



Meg Dunn, Chair  
Per Hogestad, Vice Chair  
Michael Bello  
Katie Dorn  
Bud Frick  
Kristin Gensmer  
Kevin Murray  
Mollie Simpson  
Alexandra Wallace

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 February 21, 2018 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Dunn called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

- **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Dunn, Hogestad, Wallace, Gensmer, Simpson, Dorn, Bello, Murray  
ABSENT: Frick  
STAFF: McWilliams, Bzdek, Bumgarner, Yatabe, Schiager

Chair Dunn asked the three new members (Katie Dorn, Kevin Murray & Mike Bello) to introduce themselves.

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

Staff had no changes to the posted agenda. Chair Dunn mentioned adding two items to Other Business.

- **STAFF REPORTS**

None.

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

None.

- **CONSENT AGENDA**

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 20, 2017 REGULAR MEETING.

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

***Mr. Hogestad moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the minutes of the December 20, 2017. Ms. Simpson seconded. The motion passed 8-0***

*Secretary's Note: Chair Dunn and Vice Chair Hogestad recused themselves from agenda Items 2 and 3 due to conflicts of interest. Ms. Wallace chaired these two items.*

2. 602 EAST ELIZABETH STREET - FINAL DEMOLITION/ALTERATION REVIEW

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** This is a proposal to add a wood pergola over the front entrance of the residence, new windows and doors throughout, new transom windows above historic windows on the front of the residence, rear addition, reconstruction of a historical porch on the west elevation, and new limestone planters in front of the home. The property was determined to be individually eligible as a Fort Collins Landmark.

**APPLICANT:** Anne Nelson, architect

***Mr. Bello moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the application for final demolition/alteration review for 602 East Elizabeth Street 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. The motion passed 6-0.***

- **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

3. 2601 SOUTH COLLEGE DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY APPEAL

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** This item is to consider the appeal of the determination of eligibility for Fort Collins local landmark designation of 2601 South College Avenue, which was considered eligible for its association with the growth of the automobile industry and the Ghent family and for its distinctive mid-century automobile dealership characteristics.

**APPLICANT:** Bill Wells, Brinkman Partners, applicant

Ms. Bumgarner noted the emails that had been received with regard to this item and mentioned that they had been distributed to the Commission and the Appellant and added to the online meeting materials.

*Ms. Gensmer and Ms. Simpson disclosed that they were not present at the work session when this item was discussed, but they reviewed the audio recording and are prepared to participate.*

Staff Report

Ms. Bumgarner presented the staff report, provided background information, and reviewed the relevant codes and processes. She reviewed the four elements of significance and the seven aspects of integrity, the importance of context, and the role of the Commission.

### Commission Questions of Staff

None.

### Appellant Presentation

Todd Parker with Brinkman gave the Appellant presentation. He noted that the W.A. Drake carriage steps would be incorporated into the design. He also addressed Mr. Bello's question about energy inefficiency of the building, adding that the utility costs were a hardship for the owners. He argued that the architectural style was not unique to the time period, speaking to the photos that Mr. Frick had shared with the Commission previously. He introduced Kristen Autobee with Autobee and Autobee. She said that the auto dealership architecture is not a recognized form of architecture, but falls under specialty architecture and that other types of showrooms are similar. She also addressed the changes to the building over the years, emphasizing the loss of the original garage doors, and discussed changes to the historic integrity of the structure.

### Commission Questions of the Appellant

Mr. Bello asked the Applicant whether other buildings could be severed from the showroom. Mr. Brinkman stated they looked into that possibility; however, the energy inefficiency of the main building led the owners to not pursue that option.

Mr. Murray asked about the elements deemed character-defining by Ms. Autobee: the front overhang, the roofing type, and the garage doors. Ms. Autobee replied the structure would be very different without those elements.

Mr. Parker presented some photos of auto dealerships in other communities that had been scraped or redeveloped in response to those provided by Mr. Frick.

Mr. Bello requested clarification on whether the photos of dealerships that were scraped support their argument that this design was unique. Mr. Parker and Ms. Autobee responded noting there are buildings of similar architecture, materials, and design in Fort Collins; this building is not especially unique.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Autobee if her report looked at Ghent family members other than Frank. Ms. Autobee replied she just looked at Frank and stated she was under the impression one of his sons' homes had been designated. Ms. McWilliams stated she was unaware of such a designation.

Ms. Autobee discussed Frank Ghent's contributions to the community in ways other than his auto dealerships.

Mr. Murray asked if the dealership is representative of mid-automobile era. Ms. Autobee replied it would be if automobiles are no longer around in 50 years. She noted 'mid-century' is not part of the historic lexicon and stated the structure is a commercial specialty store that was built in the mid-century, which is a time period, not a style.

Ms. Wallace asked if they had considered the connection to College Avenue and the Lincoln corridor. Ms. Autobee replied, when built, the dealership was at the south edge of town and most customers would have been approaching from the north and east, which is likely why the building is oriented on a slight angle toward the northeast.

Ms. Simpson requested clarification about the context. Ms. Autobee replied the façades are most decorative on the north and east, though the moss rock used only covers about 30% of the building.

Ms. Wallace asked about the timeline for the overhang addition to the front of the building. Mr. Murray noted the overhang was added within the first year after construction; therefore, it is also more than 50 years old.

Ms. Dorn asked Ms. Autobee if she knew of any other buildings associated with Frank Ghent. Ms. Autobee replied she did not look into that.

Commission members discussed Frank Ghent's various positions and contributions to the community. Ms. Autobee questioned whether his story is well-told by this building.

Ms. Simpson asked if the scraped auto dealerships shown in the images by Mr. Brinkman were demolished before or after the 50-year time period. Mr. Brinkman replied he was unsure.

### Staff Response

Ms. Bumgarner stated the two other auto dealerships started by Frank Ghent no longer exist; one is the Mitchell Block and the other is Beau Jo's.

### Public Input

None

### Commission Discussion

Mr. Murray stated the building might be the best example of a commercial building of this style for its age.

Ms. Simpson said the building is indicative of Fort Collins' growth and is a good example of an era when the automobile was more important.

Mr. Bello stated the front portion of the building seems to be more significant than the garage areas.

Mr. Murray commented on the original roof being hot tar and gravel but stated the new roof does not impact the significance. He added the garage doors could be changed back to a more original style.

Ms. Wallace stated the stone and higher pitched gable are the most character-defining features, and the canopy is also historic. She stated those elements fulfill integrity as she reads the code.

Ms. Dorn agreed that the design aspect of integrity was intact but questioned whether the material aspect of integrity had been lost.

Mr. Murray discussed the association of the building with the expansion of Fort Collins and the use of automobiles as the primary source of transportation.

Ms. Gensmer stated setting is preserved given the interface of the building with the roadways and the fact that College and Drake still exist.

Mr. Bello commented that the workmanship is typical for the era; however, there is nothing outstanding about the craftsmanship.

Mr. Murray commented on the building's materials, including the moss rock and large windows.

Ms. Gensmer noted that the large windows were more about design than materials. She expressed concern regarding whether the historic fabric was still intact given many of the windows have been replaced.

Ms. Wallace stated the Commission seems to agree that six of the seven qualities of integrity are intact, with the exception of materials.

Ms. Dorn questioned whether the building meets the design/construction standard because the building type is not included in the state lexicon. Mr. Murray stated the lexicon is not always what the City uses, and even though this style doesn't have a name, it is obvious given that the parts are there.

Mr. Bello questioned whether this building made a recognizable contribution to the development of the city. Ms. Simpson associated the building with the car-centric development of the city and stated this building speaks to that trend. Ms. Wallace noted the movement away from downtown and southward trending development. Ms. Simpson discussed the Ghent annexation happening at the same time the dealership was built.

Ms. Wallace asked about the building's association with the Ghent name. Ms. Simpson noted this was a dealership Frank started with his son. Ms. Dorn stated the association is very important and would like to see more research on the son and his business, as well as whether other buildings would have a better association with Frank Ghent. Mr. Bello noted Frank Ghent's contributions to the community and stated his civic involvement may have been more important than his dealerships. Ms. Gensmer stated, given the information at hand, the association criteria for persons is not met. Mr. Murray stated he does not feel strongly that the person association exists.

Mr. Murray discussed the distinctive nature of the building's design. Mr. Bellow commented the building represents a distinguishable style, though the craftsmanship is not outstanding.

Mr. Murray discussed the unique landscape architecture of the building.

Ms. Simpson discussed this property being significant not only for the way it was originally constructed or crafted, but also for the way it illustrates changing tastes and attitudes over a period of time. Ms. Dorn agreed that the building represented a certain period of time and the style of auto dealerships in Fort Collins. Ms. Wallace noted the design hints at mid-century and illustrates a change in Fort Collins design. She stated she would consider it mid-century modern. Ms. Simpson agreed citing the floor to ceiling windows, roof style, connection to the outdoors, exposed beams, and rock. The members agreed that the building meets the design standard.

Ms. Dorn expressed some concern about the change in the roof and loss of integrity.

Ms. Wallace asked Ms. Dorn if she would support design if materials was excluded from integrity. Ms. Dorn talked about materials relative to the aspects of integrity. Mr. Murray stated most of the materials are still there and the roof and garage doors can always be changed. Ms. Simpson stated she is split on the integrity of materials.

Ms. Wallace requested Commission input on context. Ms. Simpson stated the building, when built, was on the edge of town, but was oriented toward town. She noted all other corners are commercial, and College and Drake are still intact.

#### Commission Deliberation

***Ms. Gensmer moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission uphold the prior determination and find that 2601 South College Avenue is individually eligible as a Fort Collins landmark, according to the standards outlined in Section 14-5 of the Fort Collins Municipal Code. This motion is based on the agenda materials, the information and materials presented during the work session and this hearing, as well as the commission discussion on this item, with the following findings:***

- ***The property has significance under Standard A, Events, for associations with a pattern of events, specifically the movement of Fort Collins south towards midtown from downtown, the change in the City towards a community that relies on automobile transportation, the expansion of the automobile industry, as well as the larger expansion of the City, including the Ghent annexation.***
- ***The property is also significant under Standard C, Design and Construction, because it embodies the identifiable characteristics of a specific period, in this case mid-century commercial architecture. Some of the specific characteristics are the very prominent windows facing out onto the major transportation arteries, the use of moss rock and concrete block, the way that it is sited on the property and landscape in relation to the major transportation corridors of Drake and College, as well as the way it is situated in relation to the parking lot surrounding it.***
- ***The property exhibits exterior integrity, and it satisfies integrity of:***
  - ***Location, in that it remains in the same place and has not been moved;***
  - ***Design, for many of elements including the large windows and the way it was designed to face toward the streets;***
  - ***Setting, because of the way it is situated at that intersection;***
  - ***Workmanship, because, although not high style, it still embodies the type of construction that was done in that period.***
  - ***Feeling and Association, because it retains those larger characteristics tying it to both the vehicular arteries, commercial properties and the automobile industry.***
- ***Finally, the Landmark Preservation Commission has considered the context of the area surrounding the property, as is required under City Code Chapter 14, finding that the context relates directly to the major transportation arteries of Drake and College, as well as the surrounding commercial properties on those intersections, and the way they are oriented towards vehicular traffic and set back from the roads.***

***Mr. Murray seconded.***

**Ms. Wallace proposed a friendly amendment that the Commission cannot determine at this time that Standard B is fulfilled because they do not have enough information and are basing the decision on the information at hand on the Ghents. Ms. Gensmer and Mr. Murray accepted the amendment.**

**The motion passed 6:0**

Ms. Wallace confirmed that the Commission has decided to uphold the decision that the property at 2601 South College Avenue is eligible for landmark designation, according to Standards A for Events, Standard C for Design and Construction, as well as upholding six of the seven Aspects of Exterior Integrity and for maintaining Context.

*Secretary's Note: The Commission took a short break from 7:23 to 7:34, after which Chair Dunn and Vice Chair Hogestad returned to the meeting.*

**4. OLD FIREHOUSE AND SECKNER ALLEYS CONCEPTUAL/FINAL DESIGN REVIEW**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The applicant is seeking a report of acceptability from the Landmark Preservation Commission for alterations and improvements to two alleys in the locally designated Old Town Historic District: Old Firehouse Alley and Seckner Alley.  
**APPLICANT:** Downtown Development Authority

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report. She reviewed the questions the Commission raised during the work session, noting the Applicants are prepared to answer them during their presentation. She reviewed the background, the role of the Commission, the review history, and staff's findings of fact.

Applicant Presentation

Todd Dangerfield of the Downtown Development Authority addressed the Commission to introduce the project.

Craig Russell gave the Applicant presentation. He discussed the project goals and primary features of the alley off Mountain, and detailed the plans and significant elements for the Old Firehouse and Seckner Alleys. He discussed 3D projection mapping which would create an art interactive component on the alley surface. Additionally, Mr. Russell discussed the elevated vines, noting the Parks Department will be maintaining them and they will be replanted as needed.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Murray asked about the plate mounting that will allow flexion and expansion. Mr. Russell explained the plate system.

Mr. Murray asked about the light system for the Mountain Avenue alley. Mr. Russell replied the Mountain Avenue lighting system is different from Seckner Alley.

Mr. Murray asked if the 3D projection system will affect the Linden Street parking lot. Mr. Dangerfield replied he has talked to the owners of Elliot's and Blue Ocean, and they do not have concerns.

Ms. Gensmer asked if the City will remove renegade vines during monthly maintenance. Mr. Dangerfield replied the intent is not to cover the walls, and Mr. Russell noted the vines will be trained onto the structure.

Mr. Bello expressed concern about the loss of 18 parking spaces. Mr. Dangerfield discussed the monitoring of car activity, and noted the nearby Civic Center parking is underutilized.

Ms. Simpson asked where the bollard between a pedestrian and vehicular zone is located. Mr. Russell replied that is at the entry of Old Firehouse Alley at Linden.

Mr. Hogestad asked about the arch form, and expressed concern it may be misleading in terms of differentiating new from old. Mr. Russell replied the goal is to make the form as simple as possible, without having a straight line span across the alley. He stated much of the LPC direction given in 2011 was more about harmony rather than contrast.

Mr. Hogestad stated the Commission has changed some of its views to get away from false historicism. Mr. Russell noted the arch is a modern tube steel; however, alternative forms can be examined.

Mr. Dangerfield suggested a change in color could help and discussed the sconces and windows.

Ms. Simpson suggested looking at the hanging baskets for a possible redesign. Mr. Russell replied using something similar to the alley across the street is important for consistency; however, it can be examined.

Ms. Dorn asked if the planters are removable noting the Old Town Historic District standards direct primary façades, as well as visible rear and side walls, should be highly visible to the public spaces. Mr. Russell replied the planters are not very high and are narrower than what has been used in the past. He stated the height is not necessarily impacting visibility of the structure.

Ms. Simpson asked how the trash cans will be addressed. Mr. Dangerfield replied there is a consolidated trash enclosure behind Blue Ocean.

Ms. Simpson asked what techniques are being used to prevent vehicle traffic at Walnut Street. Mr. Dangerfield replied removable barrel style bollards will be installed at each end.

Mr. Murray expressed concern about vibrations damaging the buildings during the replacement of the sewer line. Mr. Dangerfield replied City Utilities will be doing that work and they have a plan of protection in place.

Chair Dunn asked if the sewer is related to the water that runs behind Walrus. Mr. Dangerfield replied an artesian spring runs from the southwest portion of that block and through the alley and parking lot.

#### Commission Deliberation

***Mr. Hogestad moved that the LPC has all necessary information to move from conceptual to final design on the Old Firehouse and Seckner Alleys.***

***Ms. Gensmer seconded.***

Mr. Bello asked if this motion, if approved, would allow the project to move to final design. Chair Dunn replied in the affirmative, and stated the final design consideration will occur now if this motion is approved.

Ms. Wallace commended the effort at addressing all sides with this project.

***The motion passed 8:0.***

#### Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn asked Mr. Hogestad if he was considering conditions. Mr. Hogestad replied he is confident an appropriate design and interpretive signage will be developed. Ms. McWilliams noted staff could always approve a design change, or bring it back before the Commission if the changes were significant.

Mr. Bello questioned why the issue was such a concern during the earlier discussion if the applicant is now being given carte blanche to develop their own design. Mr. Hogestad replied he is confident the applicant can come up with a good alternate design.

Mr. Dangerfield and Mr. Russell confirmed they understand the direction and are happy to go through staff with an alternate design.

Chair Dunn explained that staff often handles review of minor things, and the Commission can assign that role to staff. Ms. McWilliams explained staff uses the same standards the LPC uses, or that they could opt to use the Design Review Committee.

The Commission had a brief discussion about how the project meets the code requirements, having already touched on many of the points in the previous discussion.

***Mr. Hogestad moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission provide a report of acceptability for the proposed work on Old Firehouse and Seckner Alleys as presented, finding that the proposed work meets the criteria of Chapter 14, Section 14-48 of the Municipal Code, with a stipulation that the design work of the arch and interpretive signage be reviewed either by staff or by the Design Review Subcommittee.***

***Mr. Murray seconded.***

**Ms. Simpson proposed a friendly amendment to include the hanging baskets, the Tivoli light attachments and any other ornamentation that might be confused for historical material. Mr. Hogestad and Mr. Murray accepted the amendment.**

There was a discussion about whether the stipulations constituted a condition. Ultimately, there was general agreement that the Applicant is capable of looking at the design elements mentioned and implementing acceptable alternatives without a formal condition.

Mr. Russell noted much of the ornamentation has been established on the other side of the alley; however, he stated the arch issue is significant enough to make sense to re-examine.

Mr. Hogestad clarified the degree of review could range from minimal to intense, with the arches being the big element to re-examine.

Mr. Dangerfield offered to come to design review committee with alternatives to design elements of concern.

**Mr. Yatabe suggested clarification in the motion as to whether the current design is acceptable to the Commission, should the design remain unchanged subsequent to the evaluation of alternative designs by staff or the Design Review Subcommittee.**

**Mr. Hogestad and Mr. Murray accepted a change to the motion to approve the design as is should no alterations be made.**

**The motion passed 7-1, with Bello dissenting.**

## 5. NIX FARM – CONCEPTUAL/FINAL DESIGN REVIEW

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The applicant is seeking a report of acceptability from the Landmark Preservation Commission for alterations to the designated Nix Farm property, which will consist of a proposed 1,200 square-foot expansion of the existing maintenance shop, the construction of a new 5,000 square-foot vehicle/storage garage and outdoor fleet parking area, and a modular building.

**APPLICANT:** City of Fort Collins

### Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report, described the proposed project, and reviewed staff's findings.

### Applicant Presentation

Steve Steinbicker, Architecture West, provided context for the project and presented the plans for the design.

### Public Input

None

### Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Hogestad asked how long the master plan will last. Mark Sears, Natural Areas Manager, replied it should last 50 years and the hope is for the modular building to serve the needs for the next 10 years.

Mr. Hogestad discussed the importance of considering articulation and the impact of the utility buildings on the historic structures.

Mr. Murray asked about the new landscaping. Mr. Steinbicker replied landscaping on the north side is not being modified; however, the landscaping by the new detention pond and around the east and west sides of the storage yard is being revised.

Following a question from Mr. Bello, Mr. Steinbicker clarified which structures were historic.

### Commission Deliberation

**Mr. Hogestad moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission waive conceptual review, having adequate information, and move to final review.**

**Ms. Gensmer seconded.**

**The motion passed 8:0.**

## Commission Questions and Discussion

Ms. Wallace stated the proposal is sensitive to the historic structures on site.

Ms. Gensmer agreed and stated she appreciates that new buildings are being situated further away from the historic buildings.

Chair Dunn appreciated the line of sight from the river and trail are kept open.

**Mr. Bello moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission provide a report of acceptability for the proposed work at the Nix Farm, finding that it meets the criteria of Chapter 14, Section 14-48 of the Municipal Code, "Approval of Proposed Work," as described in the staff report.**

**Ms. Gensmer seconded.**

Mr. Hogestad suggested there be more consideration to some articulation and building placement to enhance historic structures in the future.

**The motion passed 8:0.**

## ● OTHER BUSINESS

- Election of Officers for 2018 (Chair and Vice Chair)

Chair Dunn opened the floor to nominations. Mr. Murray asked if anyone wanted to volunteer. Mr. Hogestad nominated Ms. Simpson for Vice Chair. Ms. Simpson declined. Chair Dunn said she is willing to continue as Chair. Mr. Murray nominated Ms. Wallace for Vice Chair. Ms. Wallace accepted the nomination.

**Mr. Bello made a motion to appoint Ms. Dunn as Chair and Ms. Wallace as Vice Chair.**

**Ms. Gensmer seconded. The motion passed 8:0.**

- Chair Dunn requested and received the Commission's approval to send a Letter of Support for Historic Denver's Grant Application for a documentary film on the sense of place.
- Chair Dunn asked the Members to share their experience at the Saving Places Conference. Ms. Dorn reported on the sessions she attended and her key takeaways. She discussed Historic Corp, a non-profit organization, and a session on windows. Mr. Murray discussed a session on state tax credits. Ms. Bzdek discussed sensitive infill in historic districts. Mr. Hogestad reported on a session on photogrammetry and lidar mapping and a session on the Old Spanish Trail. Ms. Wallace reported on a session on late 1960's and 1970's architecture. Chair Dunn discussed the Discover Denver survey project session and Governor Hickenlooper's talk.
- Mr. Bello asked some questions about the 2601 South College item and whether the property should be considered in the context of other City objectives such as energy efficiency. Ms. McWilliams replied there are many opportunities for the LPC to work with other Boards and Commissions and noted there are many ways to retrofit historic buildings to be more energy efficient. She stated the LPC is tasked with the preservation of historic structures.
- Ms. Simpson asked there was an overall survey completed before the mid-town plan was adopted. Ms. McWilliams said there had not.

## ● ADJOURNMENT

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 10:27 p.m.

---

*Minutes prepared by Tara Lehman, Tripoint Data.*

---

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on

18 April 2018

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