda tonight.

Chair Dunn said she was pleased that the City brought forward the three designations. Upon her request, Ms. Bzdek played a short video about the FoCo Café at 225 Maple.

7. LIVING OAKS (PDP170009) - DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This is a proposed design for a three-story residential project that would be a Net Zero Energy building on a 4,600-square-foot site at the southwest corner of Oak and Mathews Streets. The development site is within the Neighborhood Conservation – Buffer District (NCB). Final review will be a Type 1 hearing with a hearing officer.

APPLICANT/OWNER: Laurie and Bob Davis, DavisDavis Architects

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report. She discussed the area of adjacency, changes to the project since the last meeting, and the staff analysis and recommendation. She reviewed the new information provided at the Commission's request. Regarding the Commission's question at the work session about the entry, Ms. Bzdek read City Planner Clay Frickey's response, referencing Land Use Code Section 3.5.2(D)(2).

Applicant Presentation

Ms. Davis gave the Applicant presentation. She addressed the Commission's questions and concerns, beginning with the typology and the changes to the glass storefront. She discussed changes to size and height. She explained why the floor heights were necessary due to the sunlight angles. She addressed the changes in materials with the textured terracotta on the upper floors and the gray fiber cement on the first floor. She talked about character and pattern and how they have strengthened the design's historic ties. She provided the rationale for the color choices and showed the height comparison with the Library Park Apartments. She discussed the addition of the terracotta window headers and other details.

Public Input

None

Area of Adjacency

There were no questions from the Commission.

Mr. Ernest moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission adopt as the area of adjacency for the proposed Living Oaks building at 221 East Oak Street the sixteen designated and eligible buildings on Oak, Mathews, and Remington Streets, as listed in the staff report.

Mr. Lingle seconded. The motion passed 8-0.

Commission Questions

Mr. Hogestad asked for confirmation on the height, and Ms. Davis confirmed it is 39' 7" to the top. He asked if they had considered lowering the second floor by a foot, as they had done with the third floor. Ms. Davis said they had not considered that, and pointed out that the McHugh-Andrews House was similar at 38 feet. Mr. Hogestad pointed out that the building was still considerably taller than the average in the area.

Mr. Hogestad expressed concern that that the roof style was dissimilar to the gabled and hipped residential roof styles in the area. Ms. Davis said the flat roof in the front lowers the front, and the angled PVs give the appearance of a pitched roof to be more compatible with the neighborhood. Mr. Hogestad said it was a shed roof, not a pitched roof.

Mr. Hogestad asked if the fiber cement panels had a condition at the corner. Ms. Davis explained that while there are corner pieces available, they may not be within the budget, so there would likely be an open joint at the corner.

Ms. Zink asked if the ground floor is rainscreen, and Ms. Davis confirmed it was. Mr. Hogestad pointed out it was not made of clay, and Ms. Davis confirmed it was concrete and fiber.

Mr. Frick asked about the structure of the floor system on the first floor and the demising walls. Ms. Davis said two steel trusses would run through it, basically a cantilevered beam that would probably be between 1'4" and 1'6".

Mr. Lingle pointed out that the most immediately adjacent buildings tend to be the taller ones. Mr. Hogestad talked about the statistics of the heights and roof forms in the area.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Lingle moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission recommend to the Decision Maker approval of the Living Oaks Project Development Plan (PDP170009), finding it is in compliance with the standards contained in Land Use Code section 3.4.7 in regard to compatibility with the character of the project's area of adjacency for the following reasons:

- ***The project does not impact the individual eligibility for designation of the historic properties in the defined area of adjacency.***

- ***The project design uses massing and scale that is compatible with the historic context.***
- ***The project relies on building materials that are visually compatible with adjacent historic properties.***
- ***The project uses window patterning and proportions that provide visual ties to buildings within the adjacent historic context.***
- ***The proposed design does not impede existing visual and pedestrian connections to the adjacent neighborhood focal points.***

Ms. Zink seconded.

Mr. Hogestad stated his hesitancy to support the motion, as he did not believe the height, setbacks and width met the requirements of section 3.4.7 to the maximum extent feasible. He stated the design was not in character with residential nature of the area. He said the design does not strengthen the visual ties among buildings. He stated that the building doesn't have scale, and the materials and location of the front door don't help to establish that.

Mr. Lingle agreed with the staff analysis that the terracotta material visually harmonizes with the brick in the area as a modern interpretation of historic material, and argued that the terracotta does have scale. He suggested the Commission should embrace the transition in time periods and the use of modern materials that are compatible with historic materials in texture and color.

Mr. Hogestad disagreed that the material has scale, stating that scale is based on perception built over years.

Ms. Wallace said she agreed with all of the findings of fact, except for the compatibility of the scale and massing.

Ms. Zink did not find averages and percentages in terms of size and materials to be a valid way to evaluate. She thought the size and massing of the closest buildings were most relevant. She commented that the changes made to the detailing helped the design, adding refinement that was missing previously, and tying it into the neighborhood better.

Chair Dunn asked about the size of the fiber cement panels. Ms. Davis noted that the McHugh-Andrews House has also has larger scale pieces that are of similar size.

Chair Dunn expressed concerns about the primary entrance, the setback and orientation of the doors, in relation to section 3.4.7(F)(2). Mr. Lingle said pointed out that the public would experience the building from an angle, and wouldn't see the alcove. Ms. Zink commented that a lot of buildings have an entrance with the door somewhat obscured.

Mr. Frick said he loved the project, and was not too concerned about the entrances, but has a hard time justifying it with the Code due to the height, setback and width on this block face.

Ms. Wallace said the proposed development it is in compliance with the Code, except for its size and massing.

Mr. Ernest pointed out the varying typologies and heights within the area of adjacency. He referenced several sections of the Code, and said he finds the project complies, and that he would support the motion.

Ms. Simpson expressed concerns about the height and setbacks with regard to section 3.4.7(F)(1), pointing out that it was setback on Oak, but not on Matthews. She appreciated the Applicant's efforts to improve the project.

Chair Dunn found the height to be acceptable, given the range of heights in the area. She said she was struggling with character, but noted that the area is varied, and the project fits well with one side of the street, but not the other. She is still having some difficulty with the doors, but appreciates the articulation. She stated that the terracotta material is compatible with the brick, although she questions the size of the panels.

Public Input

John Gascoyne expressed support for the project on behalf of himself and his neighbor, Mary Ray.

The motion passed 5-3, with Frick, Hogestad and Wallace dissenting.

8. 618 W. MOUNTAIN AVENUE, THE CROSE-SCOTT-DICKEY HOUSE AND GARAGE – CONCEPTUAL/FINAL DESIGN REVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This is a design review request for work on the storm windows and front steps of the Crose-Scott-Dickey House and Garage at 618 W. Mountain Avenue, designated as a Fort Collins landmark in 2013. The applicant is seeking a Landmark Rehabilitation Loan to support the proposed project.

APPLICANT/OWNER: William and Kathleen Whitley

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report. She reviewed the loan program, the proposed work, and the supplemental information provided by the Applicant since the work session.

Applicant Presentation

None

Public Input

None

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Lingle asked about the double columns that were removed from the application. Ms. Bzdek confirmed that they had been removed. Mr. Lingle asked if doing the storm windows now would preclude them from doing the columns properly in the future. Mr. Whitley clarified that the double columns were not being considered at this time, but doing the windows now would not impact doing the columns later.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Ernest moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission move to Final Review of the proposed work at the Crose-Scott-Dickey House and Garage at 618 W. Mountain Avenue.

Ms. Zink seconded. The motion passed 8-0.

Ms. Zink moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the plans and specifications for work on the storm windows and front steps of the Crose-Scott-Dickey House and Garage at 618 W. Mountain Avenue as presented, finding that the proposed work (a) will not erode the authenticity or destroy any distinctive exterior feature or characteristic of the improvements or site; and (b) is compatible with the distinctive characteristics of the landmark and with the spirit and purpose of Section 14-48 of the Municipal Code.

Ms. Wallace seconded. The motion passed 8-0.

● **OTHER BUSINESS**

Chair Dunn asked the CSU students if they had any questions.

One student asked how frequently the codes change, and what the process is. Chair Dunn explained the role of the Commission in relation to the Code, and stated they were last changed in 2013 and are currently being reviewed again.

Mr. Ernest commented on how close the Living Oaks vote was. He also complimented Chair Dunn on her meeting management.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Gretchen Schiager.

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on 17 May 2017

Meg Dunn
Meg Dunn, Chair