



Meg Dunn, Chair
Alexandra Wallace, Vice Chair
Michael Bello
Katie Dorn
Kristin Gensmer
Per Hogestad
Kevin Murray
Anne Nelsen
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 August 15, 2018 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

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

- **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Dunn, Wallace, Hogestad, Gensmer, Simpson, Dorn, Murray, Nelson
ABSENT: Bello
STAFF: McWilliams, Bzdek, Bumgarner, Gloss, Yatabe, Schiager, Jones, Cole

New Board member Anne Nelsen introduced herself.

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

Ms. McWilliams stated there were no changes to the posted agenda.

- **STAFF REPORTS**

None.

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

None.

- **CONSENT AGENDA**

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 20, 2018 REGULAR MEETING.

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the June 20, 2018 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

2. 233 NORTH LOOMIS AVENUE - FINAL DEMOLITION/ALTERATION REVIEW

DESCRIPTION: This is a proposal to add a rear, 1-story addition to the residence. The property was determined to be individually eligible as a Fort Collins Landmark.

APPLICANT: Hannah Long and Tim Rehnstrom, contractors.

Mr. Murray moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the Consent Agenda of the June 20, 2018 regular meeting as presented. Ms. Dorn seconded. The motion passed 8:0.

[Timestamp: 5:36 p.m.]

- **CONSENT CALENDAR FOLLOW-UP**

None

- **PULLED FROM CONSENT**

None

- **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

Chair Dunn recused herself from agenda items 3, 4 and 5 due to a conflict of interest. Vice Chair Wallace acted as chair for agenda items 3, 4 and 5.

3. EVANS/REIDHEAD PROPERTY, 707 WEST MOUNTAIN AVENUE - APPLICATION FOR FORT COLLINS LANDMARK DESIGNATION

DESCRIPTION: This item is to consider the request for a recommendation to City Council regarding landmark designation for the Evans/Reidhead Property, an excellent example of a Dutch Colonial Revival style home from the early 1920s and home of Jim Reidhead.

APPLICANT: Donna Reidhead, Owner

Staff Report

Yani Jones, Historic Preservation Intern, presented the staff report. She provided background information about the property and its history. She explained that staff finds the property is a prime example of architect-designed Dutch Colonial Revival style. Ms. Jones detailed the historic aspects of the structure and discussed Jim Reidhead, a community member active in city development and preservation. Staff finds the property, built in 1922, locally significant under standard B for its association with Jim Reidhead, and under standard C for its embodiment of Dutch Colonial Revival style and association with architect Montezuma Fuller. Based on its significance, staff suggests the Commission adopt a motion providing City Council with recommendation and support for the landmark designation of the Evans/Reidhead property.

Applicant Presentation

Donna Reidhead, property owner, expressed appreciation for the work on the Loomis Addition, which inspired her to put forth this application. She stated her husband would have been pleased about the potential designation.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Murray stated he was unaware this was a Fuller structure, and the care applied to the structure speaks to it being appropriate for landmark designation.

Acting Chair Wallace asked if the Commission agreed with the standards staff put forth as the basis for designation. Mr. Hogestad and Mr. Murray agreed. Ms. Gensmer agreed and noted it is striking how similar the current building is from the front to the 1922 photo. Acting Chair Wallace noted the home was also owned at one time by the Markley family.

Acting Chair Wallace asked how the Commission feels about the building's integrity, particularly given some of the alterations. Mr. Murray replied the only potential issue is the asphalt roof. He stated the addition was done well enough, it will likely be considered historic when it hits the 50-year mark. He supported the designation in terms of location, design, setting, workmanship, and neighborhood feeling and context.

Acting Chair Wallace agreed the structure maintains the setting of the surrounding properties and stated, other than the roof, materials remain the same. She asked if the Commission had any thoughts as to the roof material change. Mr. Hogestad replied the roof form remains evident and noted modern materials keep out water.

Acting Chair Wallace stated the workmanship and general feeling of the house are maintained, as is the association.

Ms. Simpson asked if the driveway was historic and important to include. Acting Chair Wallace asked how the property would be designated. Ms. McWilliams replied a property is typically designated as the entire parcel with notes as to specific exceptions or inclusions.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Murray moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission pass a resolution recommending that City Council designate the Evans/Reidhead property as a Fort Collins Landmark in accordance with Municipal Code Chapter 14, based on the property's significance under Standards B and C, for its association with resident James Reidhead and Montezuma Fuller, design as a Dutch Colonial Revival style residence, and its preponderance of exterior integrity. Ms. Gensmer seconded. The motion passed 7:0.

4. TRIMBLE/TAYLOR/DIXON PROPERTY 817 WEST MOUNTAIN AVENUE - APPLICATION FOR FORT COLLINS LANDMARK DESIGNATION

DESCRIPTION: This item is to consider the request for a recommendation to City Council regarding landmark designation for the Trimble/Taylor/Dixon Property, an excellent example of a Classic Cottage from 1905.

APPLICANT: Shelly Terry, Owner

Staff Report

Kylee Cole, Historic Preservation Intern, presented the staff report. She provided background information about the property and its history. She stated the property is being considered for local landmark status under standard C for its architecture as a good example of a Classic Cottage, the most prevalent house form in the Loomis Addition. Ms. Cole went on to detail the key attributes of the home and discussed some recent changes to the form regarding the rear of the home. She noted County Assessor records indicate all changes to the rear of the home are historic having occurred prior to 1968, except the alteration to the siding.

Ms. Cole stated the property retains its architectural significance and represents a good example of Classic Cottage style. Staff suggests the Commission adopt a motion providing the City Council with a recommendation for the landmark designation of this property.

Applicant Presentation

Shelly Terry, property owner, discussed her history with the property and mentioned a 100-year birthday party she held in honor of the home. She described research she did on the property and the awareness it brought for the house as an entity and her role as its caretaker. She discussed the importance of preserving the home and passing it on to future caretakers.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Hogestad asked staff to clarify when various elements of the home were added. Ms. Cole stated the aluminum siding was added over the wood siding in 1993 and further detailed the changes that took place by 1968.

Mr. Murray stated the basis of the structure has been in place historically, particularly since 1968 and stated the structure meets significance in design and construction.

Ms. Gensmer agreed and stated standard C is appropriate for this designation, particularly given the red brick. She stated integrity of materials is met with the original siding being underneath the new siding.

Acting Chair Wallace agreed and noted the additions are historic except the aluminum siding. She stated the design is iconic in the Loomis Addition.

Ms. Nelsen agreed and stated the scale of the home is noteworthy and important to preserve.

Mr. Murray stated the only thing diminishing the exterior integrity is the 2-story building next door and some vinyl windows.

Acting Chair Wallace stated there are several character-defining features associated with the cottage that are strongly intact.

Ms. Gensmer agreed the metal shed is non-contributing; however, the garage is contributing. She stated the siding is a bit concerning; however, the structure still has integrity of materials.

Ms. Gensmer moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission pass a resolution recommending that City Council designate the Trimble/Taylor/Dixon Property at 817 W. Mountain Avenue as a Fort Collins Landmark in accordance with Municipal Code Chapter 14, based on the property's significance under Standard C for its history as a Classic Cottage residence and its preponderance of exterior integrity. Both the residence and the garage are considered contributing features; however, the shed does not contribute to the significance of the property. Ms. Nelsen seconded.

Mr. Hogestad stated he would support the motion; however, he expressed concern about the material that has been covered up and stated speculating what is under the aluminum siding does not make sense.

The motion passed 7:0.

5. REVIEW OF NOMINATION OF THE PATTERSON HOUSE, 121 NORTH GRANT AVENUE, FOR LISTING TO THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

DESCRIPTION:

In accordance with Certified Local Government (CLG) regulations, the Mayor and the Landmark Preservation Commission are asked to provide the Colorado Historic Preservation Review Board with comments on nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. At its September 21, 2018 meeting, the Review Board will discuss the nomination of the Patterson House, 121 North Grant Avenue, for listing to the National Register of Historic Places and the Colorado State Register of Historic Properties.

Staff Report

Ms. McWilliams presented the staff report and introduced the owner, Susan Hoskinson. Ms. McWilliams provided background information about the property, its history and its local designation. She highlighted character-defining architectural elements and details. Ms. McWilliams stated a 500-square-foot addition was added to the rear of the property in 1978 and explained the garage is a non-contributing feature.

Ms. McWilliams explained the Commission's role as a certified local government to provide the Colorado Historic Preservation Review Board with comments on the landmark designation. She stated the criteria is the same as for local landmark designations and staff recommends support of the national register listing.

Applicant Presentation

The homeowner declined speaking to the Commission.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Ms. Gensmer stated she supports recommending staff prepare a report for this property as it is clearly eligible under criterion C for the reasons previously discussed as well as the reasons presented in the staff report. She stated it retains all seven aspects of integrity, particularly design, materials, and workmanship.

Mr. Murray suggested the possibility of including standard A given the property's inclusion in the Loomis Addition. Ms. McWilliams replied standard A on the national register would not apply to the Loomis Addition at this point as there has not been sufficient documentation and study under that criterion.

Mr. Murray suggested the significant contribution of the Addition and the fact Fort Collins was in growth spurt requiring the addition may be a pattern.

Mr. Hogestad asked if there are other catalog homes on the national register. Ms. McWilliams replied she is unaware of others; however, it is likely. Mr. Hogestad stated he would be interested to have that information at some point.

Mr. Murray suggested the catalog aspect could be part of a broader pattern as well.

Mr. Hogestad commented on the details of catalog homes citing its complexity.

Acting Chair Wallace asked how the Commission members feel about the property's integrity of association, feeling, location, and setting.

Ms. Gensmer stated the property retains all those aspects.

Mr. Murray commented on the home being set further back from the street.

Ms. Dorn supported the recommendation under standard C for the property being a good example of the East Lake style and stated the home holds a preponderance of integrity.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Murray moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission finds the Patterson House meets the criteria of the National Register of Historic Places and directs staff to prepare a report to this effect for submittal to the Colorado Historic Preservation Review Board and City Leaders. Ms. Simpson seconded. The motion passed 7:0.

Chair Dunn returned to the meeting, resuming her role as chair for the remaining agenda items.

6. 221 EAST MOUNTAIN - FINAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

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 also 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 of interest.

Ms. Nelsen disclosed that she was not on the Commission when the project was previously discussed but has reviewed the videos and materials from those meetings and is prepared to participate in the discussion.

Mr. Hogestad disclosed he worked for the Neenan Company more than 15 years ago; however, he does not believe that will affect his decision.

Ms. Dorn excused herself from the remainder of the meeting.

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report and reminded Commission members there was a previous application for this site in 2016 for which the Commission recommended approval. She stated the current applicant has appeared before the Commission twice and is hoping to receive a recommendation tonight.

Ms. Bzdek discussed the area of adjacency for the parcel and discussed which buildings in the area have been determined to be eligible for designation or are currently designated. Ms. Bzdek went on to detail the designated and eligible buildings in the area and showed slides of the structures. She discussed changes made to the plan since the project last came before the Commission and provided new photo perspectives provided by the applicant.

In terms of staff analysis, Ms. Bzdek stated staff has findings in support of a recommendation of approval that the project does not impact the integrity or individual eligibility for designation of the historic properties in the area of adjacency, that the project uses window patterning and proportions that provide visual ties to buildings within the adjacent historic context, and that the proposed design does not impede the visual and pedestrian connections to any important adjacent neighborhood focal points.

Ms. Bzdek stated Planning staff members are available to answer Commission members' questions and noted the ultimate decision maker for this project is staff as it is a basic development review.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Hosanna stated he brought material samples and an exhibit showing how the Cementous panels connect to the building. He made himself available for questions.

Planning Staff Presentation

Cameron Gloss, Comprehensive Planning Manager, provided the perspective of Planning staff regarding the modification of standard for the 4th story setback and showed simulations from various angles. He stated the question is whether this additional mass is equal to or better than a compliant plan.

Mr. Gloss stated staff is questioning whether the project meets the materials standards in Section 3.4.7 which describes that dominant building materials of historic structures shall be used as the primary material for new construction.

Public Input

None.

Motion to Establish Area of Adjacency

Mr. Hogestad asked if Commission members feel the 200-foot radius for the area of adjacency is adequate. He stated there are more historic buildings on the block just outside that radius.

Mr. Murray discussed this building ultimately becoming a sentry with the Mitchell Block in defining this entry to the historic district.

Assistant City Attorney Yatabe advised the Commission that the area of adjacency should be constructed to include specific properties rather than an entire district in general.

Mr. Hogestad stated both the Armory and Avery Block are visible from the development site and should therefore be included in the area of adjacency. He discussed the importance of including character-defining buildings visible from the site itself because some of them are key buildings to the historic downtown and because it represents a historic streetscape in scale, mass, bulk, and design. He suggested including the Avery building, the two buildings next to the new construction to the east, the other Coopersmith's building, the Co-op, and the Armory, as well as the other buildings in the 200-foot radius.

Chair Dunn reiterated the included buildings are everything shown by staff within the 200-foot radius called out as historic, plus the Avery Block, Holstein Block, Howard Block, and Armory building.

Mr. Hogestad moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission adopt the properties summarized in the staff report, plus the Avery Block, Holstein Block, Howard Block, and Armory building as the area of adjacency for the proposed development at 221 East Mountain Avenue. Ms. Gensmer seconded.

Ms. Nelsen stated she would like to add the Kissock building as it is stylistically different. Mr. Hogestad stated the idea is to clearly represent the historic downtown and streetscape.

Mr. Yatabe noted the Kissock building was not included in the original motion.

Mr. Murray amended the motion to include the Kissock building. Mr. Hogestad and Ms. Gensmer accepted the amendment.

Mr. Hogestad stated this area of adjacency provides a unique opportunity as these buildings are knitted together by time and style.

The motion passed 6:0.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn asked for the materials samples to be passed. Mr. Hosanna explained some details about the materials. He noted it is a self-draining rain screen system; however, it is open to the air.

Mr. Hogestad and Mr. Hosanna discussed details on building materials.

Ms. Nelsen requested photos of other installations.

Chair Dunn asked Mr. Hosanna to explain the corner details. Mr. Hosanna replied the corner will include an aluminum receiver creating a hollow corner.

Mr. Hogestad asked about the panel size. Mr. Hosanna replied they are 18 inches by 6 feet with nice edge-to-edge connections. He stated he considers this a brick building as that is the predominant material.

Chair Dunn noted the corner is not brick. She asked what color the panels will be. Mr. Hosanna replied they are a putty or taupe color. He stated he shares concerns about making the building corner appropriate.

Mr. Hogestad asked if the windows are recessed or flush. Mr. Hosanna replied they are recessed and stated he appreciates the detail of that aspect.

Chair Dunn asked how long the product is supposed to last. Mr. Hosanna replied it is a substantial product; however, he is unaware of the exact warranty.

Ms. Nelsen asked if this would be considered a high-quality material for the purpose of the proposed new Code language. Gloss replied this would likely be a borderline material dependent on its installation.

Mr. Hogestad noted it is on the list of materials; however, it is an economic material. The finish, color, and sense of depth are important.

Mr. Hogestad asked Mr. Hosanna if he would consider using all brick. Mr. Hosanna replied in the affirmative. Mr. Hogestad stated brick speaks to scale better than a panel.

Mr. Hosanna discussed the branding desired by the client, Elevations Credit Union, which includes more of a modern, gray palette.

Mr. Hogestad stated it is important to have brick at a pedestrian level.

Ms. Nelsen stated she understands the blending of historic and contemporary and asked Mr. Hogestad if he feels these panels do not have the visual or tactile depth of other more used materials in Old Town. Mr. Hogestad replied he is concerned about the visual and tactile scale of the material.

Mr. Murray stated, though Elevations may like a smooth-faced material, it may not be appropriate for this area.

Ms. Gensmer stated the buildings in the adopted area of adjacency are primarily brick and expressed concern about compatibility of the size of the proposed panels.

Ms. Wallace stated she is more acceptable of the panels on the east side of the building; however, the brick on the other side seems to match Mountain.

Ms. Nelsen asked if the panels and brick have flush faces. Mr. Hosanna replied in the negative and stated usually the concrete panel is in front of the brick.

Chair Dunn requested Commission member feedback on the building mass and scale.

Ms. Nelsen requested a summary of step back requirements. Gloss replied the project proposes a 4th-floor step back along the street frontages to enhance the pedestrian experience.

Ms. Nelsen requested information about the Elizabeth Hotel. Gloss described the corner element of the hotel and reduction in scale along Walnut.

Chair Dunn asked if the hotel received modifications. Gloss replied in the affirmative stating they had multiple modifications for the step back.

Chair Dunn asked if the proposed building is raised above sidewalk level. Mr. Hosanna replied it meets the sidewalk on the northwest corner; however, due to grade changes, a step was introduced near the curb. It is higher than the frozen foods building by 8 inches due to drainage.

Mr. Murray stated it seems staff is concerned about the materials and step back. He asked about the appropriate way to make a motion to support staff's findings and direction.

Mr. Hogestad stated general standards require new construction to be compatible with the historic character of adjacent properties. He stated the proposal in its current configuration does not meet that requirement. He stated the Mitchell Block is articulated with a lively elevation, whereas this proposal is flat and single-dimensional. He supported the step back as required.

Mr. Murray stated the step back would make the building match the Mitchell Block and the Elizabeth.

Ms. Nelsen agreed stating the proposed massing is not compatible with adjacent properties. Ms. Gensmer agreed.

Ms. Wallace stated the Elizabeth has so much brick and variation, the massing feels broken up; however, the proposal does not seem to fit the criteria in Section 3.4.7.

Chair Dunn stated she has struggled with the massing of this building from the beginning and the Mitchell Block and Elizabeth are deferential to the nearby buildings with their height modulations and step backs.

Ms. Wallace and Chair Dunn discussed the importance of this building to the downtown area.

Mr. Yatabe noted the Commission could continue this hearing if it does not feel it has sufficient information to determine whether standards are met. Gloss discussed the goal of providing expedient development review and stated continuing the item and allowing staff to work with the applicant may be the most efficient way to move forward.

Chair Dunn asked Mr. Hosanna about his opinion. Mr. Hosanna replied material changes can be made quickly; however, if changes to the 4th floor are expected, the project may not move forward.

Mr. Hogestad stated more articulation makes a difference in how the building is perceived. He suggested examining that possibility in lieu of stepping back the 4th floor. Mr. Hosanna replied the building is not flat; the recesses created at the 1st floor are substantial and the patio recesses on the 3rd and 4th floors are very substantial.

Ms. Wallace stated she would be comfortable with the 4th floor not being stepped back if the materials could be changed.

Ms. Nelsen stated the building starts to feel flat above the 3rd floor and suggested some possible changes on the balconies.

Chair Dunn noted historic buildings in Fort Collins do not have balconies and suggested that may be a topic for future discussion. Gloss stated there is more of a change in terms of residential units being constructed and there is a market expectation for outdoor space.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Hogestad moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission continue this discussion to the next regular meeting for further study of the 4th floor massing or step back, mitigation if the 4th floor is not stepped back, and scalable materials in proper locations.

Mr. Hosanna stated he can complete the mitigation of the 4th floor with articulation and material changes in the next month.

Ms. Gensmer seconded the motion.

Mr. Hosanna stated he could manage material changes within his construction schedule.

The motion passed 5:1 with Murray dissenting.

(**Secretary's Note: The Commission took a brief recess at this point in the meeting.)

7. DOWNTOWN AND TRANSITION AREAS CODE UPDATES AND RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

DESCRIPTION:

The purpose of this item is to provide the Landmark Preservation Commission a progress report on two interrelated Land Use Code amendment projects that together address design standards for Downtown and within Neighborhood Conservation Buffer (NCB) transition areas at the interface between Downtown and the Old Town Neighborhoods. Staff is requesting that the Commission provide a recommendation to City Council on the proposed changes.

Staff Report

Cameron Gloss stated this discussion will be focused on one component of the Downtown Code Standards related to building materials. The intention is to have high quality building materials on the lower portion of the building where pedestrian interactions occur. Those include smaller scale materials that produce detail and a feeling of durability. He stated the challenge is providing a list of acceptable materials that provides creativity and compatibility and promotes the pedestrian scale.

Mr. Gloss stated a suggestion has been made to make a list of unacceptable materials rather than acceptable. He acknowledged staff is aware of cost factors. He requested the Commission provide feedback and direction to staff in anticipation of staff bringing draft Code language back at the next LPC meeting.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Murray noted Mr. Hosanna stated the concrete panels are costlier than brick. Mr. Gloss stated most of the higher quality materials are costlier per square foot. A big price drop occurs for undesirable materials, such as synthetic stucco.

Mr. Hogestad noted the material costs do not necessarily take labor costs into account.

Mr. Gloss described the expanding Downtown boundaries which not include the breweries and the River District.

Chair Dunn asked if a separate materials list will be devised for each district. Mr. Gloss replied the type of standards written for the RDR are far more detailed than this is intended to be.

Chair Dunn stated durability, authenticity, human scale, and human interest are the desired characteristics, which could all be found in some yet undiscovered material; therefore, she does not like the idea of listing materials either way. She stated she would rather list parameters of quality materials.

Ms. Wallace agreed, and stated hardness or other criteria could be considered. Mr. Gloss stated the goal of this process has been to reduce subjectivity without stifling creativity.

Mr. Gloss asked if the Commission would rather define parameters around what is desired rather than what is not desired. Chair Dunn replied in the affirmative.

Chair Dunn stated she would like to see materials that can be maintained and repaired rather than replaced.

Mr. Murray stated the categories of sustainability, durability, and appropriateness to the area seem to be reasonable.

Mr. Gloss stated the crafting of the language is the difficult aspect of requiring handsome, long-lasting materials that are not cost prohibitive for developers.

Mr. Murray stated cost cannot be legislated.

Mr. Gloss stated the focus is on higher quality materials for the lower portion of the buildings to enhance the pedestrian experience.

Mr. Hogestad asked if staff is considering providing a list. Mr. Gloss replied staff was criticized for the list as it places designers in a box; however, staff is of the opinion it is not an all-inclusive list and could include things like the importance of human scale.

- **OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

- **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 9:27 p.m.

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

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on

19 Sept 2018



Meg Dunn, Chair