



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 June 20, 2018 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

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

- **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Dunn, Hogestad, Gensmer, Dorn, Bello, Murray

ABSENT: Simpson, Wallace

STAFF: Bzdek, Beals, Yatabe, Schiager

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

Ms. Bzdek noted that the Walnut Street Infill item was pulled from the agenda and the Sign Code Update was added as a discussion item.

- **STAFF REPORTS**

None

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

None.

● **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 16, 2018 REGULAR MEETING.

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the May 16, 2018 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

***Mr. Murray moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the Minutes of the May 16, 2018 regular meeting as presented. Ms. Gensmer seconded. The motion passed unanimously.***

2. 247 LINDEN – CONCEPTUAL DESIGN REVIEW

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The applicant is seeking conceptual review comments from the Landmark Preservation Commission for the development of residential lofts at 247-249 Linden Street in the Old Town Historic District. The proposal includes modifications or replacement of all of the existing doors and windows on the façade and the second floor of the rear elevation within the existing openings, as well as new openings and garage doors on the first floor of the rear elevation on the alley. The project also includes a rooftop addition to create additional square footage for the two residential units associated with the project, and the removal of a portion of the masonry on the side elevations to install railing for the residential patios.

**APPLICANT/OWNER:** David Kress, RB+B (architect); Tom Moore (owner)

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report. She provided background information about the property and building. She also explained the role of the Commission and reviewed the relevant code. She noted there are standards for the Old Town Historic boundary. Lastly, she reminded the Commission of the questions they had at the work session and noted the Applicant had provided additional information to address those.

Chair Dunn asked about the name of the subject building. Ms. Bzdek replied it is the Robertson and Haynes Block which was built in 1882.

***Mr. Hogestad disclosed that he worked for RB+B Architecture 25 years ago, and knows the team present at the meeting, but he does not believe that creates a bias for him.***

Applicant Presentation

David Kress addressed the Commission and introduced his team. He stated the project aims to respect, restore, and enhance the building's historical integrity. He stated the project would retain the ground-floor retail and add two living units on the upper floors; the third floor is a new addition which would be set back from both the front and rear façades.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn reviewed the relevant code to ensure the Commission members are all considering the same information. She asked Mr. Yatabe about any of the documents taking precedence over others. Mr. Yatabe replied that specific instances must be considered should a conflict exist between the documents.

Chair Dunn asked the Commission if anything should be added or subtracted to the list of character defining features. Mr. Hogestad mentioned scale, mass, bulk, window patterns, materials, and other elements. He discussed the human scale of the building.

Mr. Murray discussed the physical characteristics of the building. Mr. Murray asked if the stucco would be removed. Mr. Kress said that was not necessarily the case.

Mr. Murray asked if the garage door will remain. Mr. Kress replied that would depend upon on the tenant; however, the idea of including the garage door is a good idea.

Mr. Hogestad asked about the door and window replacement for the storefront. Mr. Kress replied the elements would likely have metal cladding as opposed to painted wood. Tom Moore, building owner, replied the project can be flexible with the window assembly or garage door. Mr. Hogestad opposed using a storefront system.

Mr. Hogestad asked about the structural stability of the walls. Mr. Kress replied it seems structurally sound and questioned what occurred at the building next door to cause the need for stabilization. Mr. Hogestad encouraged the placement of the new structure in the interior of the building to avoid injuring the exterior walls.

Mr. Hogestad asked what materials will be used for the third-floor addition. Mr. Kress replied it will be a cementous material with a rainscreen system. Mr. Hogestad stated he finds those problematic from a preservation standpoint. Mr. Kress stated they are open to suggestions; however, they would like to do something lighter weight as opposed to masonry. Mr. Hogestad stated a metal panel could make sense.

Chair Dunn asked what size panel is being considered. Mr. Kress replied they have yet to work out those details; however, the goal is to not draw attention with an unusual material.

Mr. Bello agreed with Mr. Hogestad in terms of metal being appropriate.

Ms. Dorn discussed the applicable Secretary of Interior standards and questioned whether original building materials will be removed to accommodate the new level. Mr. Kress replied original materials will not be removed for the upper floor; however, the two alley garage doors are being considered. He stated the roof will be removed to accommodate the addition, and noted the structure under the roof has some shearing taking place.

Mr. Hogestad stated the roof is not critical to understanding the building's history. Chair Dunn agreed and noted it is completely invisible from the pedestrian perspective.

Mr. Hogestad expressed concern the addition is too close to the face of the building. Mr. Bello disagreed and stated the character of the addition makes it distinct and separate.

Chair Dunn read the applicable Secretary of Interior standard which stated the addition should be set back at least one full bay from the primary structure and should be inconspicuous when viewed from surrounding streets. Mr. Kress replied visibility rather than setback should be the concern.

Ms. Dorn asked about the creation of the new openings in the rear of the building which would remove materials from the existing building. Mr. Moore replied that is planned.

Ms. Dorn asked if the windows on the building façade are being planned for removal. Mr. Moore replied they would be removed if they cannot be rehabilitated or are not of historic significance.

Ms. Dorn asked if the entry door is planned to be replaced. Mr. Kress replied the residential access door does not seem to be significant as it stands. Mr. Hogestad stated some of the door replacement was done in the 1980's to appear historic and stated he would like to leave the garage door, or something similar, as part of the character of the building.

Mr. Murray stated the design is going in the right direction and either the storefront or garage door would be considered historic. Mr. Hogestad discussed aspects of the garage door. Ms. Gensmer stated the garage door is appropriate to the building as is a storefront. The garage door could be something that evokes the appropriate character.

Ms. Dorn stated a period of significance needs to be established to inform the front restoration and appropriate standards.

Mr. Bello stated the garage door makes sense as it was likely present 50 years ago. Chair Dunn stated both the garage door and storefront would be appropriate. She supported an auto-centric feel. Mr. Hogestad suggested the period of significance is the automotive period.

Chair Dunn asked about the materials and step back for the penthouse addition. Ms. Gensmer expressed concern that darker colors could overwhelm the historic building.

Mr. Murray suggested horizontal patterning and agreed the colors should be lighter to make the addition disappear.

Ms. Dorn agreed lighter colors would fade but also stated it would be interesting to see something different from the original building. She stated she would like to see more setback of the upper level to reduce its visibility from the street.

Chair Dunn stated the Secretary of the Interior guidelines recommend using the same forms, materials, color, range, et cetera; however, materials are not mentioned in the rooftop addition section.

Mr. Bello stated the third story on this building should be notably different to allow the historic structure to stand out.

Mr. Hogestad stated he likes the idea of a lighter color, adding that a tin or metal graphite-colored material could work as well. He stated the windows in the back are contemporary, but proportional to the historic windows. He asked where the mechanical units will be located. Mr. Kress replied that is planned to be addressed in the ceiling space above the retail.

Ms. Gensmer stated it is important the side parapet is preserved and clearly differentiated. She stated it is difficult to mitigate the impact of the third story from the Cozzola's side as it is a single-story structure.

Mr. Murray appreciated the nine-foot setback and stated it is difficult to see from the street.

Ms. Dorn stated she is not convinced the third story has been reduced to the maximum extent feasible and it might be helpful to see other perspectives to get a better sense of the visibility of the addition.

Mr. Kress asked if shifting the entire third story back would be viewed positively. Chair Dunn replied it would be helpful to see renderings of both options.

Mr. Hogestad stated it is not just about visibility but about the relationship between the face of the historic building and the addition. He also suggested modulating the face of the addition.

Chair Dunn stated the application is headed in the right direction in terms of the Commission.

*[\*\*Secretary's Note: The Commission took a brief recess at this point in the meeting.]*

### 3. SIGN CODE UPDATE: RESTORATION OF HISTORIC SIGNS

#### **DESCRIPTION:**

The purpose of this item is to request a recommendation from the Landmark Preservation Commission to City Council regarding a code change that would revise the process for review of sign permit applications related to historic signs.

#### Staff Report

Noah Beals, Senior City Planner, discussed the overall goals of the Sign Code update and stated his presentation will focus on the restoration of historic signs. He discussed the Sign Code and its regulations for various types of signs. He noted the Sign Code standards do not replace the Secretary of the Interior standards and these regulations apply only to the Downtown area.

Mr. Beals explained the historic signs applications will be reviewed by the CDNS Director and the Chair of the LPC.

Ms. Dorn asked if the term reconstruction could be used in place of the term replica. Mr. Beals replied in the affirmative.

#### Public Input

None

#### Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn asked who makes the final decision. Mr. Beals replied it will go to City Council.

Mr. Murray asked if restoration and replication have been defined. Ms. Bzdek replied the Commission will need to decide if it wants to introduce the word replication versus restoration. Mr. Hogestad noted replication can occur based on photo documentation. Ms. Dorn stated the Secretary of the Interior standards use the term reconstruction for recreation or replication and suggested the City's Sign Code use compatible language.

Mr. Bello asked if there is a limit to the number of signs that can be reconstructed. Mr. Beals replied the Code does not have a limit written in; however, the decision maker could identify those limits. He also noted the regulations state a comparable design counts toward the sign allowance for the overall building; however, if an historic sign is being restored, it does not count toward the sign allowance.

Chair Dunn asked if reconstructed historic signs must be in their original location. Mr. Beals replied that could be part of the decision makers' discussion.

Ms. Dorn noted location is addressed in the Secretary of the Interior standards as well.

Mr. Hogestad asked why the CDNS Director and LPC Chair are the sole decision makers. Mr. Beals replied that is where the staff recommendations begin; however, those individuals can refer a decision to the full Commission.

Mr. Hogestad expressed concern with decisions being made by only two individuals and strongly believes the Commission should be involved in all decisions. He stated he would not support the recommendations as presented.

Mr. Yatabe noted this does not substitute for a review of a designated landmark building.

The Commission and Mr. Beals discussed aspects of the proposed language.

Chair Dunn suggested the title of this section should be "sign allowance for restoration of historic signs".

Mr. Beals discussed the Butterfly Café sign and how this process could streamline that decision. He attempted to clarify the language. He provided various examples of how these regulations would apply.

Ms. Dorn discussed the standards for reconstruction per the Secretary of the Interior guidelines.

The Commission discussed removing the 20-year period. Chair Dunn suggested just using "period of significance".

Chair Dunn stated she would like to see some rewritten language prior to the Commission making a recommendation. She also suggested the creation of a decision flow chart.

Ms. Dorn noted she would like to see language changes regarding reconstruction versus conjectural reconstruction, and the removal of the 20-year reference.

- **OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

- **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 8:08 p.m.

---

*Minutes prepared by Tara Lehman, Tripoint Data, and respectfully submitted by Gretchen Schiager.*

---

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on 15 August, 2018

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