



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 September 19, 2018 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

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

- **ROLL CALL**

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

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

Ms. Bzdek indicated that there are no changes to the posted agenda. Mr. Murray recused himself from Item #2, 125 S. Sherwood, and moved to the gallery. Mr. Murray, acting as a private citizen, pulled Item #2 from consent for discussion.

- **STAFF REPORTS**

None.

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

None.

- **CONSENT AGENDA**

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

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

3. 512 WEST MAGNOLIA STREET - FINAL DEMOLITION/ALTERATION REVIEW

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

APPLICANT: Thomas Knebel, contractor

Ms. Simpson moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve items 1 & 3 of the Consent Agenda. Ms. Gensmer seconded. The motion passed 6-0.

- **PULLED FROM CONSENT**

2. 125 SOUTH SHERWOOD STREET - FINAL DEMOLITION/ALTERATION REVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This is a proposal demolish the existing residence and outbuildings for new, single family construction. The property was determined to be individually eligible as a Fort Collins Landmark.

APPLICANT: Keira Harkin, contractor

Staff Report

Ms. Bumgarner presented the staff report. She provided some background, history and photos of the property, and reviewed the role of the Commission and its three options for a decision. She stated that Staff recommends approval of the project.

Applicant Presentation

Keira Harkin, the contractor, addressed the Commission on behalf of the owner. She said the owner had just recently purchased the property and at that time made her plans known, but neither the realtor nor the previous owner disclosed the eligibility of the property for landmark designation. She said they had professionally documented the property through a consultant who deemed the property not eligible.

Chair Dunn asked for clarification about the determination of eligibility made by the last chair. Ms. Bumgarner explained there had been an addition, but the previous chair determined that the property was still eligible.

Public Input

Nancy York, who resides at the corner of West Oak and Whitcomb, reported that a neighbor had shown her that the interior of this property had already been demolished. She did not believe the interior demolition could be in compliance with City Code. She said the Code should be changed to prohibit a perfectly good house from being demolished, and there should be consequences for doing so. She noted that a similar demolition had happened in her neighborhood.

Kevin Murray expressed concern that the public hadn't had time to learn about the project and respond. He was also concerned that some of the demolition was done without a permit. He suggested the Commission exercise the option of a 45-day delay.

Staff Response to Public Input

Mr. Yatabe clarified that while Mr. Murray is a Commission member he has recused himself from this item and was speaking as a private citizen in this matter.

Chair Dunn asked Staff to clarify whether interior demolition requires a permit. Ms. McWilliams said some interior work does require a permit, but she did not have specific information as to any interior demolition of this property.

Applicant Response to Public Input

Ms. Harkin stated that she has not broken any rules. She explained why certain materials were removed from the home and emphasized that the work that had been done does not require a permit.

Mr. Yatabe shared Code Section 14-71(b), noting the last sentence, which specifies that it doesn't apply to interior demolition.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn clarified that the Commission's role is not to judge whether the home should be demolished or not, or whether the new proposed building is appropriate. The Commission is to determine whether the Applicant has complied with the Code requirements for demolition. She stated the Commission can either approve the demolition, postpone the decision, or approve it with conditions.

Ms. Gensmer stated she didn't attend the work session but had reviewed the recording and is prepared to participate.

Ms. Simpson asked for and received confirmation on the date the APO letters was sent out, which was September 5th.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Hogestad moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the demolition/alteration of 125 South Sherwood without conditions, finding that the Applicant has complied with the requirements of Municipal Code Section 14-72.

Ms. Nelson seconded.

Chair Dunn explained for the public that the only way to prevent the demolition would be through a non-consensual designation. However, the consultant, the Director, and Chair Dunn now agree that the property is not individually eligible for designation.

Ms. Simpson asked what a neighbor concerned with the height of the new building could do. Ms. Bumgarner stated that those concerns could be directed to Zoning.

Chair Dunn mentioned the solar access requirement in the code. She noted that concerned neighbors could speak to Council or to Zoning.

The motion passed 6-0.

Mr. Murray rejoined the Commission.

● DISCUSSION AGENDA

4. 223 WILLOW (WILLOW STREET RESIDENCES – PDP180006) - FINAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This is a proposed 5-story, multi-family apartment project at 223 Willow in the River District. The current use of this 2.04-acre lot is industrial, storage, and truck parking. It is bounded by the Union Pacific Railroad on the south.

APPLICANT: Katy Candau, Oz Architecture

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report. She began with a project summary and reviewed the properties included in the proposed area of adjacency the Commission had previously discussed. She discussed the items the Commission had requested at the work session.

Ms. Bzdek presented the Staff Findings of Fact, recommending approval. She also reviewed the role of the Commission and noted the project will be going before the Planning and Zoning Board tomorrow evening.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Illanes gave the Applicant presentation, focusing on new information. He discussed incorporating the Commission's input and suggestions from the previous meeting. He reviewed the changes to the design since that time, displaying slides comparing the previous and current designs.

Mr. Illanes discussed the window details and mentioned a concern he heard the Commission express at the work session about lap siding. He stated manufacturer's instructions will be followed for installation to ensure the product is warranted.

Public Input

None.

Area of Adjacency Deliberation

Ms. Nelson disclosed she had not been on the Commission at the time of the previous discussion, but she feels she is properly informed to make a decision at this time.

Ms. Gensmer moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission adopt 401 Pine Street, 200 Jefferson Street, and 359 Linden Street as the area of adjacency for the proposed development at 223 Willow Street.

Ms. Dorn seconded. The motion passed 7-0.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Hogestad asked the Applicant to speak in more detail about the decision to use lap siding in the River District. Mr. Illanes replied lap siding was used in several other buildings in the area and it speaks to a residential use. He noted other materials are used as well.

Mr. Hogestad asked if lap siding is used on any historic buildings within the area of adjacency. Mr. Illanes replied it is used on buildings on Linden and on houses next to Confluence. Chair Dunn asked if lap siding was used on the Pine Street homes. Ms. Bzdek replied they are brick and are also not eligible; however, the Linden Street residence next to Confluence is eligible.

Mr. Hogestad asked if a substrate will be used to take up imperfections in framing. Mr. Illanes replied it is a rain screen that will be installed as required by the manufacturer.

Chair Dunn asked how the siding is attached to the rain screen. Mr. Illanes replied different manufacturers have different systems, therefore he is unsure how this specific system will be attached.

Mr. Hogestad asked about the exposure on the siding. Mr. Illanes replied it will be six inches.

The Applicant provided material samples which were passed around.

[Secretary's note: Photos of the samples have been provided by the Applicant for the record.]

Mr. Hogestad stated the design is much more effective and commended the changes. He asked about the distance of the brick return. Mr. Illanes replied it is seven feet and could go up to nine feet in some places.

Mr. Murray stated he appreciated the presentation and the explanation of changes was helpful.

Mr. Hogestad acknowledged the changes in massing and attention to historic scale, adding that it was very effective.

Ms. Gensmer appreciated the material samples. She stated she had been concerned the building looked monolithic, but the step backs and material changes helped relieve that and made the massing more compatible.

Ms. Nelsen said this is a sensitive project and the materials were handled elegantly.

Ms. Dorn appreciated the detail in the packet and the material samples.

Chair Dunn appreciated the responses to the Commission members' comments. She stated the proportions fit better with the historic context and the step backs and material changes are helpful. She also commended moving the building entrance to the front.

Mr. Hogestad stated he is still concerned about the Hardie siding and stated he hopes the detailing and specification will eliminate that issue.

Commission Deliberation

Ms. Nelsen moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission recommend to the Decision Maker approval of the proposal for 223 Willow Street (PDP180006), finding it complies with the standards contained in Land Use Code section 3.4.7 in regard to compatibility with the character of the project's area of adjacency for the following reasons:

- ***The project design uses mass mitigation strategies that achieve the basic goals of the code regarding similarity of height, setback, and width.***
- ***The project includes building materials and detailing that reflect or are visually compatible with the dominant materials of adjacent historic properties.***
- ***The project uses window patterning and material techniques to create the appearance of proportions that reflect the window character of adjacent historic buildings.***
- ***The proposed design improves visual and pedestrian connections to the adjacent neighborhood focal points.***

Mr. Murray seconded. The motion passed 7:0.

5. 221 EAST MOUNTAIN - FINAL 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 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 Item #5 due to a conflict of interest.

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report. She discussed the proposed project and area of adjacency and detailed changes made since the last Commission hearing. She reviewed the Commission's request from the work session and stated staff concludes the project satisfies the requirements of the Land Use Code.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Hosanna gave the Applicant presentation. He discussed the material changes since the previous meeting and passed samples of the new materials to Commission members. He discussed the ways the project meets the Land Use Code and stated no historic structures are being compromised by the project and its design. He discussed the building height and noted part of the charm of downtown is its variety.

Mr. Hosanna stated he appreciated the constructive criticism provided previously from the Commission.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions of Applicant or Staff

Mr. Hogestad asked if the relationship of the materials has changed to create shadow lines. Mr. Hosanna replied in the affirmative and discussed the ways in which he is adding texture within the material itself.

Mr. Hogestad asked about the window glazing. Mr. Hosanna replied he will be using center glazing.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Murray commended Mr. Hosanna's presentation and stated he appreciates the changes made to the project. He expressed concern about the 4th floor not being recessed, noting it is not similar to building heights of area existing historic structures.

Mr. Hogestad agreed that is a problem and stated he does not see an equal to or better than condition for that modification and state the massing resulting from the 4th story does not match that of buildings in the area of adjacency. He supported other changes that have been made to the project.

Ms. Gensmer supported the change in materials, stating they are more compatible with buildings in the area of adjacency. She also appreciated the use of the glass block around the trash area.

Mr. Murray stated the material issue is satisfied in his opinion and suggested the formation of a motion that would help support staff's negotiations on the step back.

Mr. Hogestad expressed concern about the lack of step back for the 4th floor from a preservation standpoint.

Ms. Bzdek discussed Staff's rationale for supporting the height modification.

Clark Mapes, City Planner, commented on the building mass noting its similarity to other buildings in the area.

Mr. Hogestad stated he does not believe the materials articulate the building.

Ms. Dorn stated an analysis of the ratio or proportion of step backs on the 4th floors could be helpful. Chair Dunn noted that would require the continuation of the meeting.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Murray moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission recommend approval of the proposed building at 221 East Mountain Avenue as presented with the condition that the 4th floor step backs be similar in depth to those found on the Mitchell Block to the north.

Ms. Gensmer seconded.

Mr. Murray stated the idea behind his motion is to not force the removal of the 4th floor but to make it fit with the rest of the neighborhood.

Mr. Hogestad expressed concern this building does not relate to the historic buildings within the area of adjacency. He stated he would have a hard time supporting the motion.

Ms. Nelsen agreed she too would have a difficult time supporting the motion.

Mr. Murray asked if the Commission agrees the proposed building is acceptable in terms of materials. Chair Dunn replied in the affirmative. Mr. Hogestad replied the building meets the criteria in Section 3.4.7 except for mitigating the mass and bulk of the building.

Chair Dunn stated the proposed building does not match the historic parapet lines in the area.

Mr. Hogestad discussed the use of more transparent materials.

Ms. Nelsen agreed the balconies could be the key to achieving the needed step back.

Ms. Dorn noted the objective of the LPC is to consider the historic buildings in the area of adjacency and stated contemporary buildings should not be referenced in the motion.

Ms. Gensmer and Mr. Hogestad agreed. Ms. Nelsen stated she would not support the motion and stated she would like to look at this in the context of the historic properties in the area of adjacency.

Mr. Murray withdrew his motion. He added that the Mitchell Block went through a similar issue in its review which resulted in a workable solution.

Ms. Nelsen asked about the step back requirement. Mr. Mapes replied the requirement is that the entire 4th floor be stepped back at a 35-degree angle. If the balconies did not have covers, there would be some step back.

Mr. Hogestad moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission recommend to the Decision maker approval of the project at 221 East Mountain Avenue (BDR180012), with the condition that the balconies be modified to provide step backs that would help the building maintain historic articulation.

Mr. Murray seconded.

Mr. Murray stated that motion makes him feel better about the project's compliance with Section 3.4.7.

Ms. Nelsen stated this may address the massing issue.

Ms. Dorn asked if there is a true reference to massing and scale in the motion. Mr. Hogestad replied there is a reference to articulation in the motion.

Members indicated support of the motion.

The motion passed 6-0.

[Secretary's Note: The Commission took a short break from 8:14 – 8:21.]

6. ADOPTION OF THE LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION'S 2019 WORK PLAN

The purpose of this item is to discuss and adopt the Landmark Preservation Commission's Work Plan for 2019.

Staff Report

Ms. McWilliams reminded the Commission of the changes the members requested at the work session and noted those changes have been made and staff recommends adoption of the Work Plan.

Commission Deliberation

Ms. Dorn moved to adopt the Landmark Preservation Commission's Work Plan for 2019.

Ms. Nelsen seconded. The motion passed 7:0.

● **OTHER BUSINESS**

Chair Dunn reminded the Commission about the changes to its November meeting dates.

● **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 8:24 p.m.

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

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on Nov. 14, 2018.



Alexandra Wallace, Acting Chair