



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 May 17, 2017 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Dunn called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

- **ROLL CALL**

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

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

No changes to posted agenda.

- **STAFF REPORTS**

None.

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

None.

● **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 19 REGULAR MEETING.

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the April 19, 2017 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

***Ms. Gensmer abstained, having not been present for the April 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.***

***Mr. Ernest moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the Consent Agenda of the April 19, 2017 regular meeting as presented. Mr. Hogestad seconded. The motion passed 6:0.***

2. 305 CIRCLE DRIVE - FINAL DEMOLITION/ALTERATION REVIEW

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** This is a proposal to demolish the residence and attached garage located at 305 Circle Drive. The property was determined to be individually eligible as a Fort Collins Landmark.

**APPLICANT:** Barry Schram, Lamar Valley Craftsman

Chair Dunn responded to a comment in a citizen email, clarifying that she was not related to any previous owner or resident of the property.

Staff Report

Ms. McWilliams presented the staff report, including background, history, a review of the applicable Code section, and the role of the Commission.

Applicant Presentation

Olexa Tkachenko, the project architect representing the owner, declined to make a presentation, but will respond to comments or questions.

Public Input

Sarah Brooks, 1522 Whedbee Street, opposed the project stating that it is a shame that Circle Drive continues to be developed into something it is not.

Torger Hougen, 335 Circle Drive, opposed the project, expressing concerns about the materials and design.

Heather Lahdenpera, 280 Circle Drive, lives directly across the street from this project. She supports the project, and would rather have an owner with a home that meets their needs in that location than renters.

Sarah Dentoni, 20 Circle Drive, said while she appreciates an owner's right to do as they wish with their property, she opposes this project because the design does not address the language of Circle Drive.

Cara Neth, 335 Circle Drive, stated that Circle Drive is special and distinctive, and worthy of preservation as the City's first subdivision. She said she is not opposed to massive renovations, or scraping houses that have not been maintained, but opposes this one because the home is well maintained and is the nicest on street. She added that Bob Ostertag, an internationally-known experimental musician, was a past tenant.

Andrew Milbauer, 815 West Oak, supports Staff's findings and recommendation to approve without conditions. He stated the project complies with the City's guidelines and that the Applicant has met the requirements. He questioned whether the porch was unique, as had been stated in the architectural inventory.

Drew Ditter, 310 Circle Drive, spoke in favor of the proposal, stating he prefers owners who are permanent residents.

Rich Wright, 315 Circle Drive, does not support the project because the design does not fit the neighborhood.

An anonymous resident of Circle Drive opposed the project, stating that this proposal is not compatible with the neighborhood of smaller ranch-style homes. She also mentioned that this will increase property taxes in the neighborhood.

### Applicant Response

Olexa Tkachenko explained that the owners and the project team have chosen to propose a new project for the site. They have submitted all required documents, received approval from all City departments, and request the approval of the Commission.

### Staff Response

None

### Commission Questions

None

### Commission Discussion

Mr. Ernest commented that the study by Mr. Marmor included a table showing the number of residences on Circle Drive (60), and the number of remodels (20), which he found interesting.

Mr. Frick said it looks like a great design, but he wished it were somewhere other than in a potential historic district. He would have liked to see more effort to create a design that would be compatible with the neighborhood character.

Mr. Ernest referenced a citizen email that raised a question about the plan of protection and disposal of materials. Mr. Tkachenko responded that usable interior items will be donated to Habitat for Humanity. He said there was no plan to sell exterior materials, as they contain asbestos and cannot be reused. He stated the brick could be repurposed if someone wanted it.

Chair Dunn asked about the plan of protection for the homes next door. Mr. Tkachenko responded that there would be no impact to neighbors. Chair Dunn commented about a recent demolition on Whitcomb that created tremors in the house next door. Mr. Tkachenko replied that the deconstruction will be coordinated with the general contractor so that there will be no disturbance to neighboring properties.

Chair Dunn commented that this neighborhood would be a great historic district, noting that the onus for landmarking a district falls to the owner(s) of the homes within the proposed district. Non-consensual designation is rare. The homeowners or neighbors would typically need to provide protection for this house, or a district, through a grassroots movement.

***Mr. Ernest moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the application for final demolition/alteration review for 305 Circle Drive as presented, finding that the Applicant has complied with all Code requirements and purpose of Section 14-72 of the Municipal Code.***

***Ms. Gensmer seconded.***

Mr. Ernest will vote in favor of the motion. He agreed with Chair Dunn's comments on the process for forming a district and historic designation. He acknowledged the frustrations with the process, adding that concerned citizens can work with Council to get the Code changed. He said the Code is specific about the Commission's options.

Mr. Frick agreed with Mr. Ernest's comments.

Ms. Zink will vote in favor since the owner has met the requirements, and there not much of an option available to the Commission.

Mr. Hogestad expressed disappointment with the Commission's options. He stated that the design team could have done a better job of addressing compatibility. He will support the motion, since the Applicant has met all of the requirements.

Ms. Wallace will support the motion, adding that while this is not what the Commission would prefer, it is what the Code allows.

Ms. Gensmer will also vote in favor of the motion, as the Applicant has met the Code. She agreed with Mr. Hogestad's comments. She added that she doesn't think any conditions for approval are warranted.

Chair Dunn added that this home was found to be eligible as a local historic landmark, and it is very likely the Commission would have recommended designation, if the owners had brought it to them. She explained that the Commission is approving this, not because they think this is the best result,

but because they are restricted by the Code. She understands the difficulty for the neighbors, but the Applicant has met the requirements. She mentioned that there are design guidelines for her neighborhood, but they are voluntary, not required. She encouraged anyone who is interested in landmarking their property or a district, to speak with Historic Preservation Staff.

***The motion passed 7-0.***

3. CONFLUENCE (PDP170001) - DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** This proposal is a mixed-use project of residential, office, commercial space, and parking on a 0.4-acre site at 401, 405, and 409 Linden Street in the River Downtown Redevelopment District (RDR). Final review will be a Type 1 hearing with a hearing officer.

**APPLICANT:** Jason Kersley, [au]workshop, llc., 405 Linden Street

***Ms. Gensmer recused herself due to a conflict, and Mr. Frick recused himself because he was not present at the 2015 review of this project.***

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report. She discussed the relevant Code and the Commission's role in the process. She reviewed the background and staff analysis, and provided recommendations for the area of adjacency.

Mr. Yatabe asked the members to confirm whether they were present for the 2015 review of this proposal, and if not, whether they had reviewed the materials from that meeting. Mr. Ernest said he had reviewed the materials. Chair Dunn confirmed she was there. Ms. Zink was there and also reviewed materials.

Applicant Presentation

Jason Kersley gave the Applicant presentation, including historical context, zoning summary, site plan, and responses to Code requirements. He reviewed the Commission's comments from their 2015 development review and explained how their design addresses them. He talked about the materials, where they are placed on the building, and how they relate to the surrounding historic context.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions

Mr. Ernest pointed out a discrepancy in the address for the sign shop at 320 Willow. Mr. Kersey said the Assessor's map shows 320, but the number on the building is 326.

Upon Mr. Hogestad's request, Mr. Kersey reviewed the materials again, pointing out their locations.

Ms. Zink asked about the fenestration and window patterns. Mr. Kersey explained that they used storefront windows for the retail portion, and the residential windows are aluminum clad wood.

Mr. Hogestad asked how the cement board is scored and mounted, and whether it's a rainscreen. Mr. Kersey replied that it was a raw concrete panel rainscreen. He passed around samples of all the materials.

Mr. Hogestad asked how the wood would be treated, and Mr. Kersey said it would be stained.

Ms. Zink asked about the coursing for the stone, and the mortar for the brick. Mr. Kersey said the brick would have standard gray mortar, and the stone would be rubble.

Mr. Hogestad asked for details about the concrete panels, such as how they are scored, how the corners are made, what the header and sill look like, how the storefront fits into it, and how they are attached to the wood tower piece. Mr. Kersey said there would be an open butt joint at the corner. He said the panel size would be 2' x 10' vertical, but they are still working through the details. Mr. Hogestad expressed concern that they don't have the detail worked out. Mr. Kersey assured him that they would get there.

Chair Dunn asked about the rust on the corrugated panels dripping to the sidewalk. Mr. Kersey said there is a sunshade to catch that, and a narrow patch of grass to catch anything that gets past that.

Mr. Hogestad asked about the signage. Mr. Kersey explained it would be a ghost sign in lighter colored stain.

Mr. Kersey responded to additional Commission questions about materials and colors, pointing out their placement.

Chair Dunn asked about the Camp Collins sign, noting that it should be "Fort" Collins, not "Camp" Collins, and the year should be 1864, not 1866. Mr. Ernest suggested they come back to discuss the sign further.

Chair Dunn asked whether the small building behind the outbuilding is part of the eligibility. Ms. Bzdek said she would have to look into that.

### **Area of Adjacency**

Chair Dunn asked the Commission about their thoughts on the area of adjacency. Mr. Ernest stated he is comfortable with Staff's recommendations.

***Mr. Hogestad moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission adopt the area of adjacency as listed in the staff report for the proposed Confluence project.***

***Mr. Ernest seconded. The motion passed 5-0.***

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Hogestad expressed amazement at the detail and volume of materials included. He said the project meets all the criteria, but he feels that the whole project is a lot of little pieces in need of a unifying element that brings it all together. He clarified that was not meant as a criticism, just a comment.

Mr. Ernest commented that the Applicants responded to the Commission's concerns from the 2015 review. He recognized the complexity of differentiating between the three separate buildings, and is comfortable with the result. Mr. Hogestad responded that the materials are varied on each building, and that the project was overly detailed and struggling for identity.

Ms. Zink commented that the scale in relation to the historic buildings is reasonable, considering that the historic buildings are simple and traditional, and these are complicated, modern buildings.

Chair Dunn referenced Section 3.4.7(F)(3), and asked the Commission members whether the project met the requirement to maintain the existing distribution of materials on the block. Mr. Hogestad said it meets the intent of the Code.

Ms. Wallace said the materials fit well in the River District area, and she appreciated the nod to surrounding architecture. She wondered if the project's application of the Code might be too literal.

Chair Dunn said she was intrigued by the way the coloring of the corrugated metal felt familiar to the brick in some of the buildings in the area. Mr. Hogestad said the corrugation has a connotation of industry and warehouse, and prefers the color of this metal over galvanized. Ms. Zink said the metal also relates to the railroad tracks.

Chair Dunn asked for comments relating to Section 3.4.7(F)(1). Mr. Ernest said while the new structure is quite dissimilar in size to the historic structures, he agreed with the Staff analysis that the stepped back massing and other setbacks have addressed that.

Mr. Hogestad said the fine grain of detail actually helps to make the buildings appear and feel smaller.

Chair Dunn said it complies well in terms of step backs and the placement of taller sections in the interior. She is concerned about the section behind the house, but it is interior, so it does comply with the Code.

Mr. Hogestad expressed concern that the final details of how it comes together are missing, and they always ask for that in a final review. Mr. Hogestad said it could take months to develop that detail, and maybe in this particular instance, it isn't necessary to wait for it. Ms. Zink commented that they usually have more generic detail, not that fine level of detail. Mr. Hogestad stressed the importance of the details to the execution and appearance of the project, adding that the finished product must look like what they are approving. Mr. Hogestad said he is confident the Applicant will figure out the solutions, and suggested they could move forward based on the assumption it will be well-executed.

Chair Dunn requested comments about Section 3.4.7(F)(2). Ms. Zink said the alignment in this case is more general, and that the heights are similar enough. In terms of window patterns, Ms. Zink said the other buildings don't have windows that establish a pattern. Mr. Ernest agreed. Ms. Zink said the windows and cornices fit in with the River District. Ms. Wallace said it is a new entity, so it can't be matched up with anything comparable. Mr. Hogestad added that the window proportion is historic in nature.

Chair Dunn commented that the signage acknowledging the Fort serves as a connection to the focal point required by Section 3.4.7(F)(4).

#### Commission Deliberation

**Mr. Ernest moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission recommend to the Decision Maker approval of the Confluence project (PDP170001), 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 employs a massing strategy at the transition edges that is compatible with the historic context and situates taller elements at the interior of the project site.**
- **The project includes primary building materials on the elevations immediately abutting historic properties that are reflective of the dominant historic materials.**
- **The project provides multiple design elements that create visual ties to buildings within the adjacent historic context.**

**Ms. Zink seconded.**

Mr. Hogestad recognized the huge effort to design this building, and again noted that it was not his intent to criticize the design work. He stated he'd never seen so much detail so closely tied to the Land Use Code and Design Guidelines. He hopes the Applicant will come back for a complimentary review of the proposed Fort Collins signage. Chair Dunn agreed.

Mr. Ernest stated he would support the motion, commenting on the project's compliance with the various sections of 3.4.7. He added that the Applicant also did a good job of applying the River District Guidelines without subordinating the Land Use Code provisions.

**The motion passed 5:0.**

#### ● OTHER BUSINESS

None

#### ● ADJOURNMENT

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 7:57 p.m.

*Minutes respectfully submitted by Gretchen Schiager.*

---

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on 21 June 2017

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Meg Dunn, Chair