



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

Regular Meeting October 18, 2017 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**
Chair Dunn called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

- **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Dunn, Zink, Hogestad, Ernest, Simpson, Gensmer, Lingle, Wallace, Frick
ABSENT: None
STAFF: McWilliams, 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 SEPTEMBER 20, 2017 REGULAR MEETING.

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the September 20, 2017 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

Mr. Ernest moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the minutes of the regular meeting of September 20, 2017 as presented. Mr. Frick seconded. The motion passed 9:0.

2. 227 WOOD STREET (THE HARDEN HOUSE) - CONCEPTUAL DESIGN REVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This is a request for conceptual design review of The Harden House at 227 Wood Street, designated as a Fort Collins landmark in 1999. The proposed work includes demolition of an existing rear porch (undated, historic), rear addition that steps in six inches on both sides, addition of a skylight, and addition of a deck. The applicants have been before the LPC on August 16, 2017 and September 20, 2017. This a revised option based on feedback received from the Commission at those meetings.

APPLICANT: Gordon Winner, property owner
Heidi Shuff, architect

Staff Report

Ms. Bumgarner presented the staff report, including information about the property and the proposed changes. She shared current and historic photos of the home. She explained the role of the Commission, and reviewed the relevant Code sections and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. She displayed the latest drawings for the proposed changes to the home.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Winner, the property owner, addressed the Commission to explain the modifications to the design since the last meeting. He asked if using a hyphen is a requirement. He explained how he has simplified and scaled down the design. He stated he would like to open up the back wall between the kitchen and the family room. He said he believes the design is getting close to final.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn asked the Commission's thoughts about the hyphen. Mr. Ernest said he had reviewed the Guidelines again with regard to the hyphen. He pointed out a couple of relevant sections. He said the addition being subordinate to the original home is more important than the specific design. He also emphasized the addition should be differentiated from the original. He noted that the related section mentions the hyphen as only one of several recommendations. He does not believe the hyphen is required.

Mr. Frick agreed with Mr. Ernest. He said because the house is so small and simple, forcing a hyphen would be overkill. The differentiation could be accomplished with setbacks, materials, and other elements.

Mr. Lingle stated that he had listened to the recording of the meetings he had missed last month. He said the need for a hyphen should be programmatically driven. In this case, a hyphen is not needed and should not be forced. He said that by stepping the addition in on both sides, and not extending to the north, it would be adequately differentiated from the original without a hyphen.

Mr. Frick suggested that the addition be a rectangle, but the setback on each side should be the same. He said the addition should be simple and lined up with the existing building in terms of access. Chair Dunn asked why the setbacks weren't the same on both sides. Mr. Winner said he was trying to make the setback as big as possible. He would be willing to make it a foot on both sides. Mr. Lingle agreed with Mr. Frick's comment regarding keeping the addition symmetrical, adding that it would be cleaner and more appropriate for the form.

Ms. Zink stated that the roof overhang should not extend beyond brick of the original building. Mr. Winner said the overhang is currently more than 12 inches but less than 24, and said he intends to match the existing overhang. Ms. Zink asked if the new overhangs match the original. Mr. Winner said they would. Ms. Simpson added that if the roof of the addition is the same height as the original, and the sides are stepped back, the overhang would not be seen from the front.

Mr. Frick said even a six inch setback on either side would be acceptable to give them more space.

Mr. Hogestad said the whole idea of a hyphen is to differentiate from the original. As long as there is sufficient differentiation, a hyphen is not specifically required. He expressed concern about the roof having only a six inch difference in height, stating that dropping the plate height would make it more obvious that it is an addition. Mr. Winner said the addition will be siding versus the brick original, and there would be six inch setbacks. Mr. Hogestad suggested a band at the eaves or something extra with the siding to differentiate. He also suggested making the plate height lower, as well. Mr. Hogestad said a one foot setback on one side and one and a half on the other is okay.

Mr. Frick said lowering the plate height from the original would make the roof more distinguishable from the original. Mr. Hogestad said it should be as different as possible, since they aren't using a hyphen. Mr. Frick pointed out a number of things that will differentiate the old from the new to make it a significant amount of change.

Chair Dunn said the Commission seemed to agree that the hyphen is not necessary. She said unless there is a good reason, they want to meet all of the Guidelines, but in this instance, the Applicant has presented a solid case for why the basement won't work and the hyphen is not the best solution. She added that she would like to see a one foot setback on each side, and asked the Commission for their thoughts.

Ms. Gensmer stated that she had reviewed the video from the last meeting she missed. She agreed that the setback should be one foot on each side. Ms. Wallace agreed, and said she would also like to see the plate lowered a little, and a different roof pitch. She felt that was enough differentiation.

Ms. Simpson does not have a preference between a one foot or six inch setback. While she thinks symmetrical setbacks would be best, she doesn't feel strongly about it. With regard to lowering the height, she expressed concern about having sufficient ceiling height and would like more information on that.

Mr. Frick and Mr. Winner clarified that the roof would be the same pitch, just lower. Ms. Wallace suggested a different pitch. Chair Dunn said the roof should be the same pitch, and other Commissioners agreed.

Ms. Gensmer said while the hyphen would preserve more of the historic material of the existing wall, she sees the reasoning for the design. She asked how much of the historic material would be removed. Mr. Winner would like to remove about 10' of the 24' width, leaving a head height of 7-7.5' to match head height in the original. Mr. Hogestad said they would like to see a section of that in the final design. Mr. Winner explained about the plan for the interior. Mr. Hogestad would like to see where the original openings were on the plans they bring next time.

Ms. Zink agreed that the plans should indicate the original door and window openings. She asked if there was an opening to the left of the refrigerator. Mr. Winner said there was a door for access to the root cellar, and explained how the kitchen was originally laid out.

Chair Dunn asked about the windows. Mr. Frick said he agreed with the smaller windows above the shower. He also understands what they are doing with the stairwell. He said he wouldn't put in a window larger than the existing. He suggested adding a basement-type window.

Chair Dunn pointed out the section of the Guidelines about the windows. Mr. Hogestad clarified that they should not recreate the historic windows. Chair Dunn asked about egress windows for the basement. Mr. Winner said there would be a larger egress window on the south side. Mr. Winner said he was open to suggestions on the window configuration for the bathroom, but would like them to be higher up for privacy. Mr. Frick suggested a couple of small windows, or placing a shower curtain over the window on the inside. He said two small, square windows would work, but cautioned against a horizontal look.

Mr. Winner mentioned that they would like to remove all the shingles and make them contiguous across the whole house. There was a discussion about using wood shingles. Ms. McWilliams said if they use historic tapersawn shingles, like the Avery House, they could qualify for the rehabilitation loan program. If they use a different roof material, even if it is a wood product, it wouldn't qualify for the loan program. She also said any roof material that is appropriate for the home would likely qualify for state tax credits, but she recommended verifying that with the State. Mr. Winner asked about insurance on wood shingles due to the fire rating. Mr. Lingle said fire resistant wood shingles are available. Chair Dunn suggested talking to the State and calculating the costs either way, noting that with the tax credits, it may come out the same as it would have with lower cost materials.

Mr. Winner said they would also like to put gutters on to protect the house, which would be a significant change. Mr. Hogestad agreed that it is more important to protect the home, than to avoid covering the molding. Mr. Frick said using a half-round gutter would not only be more in keeping with the style and age of the home, but due to its shape, it also allows some of the molding to be visible. Ms. McWilliams added that the State usually wants to see half-round gutters, and that they would also qualify for the loan program. Ms. Zink pointed out a photo that shows some staining and possible deterioration of the mortar in the foundation caused by the lack of gutters.

Mr. Winner thanked the Commission, adding that they had made good progress and established some clarity.

- **OTHER BUSINESS**


None

- **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Gretchen Schiager.

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on Dec 29 2017



Meg Dunn, Chair