



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

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 16, 2018 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

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

- **ROLL CALL**

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

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

Ms. Bzdek explained that Item #4, 903 Stover, was withdrawn from the agenda, and will be handled administratively. Chair Dunn reviewed the Consent Agenda and confirmed that no one wished to pull any items from consent.

- **STAFF REPORTS**

None.

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

None.

- **CONSENT AGENDA**

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 18, 2018 REGULAR MEETING.

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the April 18, 2018 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

2. 1518 PETERSON STREET - FINAL DEMOLITION/ALTERATION REVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This is a proposal to add a rear, story addition to the residence. The property was determined to be individually eligible as a Fort Collins Landmark.

APPLICANT: Jeff Emmel, owner

Mr. Bello moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the Consent Agenda of the May 16, 2018 regular meeting as presented. Ms. Gensmer seconded. The motion passed 6-0.

- **CONSENT CALENDAR FOLLOW-UP**

None.

- **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

3. 1501 PETERSON – CONCEPTUAL/FINAL DESIGN REVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant is seeking a report of acceptability from the Landmark Preservation Commission for new storm and screen units in the first and second stories.

APPLICANT/OWNER: Sally and Robert Linton

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report, describing the property, the proposed work, and the role of the Commission. She stated staff has found the project complies with the applicable Municipal Code standards.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Wernimont of Colorado Sash & Door, the Contractor for the work on the windows, addressed the Commission to clarify details about the work.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Murray thanked Mr. Wernimont for the additional information he had provided. Mr. Wernimont explained the mechanism and workings of the chosen window solution. He said they intend to make all the windows operable to allow ventilation options. Mr. Murray asked if the window system is reversible. Mr. Wernimont explained that a missing piece is being replaced, adding that it could be removed if desired.

Ms. Dorn asked about how the screen aligns with the window glass. Mr. Wernimont explained that the windows would look like the originals. Mr. Wernimont stated they will ensure the storm screen is flush with the brick mold, unless the original is not flush.

Commission Deliberation

Finding no significant adverse effect on the designated property, and with all necessary information in place, Mr. Murray moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission waive conceptual review and move to final review of the proposed work at 1501 Peterson Street. Ms. Gensmer seconded. The motion passed 6:0.

Mr. Murray moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission provide a report of acceptability for the proposed work at 1501 Peterson Street, 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. Dorn seconded. The motion passed 6:0.

4. 903 STOVER – CONCEPTUAL/FINAL DESIGN REVIEW

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

5. 725 MATHEWS – CONCEPTUAL/FINAL DESIGN REVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant is seeking a report of acceptability from the Landmark Preservation Commission for rehabilitation of the windows on the residence, which will include installation of wood storm windows and wood screens, weather stripping, in-kind replication and replacement of missing blind stops, and weather stripping and repair of the front door.

APPLICANT/OWNER: Victoria Bridges

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report, providing information about the property, the proposed work and the role of the Commission. She stated staff has found the project complies with the applicable Municipal Code standards.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Wernimont of Colorado Sash & Door, the Contractor for the work on the windows, addressed the Commission about the work to be done. He provided details that were not available at the previous Conceptual Review.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Murray asked about the missing blind stop. Mr. Wernimont replied it was cut off in some locations; however, it would have been part of the original blind stop. Mr. Murray asked about the door replacement parts. Mr. Wernimont stated the current door was modified poorly; therefore, the plan is to remove the door from its frame, repair it correctly, and rehang the original door.

Commission Deliberation

Finding no significant adverse effect on the designated property, and with all necessary information in place, Mr. Murray moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission waive conceptual review and move to final review of the proposed work at 725 Mathews Street. Ms. Gensmer seconded. The motion passed 6-0.

Mr. Murray appreciated the original door will be replaced.

Mr. Murray moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission provide a report of acceptability for the proposed work at 725 Mathews Street, 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. Simpson seconded. The motion passed 6-0.

[Secretary's Note: The Commission took short break at 6:00, resuming the meeting at 6:05]

6. 221 EAST MOUNTAIN - CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This is a proposed four-story, mixed-use development of office, retail and residential uses with a single-level parking structure below grade. The 0.449-acre lot is at 221 East Mountain Avenue on Block 131, lots 1-6, at the former location of the Goodyear Tire Shop. The project fronts both East Mountain Avenue and Mathews Street on the southwest corner of the intersection and fronts alleys to the south and west. The approximate square footage total, including the garage, is 90,172 square feet. The project is within the Downtown (D) District.

APPLICANT: Bob Hosanna, Neenan Archistruction

Ms. Simpson recused herself from this item due to a conflict.

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report, reviewing the proposal and describing the surrounding historic properties. She displayed 3D modeling images prepared by Planning staff. She explained that this is an opportunity for the Commission to provide comments, but no formal recommendation will be made at this time.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Hosanna, Neenan Archistruction, gave the Applicant presentation. He addressed the Commission's concerns about the variation in height between the proposed development and the surrounding buildings. He pointed out the patterns in height around downtown and noted there are drastic height differences in the area. Additionally, he stated the proposed fence for the roof-top dog park will be 6 feet in height, which is not taller than the required mechanical screening elements.

Mr. Hosanna discussed downtown streetscapes and explained the changes made to the building in mass and materials to address the Commission's questions about how it relates to the Frozen Food building. He also pointed out how they brought the panels to the ground to satisfy the Commission's concerns. He talked about the changes to the windows that are meant to reference the Frozen Food building, and discussed the articulation and material variation used in the design to respond to Mr. Hogestad's comments at the previous Conceptual Review.

He said the Planning Department had asked them to increase the articulation at the ground level and discussed the purpose of the vertical elements on the south elevation.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn directed the Commission's attention to Section 3.4.7f and suggested the Commission members address topics in order.

Section 1 – Height, Setback, Width

Mr. Bello commented on the horizontal metal material under the glass on the Frozen Food side of the building and stated it addressed Mr. Hogestad's concerns about height.

Mr. Murray stated that he didn't see how the height lines up and asked how the corner references the height of the Frozen Food building.

Chair Dunn said that the horizontal elements are more related to 3.4.7f(2). She commented she doesn't see the reference to the height of the Frozen Food building and said there is still a very abrupt step in height. She pointed out the step back on the Bohemian building as an example. Mr. Hosanna said he doesn't have the flexibility in the floorplan to accommodate a stepback. He commented that he is having difficulty figuring out how to navigate the height issue and stated the interior layout is driving the exterior design.

Mr. Bello asked if the balconies are required. Mr. Hosanna replied they are necessary for the target clientele. Mr. Bello suggested a possible solution regarding the balconies to relate to the height and width of the Frozen Food building.

Ms. Dorn commented that it is difficult to make the horizontal band under the windows relate to the Frozen Food building at its height and location.

Chair Dunn stated Commission members are struggling with the height and width of the east side and requested input on the north elevation.

Ms. Dorn asked about the large vertical element on the north side. Mr. Hosanna replied it started as a downspout to feed the planter box below and has since become a design feature. Ms. Dorn commented it could possibly emphasize the height of the corner.

Section 2 – Window Patterns, Primary Entrance, etc.

Mr. Murray commented on the importance of not overwhelming the view into historic downtown and stated the fourth story causes issues with that aspect. He noted Mr. Hogestad had suggested making the building corner a statement. Mr. Hosanna replied corners can be overdone and stated this corner is a statement for this time period.

Chair Dunn commented on the corners of the Bohemian building, the Northern Hotel, and other buildings which have corners that read as entrances but do not actually function as entries.

Ms. Dorn asked about the window pattern matching that of the Frozen Food building. Mr. Hosanna replied the proposed building uses part of the patterning, but in a subtler way.

Ms. Dorn asked if the height and width of the windows match. Ms. Hosanna replied they are quite close. Ms. Dorn suggested possibly incorporating them in an aligning manner. Mr. Hosanna replied the widths do not match and it would be difficult to align them due to floor heights.

Chair Dunn appreciated the glass block elements.

Ms. Gensmer asked if the glass block bands are also offset. Mr. Hosanna replied they are closer to the same height as the Frozen Food building. Chair Dunn suggested that may be a good way to keep the horizontal line connection.

Section 3 – Material Distribution

Mr. Bello asked if Mr. Hosanna considered using any white material to reference the Frozen Food building. Mr. Hosanna replied in the negative and asked if a white canopy would help. He stated there is more reference to the house next door.

Mr. Murray commented on the size of the material and stated the flatter surface of the rainscreen references the Frozen Food building.

Ms. Dorn asked about material samples. Mr. Hosanna described the materials and stated he would bring samples at the next review.

Chair Dunn commented the materials used on the Frozen Food building are unique to this part of town, and replicating them may not necessarily be desirable. Ms. Bzdek explained the material distribution is based on all surrounding buildings and the Code allows for a variety of materials.

Chair Dunn and Mr. Bello wondered whether they can specify that because the Frozen Foods building is so unique, they can disregard it in their evaluation of the distribution of materials. Chair Dunn requested staff examine the appropriate language prior to the next meeting.

Section 4 – Visual and Pedestrian Connections, etc.

No specific comments were offered on this section.

Section 5 – Landscaping, etc.

Mr. Hosanna stated the only landscaping is the existing trees.

General Commission Comments and Questions

Ms. Dorn asked about the dimensions of the rain screen panel. Mr. Hosanna replied it is 18 by 6 feet.

Chair Dunn stated the Commission members are still struggling with building height and width. She asked how the members feel about the windows. Mr. Murray replied the windows work proportionally with the Frozen Food building. Ms. Dorn stated it would be interesting to see the windows referencing the Frozen Food building on the 2nd floor.

Mr. Hosanna asked if the design must reference the Frozen Food building or if other buildings in the area of adjacency can be considered. Mr. Murray replied the building next door requires more emphasis. Mr. Hosanna stated he will look at window changes. He stated he will not be able to attend the next meeting and will send a colleague. He requested input from Commission members as to how close they feel the design is to being acceptable.

Ms. Gensmer stated she remains concerned about the building height and mass.

Mr. Bello stated the changes discussed should help and he is struggling with the requirement to reference the Frozen Food building.

Ms. Dorn stated the change in height is going to be a challenge.

Mr. Murray stated he is not as worried about the corner, and stated the panels copy the stucco more than anything else could. He stated the height and width can be addressed proportionally, and this does that. He added he would like to see the fourth story step back, although he realizes that is not viable.

Chair Dunn stated she is in support of the materials; however, she expressed concern this building does not defer to the historic building next door.

Ms. Simpson returned to the meeting.

7. P.D.P. #180003 OASIS ON OLIVE, 310 WEST OLIVE STREET FINAL DESIGN REVIEW & REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION TO DECISION MAKER

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This is a proposal to construct a three-story, seven-unit multi-family building between Howes Street and Canyon Avenue. The project is adjacent to several designated and individually eligible buildings. The development proposal will be subject to Planning and Zoning Board (Type II) review.

APPLICANT: Steve Slezak, Oasis Development

Staff Report

Ms. McWilliams presented the staff report, including a project summary, an explanation of the role of the Commission, and a review of the area of adjacency. She explained staff's findings and rationale to support recommending approval.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Slezak addressed concerns from his previous appearance before the Commission, including the standoff entry feature, the vertical windows and arch over the garage door. He stated the arch remains in the design and discussed the window pattern.

Mr. Slezak discussed the landscape plan, focusing on relocating the rose garden, and his intention to retain most of the shrubs. He stated the design emphasizes outdoor space and gardens.

Mr. Slezak shared material samples with the Commission members, explaining why various materials were chosen. Regarding the entry feature, Mr. Slezak provided various options and briefly discussed them. He stated his preference is to use brick and stucco rather than metal.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn directed the Commission's attention to Section 3.4.7f and suggested the Commission members address topics in order.

Section 1 – Height, Setback, Width

Mr. Murray suggested focusing on new information. Chair Dunn stated the massing has been deemed acceptable.

Ms. Simpson expressed concern about the height difference between this building and 316 West Olive. Chair Dunn noted a lot of the building is stepped back.

Ms. Dorn commented something needs to be done with the void on the first level on the west elevation to create some correlations with the height of the building to the west.

Ms. Dorn asked why it is necessary to see into the parking structure. Mr. Slezak replied that is necessary for ventilation. Ms. McWilliams pointed out there is a screen mesh on the parking structure openings.

Mr. Murray asked about the small parking garage on the south side of the building. Mr. Slezak replied it is a single-car garage.

Mr. Murray stated the building provides a good transition to the Cortina building.

Section 2 – Window Patterns, Primary Entrance, etc.

Ms. Simpson asked if the elevation of the fascia could be brought down to line up. Mr. Slezak replied that is a reasonable comment; however, he questioned why it was important.

Commission members discussed the fascia and roof lines.

Mr. Slezak said the architect placed a lot of importance on horizontal lines and explained the thinking behind how the fascia is lined up with the flat roofs.

Ms. Simpson suggested including a horizontal element to reference the neighboring building. Chair Dunn stated the garage and step backs reference the smaller building. Ms. Gensmer agreed, adding the upper level porch also helps.

Chair Dunn stated she liked the original design of the entry. City Planner Pete Wray discussed the entry and stated staff has recommended making it wider to accommodate two pedestrians.

Ms. Simpson agreed with Chair Dunn on the entry design.

Ms. Dorn asked if the Code requires the entry to be incorporated into the building or if it can be used as a feature. Ms. McWilliams stated the Code addresses entries in Section 3.4.7 and elsewhere.

Mr. Murray stated he prefers having the door or entry visible from the street or sidewalk. Chair Dunn noted there is no single primary entrance for all units.

Mr. Wray discussed the Code requirements for an entry and connecting walkway.

Mr. Murray asked if placing a door in the front of the tower has been considered. Mr. Slezak replied in the negative.

Ms. Simpson asked if the door into the stairway is on the west or north side of the tower. Mr. Slezak replied it is on the west side of the tower.

Commission members discussed various aspects of the entry.

Chair Dunn asked if the entrance must be a door. Mr. Yatabe replied the Code has a definition for principal entrance; however, that specific definition is not applicable to 3.4.7. He stated it is up to the Commission to interpret this.

Ms. Simpson stated one main entrance into the site would cover all the apartments. Chair Dunn and Ms. Gensmer agreed. Ms. Dorn stated she believes an entrance needs to be integrated into the building form itself.

Section 3 - Materials

Ms. Dorn commended the use of local sandstone. Commission members agreed the materials are acceptable.

Section 4 – Visual and Pedestrian Connections, etc.

Chair Dunn stated one of the important visual connections is the relationship between the new building and the houses. She commended keeping the grass and rose gardens in maintaining the sense of history.

Section 5 – Landscape, Focal Point

Ms. Simpson asked about the current location of the rose gardens. Mr. Slezak replied they are currently on the south side of the stair tower. He stated the roses have sentimental value and all possible efforts will be made to save them; however, he cannot guarantee they will survive the relocation.

Ms. Simpson asked about the emphasis on the rain garden and expressed concern about the proposed location for the roses. She suggested reshaping the rain garden to allow the rose garden to be in the middle of the lawn. Mr. Slezak replied he does not want the rain garden; however, engineering requirements exist.

Chair Dunn asked if the Commission can specify a preference for the historic rose garden over the rain garden. Ms. McWilliams replied the Commission could make that recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Board. Mr. Wray stated the storm drainage coordination for this site has been ongoing and the location of the rain garden, from a functional standpoint, is to catch all the different drain lines on site and from the building. He stated plantings can occur on the rain garden as long as water can filter through.

Chair Dunn summarized the Commission members' comments.

Ms. Simpson stated she remains somewhat concerned about the height difference between this building and the building to the west; however, she understands others' perspectives.

Mr. Bello discussed various entrance options. Ms. Dorn stated she would like to see options to place the main building entrance on the south.

Mr. Murray asked if that could be included as a suggestion to allow Mr. Slezak to move forward. Ms. Dorn expressed concern the Commission is being rushed.

Chair Dunn stated her belief that the arch meets the main entrance requirement.

Mr. Wray discussed the Code references and the exception related to multiple front façades.

Mr. Bello agreed the arch works as an entryway.

Ms. Simpson stated she would like to ensure the trellis continues on the walkway. Mr. Slezak replied it will do so.

Mr. Bello asked if the project is receiving a variance for parking. Mr. Wray replied the project meets the minimum parking requirements as it is within the TOD overlay zone.

Ms. McWilliams offered that staff or a small group of Commission members could be assigned to review changes.

Mr. Murray discussed the items he would like to see addressed administratively, including visual alignment of horizontal lines at eye level, addressing the front entrance based on the discussion, and reviewing the rose garden location for adequate sunlight.

Ms. Simpson asked if the original landmark document includes language about the rose garden. Ms. McWilliams replied she believes it does; however, it is not detailed. She stated staff would document the rose garden and any other important landscape features prior to work beginning.

Chair Dunn asked what the Design Reviews Subcommittee should examine. Mr. Murray replied it should look at the primary entrance. Mr. Bello stated the entrance to the property needs to be identifiable and supported the arch.

Ms. Dorn stated an option with an entrance to the building should be considered.

Chair Dunn stated the subcommittee needs more direction. Mr. Yatable noted there is nothing in the Code that allows for a design subcommittee. Additionally, he discussed possible scheduling issues with the Planning and Zoning Board meeting. He stated the Commission could recommend approval with conditions.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Bello moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission recommend to the Decision Maker approval of the Oasis on Olive project, P.D.P. #180003, finding it is in compliance with the standards contained in Land Use Code section 3.4.7 for the following reasons, so long as the conditions listed below are satisfied:

- ***The project does not negatively impact the individual eligibility for designation of the historic properties in the defined area of adjacency, and therefore complies with 3.4.7 (A) Purpose, and (B) General Standard.***

- *The project design's overall height, setback and width is compatible with the historic properties in the defined area of adjacency, and therefore, complies with 3.4.7(F)(1). The project's massing strategy and use of similar materials and roof forms mitigate the negative impact on directly adjacent historic resources.*
- *The project complies with 3.4.7(F)(2) through the use of gable and intersecting gable roof forms and similar roof pitches to the historic resources. Additionally, the projecting garage on Olive Street is similar in shape to the 316 West Olive building.*
- *The project design includes primary building materials reflective of the dominant historic materials, and therefore complies with 3.4.7(F)(3).*
- *The focal and pedestrian points between the PDP gardens and the historic lots will be maintained, and no fencing is proposed between this lot and the rear lots of 227 and 231 South Howes which this lot was historically associated with. This significantly helps to retain and promote the historic buildings' setting and association, and so complies with 3.4.7(F)(4).*
- *The purposeful omission of fencing between the new and historic lots significantly helps to retain and promote the historic buildings' setting and association with the historic rose gardens. To the extent possible the historic rose beds and gardens will remain. Replacement trees will be approved according to the requirements of the City Forester. For these reasons, the project complies with 3.4.7(F)(5).*

Conditions that need to be satisfied to meet LUC 3.4.7:

- 1) *Provide an identifiable entrance with a door into the building; if from a design standpoint that is not feasible, then the LPC would accept an identifiable entry into the site (3.4.7)(F)(2).*
- 2) *Horizontal elements such as the roofline facia should align across the building (3.4.7)(F)(2).*
- 3) *The rose garden should be relocated to a location where it will get adequate exposure to the sun so that the roses thrive; and the location should be in a place where it is a prominent feature of the site (3.4.7)(F)(5).*
- 4) *The current conditions and location of the historic rose garden will be documented before relocation (3.4.7)(F)(5).*

Ms. Dorn seconded.

Chair Dunn stated she agrees with conditions 2 through 4, but is satisfied the arch already complies with the Code and therefore may not support the motion.

Ms. Gensmer agreed with Chair Dunn but stated she would support the motion.

Ms. Dorn supported the flexibility provided in condition 1.

Mr. Murray stated the motion is a good compromise.

Chair Dunn stated she supports the project but is conflicted regarding the motion.

Ms. Simpson stated she will support the motion, and feels the arch does already meet the Code requirement.

Mr. Murray stated he supports the wording of the motion.

Chair Dunn stated she will not support the motion, as she does not agree with the first condition; however, she does support the project and its design.

The motion passed 5-1, with Dunn dissenting.

- **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Bello asked about the criteria regarding adjacency and whether there is a priority for abutting buildings versus others. Chair Dunn replied the Code does not currently have a preference; however, the proposed Code changes are examining a possible distinction.

Chair Dunn stated Historic Larimer County is having its annual member meeting Sunday at Wolverine Farm Letter Press and Public House.

- **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Tara Lehman, Tripoint Data.

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on 20 June 2018



Meg Dunn, Chair