



Meg Dunn, Chair  
Alexandra Wallace, Co-Vice Chair  
Kristin Gensmer, Co-Vice Chair  
Michael Bello  
Mollie Bredehoft  
Katie Dorn  
Kevin Murray  
Anne Nelsen  
Anna Simpkins

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 21, 2019 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Dunn called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

- **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Bello, Bredehoft, Dunn, Gensmer, Nelsen  
ABSENT: Wallace, Dorn, Murray, Simpkins  
STAFF: McWilliams, Bzdek, Yatabe, Schiager, Lambrecht

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

No changes to posted agenda.

- **STAFF REPORTS**

None.

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

None.

- **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 19, 2109 REGULAR MEETING.

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the June 19, 2019 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

***Ms. Gensmer moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the minutes of the June 19, 2019 regular meeting as presented. Ms. Nelsen seconded. The motion passed 5-0.***

2. 612 S HOWES – DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

**DESCRIPTION:** Proposed duplex addition to a historic property, 612 S Howes (the Anderson-Goff House, 1900). Site alterations would include a five-stall parking pad on the alley side and a shared courtyard between the old and new residences. The project would retain the existing residence without alterations and demolish the detached 1948 garage.

**APPLICANT:** Stan Arnett, r4 Architects

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report. She clarified the area of adjacency specifying that the historic properties directly abutting the property are the priority for compatibility considerations, based on the relevant Code provisions. She reviewed the history of the on-site historic resources and clarified the period of significance.

Ms. Bzdek stated early staff findings show it is worth discussing the garage being constructed after the period of significance in terms of its proposed demolition.

*[Secretary's Note: The Commission took a brief recess due to a technical issue.]*

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Arnett gave the Applicant presentation detailing the proposed project and parking. He also noted all four units will include transom windows and detailed the proposed façade.

*[Secretary's Note: The Commission took a brief recess due to a technical issue.]*

Public Input

None

Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn requested the Commission discuss the garage and noted the property does not have to be landmarked in order to be considered historic under the Land Use Code. She also noted the property has been determined to be eligible based on a thorough survey by a third party, but because it hasn't been landmarked, it hasn't been clearly determined whether the garage would be part of the eligibility.

Mr. Bello stated he did not believe the garage was significant given its later date of construction.

Ms. Nelsen agreed stating the garage is secondary to the home.

Ms. Gensmer and Ms. Bredehoft agreed.

Chair Dunn stated she does not believe the garage is historic as it falls outside the period of significance.

Chair Dunn suggested discussing each standard one by one.

Regarding standard 1, Chair Dunn stated the project complies. Regarding standard 2, Chair Dunn noted the Commission agrees the garage is not historic. The Commission agreed the project meets standards 3, 4, and 5, and standards 6, 7, and 8 do not apply.

Chair Dunn stated standard 9 addresses making new work differentiated from the old and compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. She requested Commission input on this issue.

Ms. Nelsen asked the applicant if he is familiar with the Secretary of the Interior standards and Old Town guidelines. Mr. Arnett replied he has not done many historic projects; however, the addition is intended to not tower over the existing structure and has the same roof pitch making it not visible from the street.

Ms. Nelsen requested additional information on how this design communicates with the surroundings. Mr. Arnett replied he examined the addition from the view corridor.

Ms. Nelsen asked Mr. Arnett if he considers the addition to be secondary to the existing structure. Mr. Arnett replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Nelsen commented on the eave lines being identical and asked if that could be dropped for the addition. Mr. Arnett replied in the negative noting the existing home is quite shallow. He noted the first-floor elevation for the new structure has been kept at grade.

Mr. Bello discussed the verticality of the windows on the existing building versus the horizontal windows on the addition.

Ms. Gensmer commented on the sandstone foundation of the existing building but noted it is not the dominant material. She encouraged Mr. Arnett to look at the material ratios.

Ms. Bredehoft asked about the proposed scale of the stone veneer. Mr. Arnett replied the stone would be larger and perhaps not as cultured.

Ms. Bredehoft stated the front entry is not obvious. Mr. Arnett replied placing entries in the courtyard seemed too intimate for guests; therefore, the entries are faced to the east to be closer to the parking lot. Ms. Bredehoft commented on the lack of a sense of arrival and asked why the front entrance is being downplayed. Mr. Arnett replied he was attempting to keep as much room in the courtyard as possible.

Chair Dunn commented on the overhang looking more office-oriented than residential. She stated she would prefer to see a gable or something similar to what is on the historic house to mark the front entrance.

Ms. Nelsen commented on ensuring drainage does not affect the historic materials of the existing property. Mr. Arnett replied he has a civil engineer working on a swale design.

Chair Dunn asked why the parking is not directly off the alley. Mr. Arnett replied there is a desire to not have to back into the alley.

Ms. Gensmer stated it is compatible to keep parking at the rear of the lot, though it does take up space. She agreed with the concept of preserving as much courtyard space as possible.

Ms. Bredehoft asked where residents would be storing garage items. Mr. Arnett replied the property manager will be responsible for yard maintenance.

Ms. Nelsen stated she does not see compatibility and is not convinced the building is secondary on the lot.

Chair Dunn stated the compatibility should show a family resemblance to the historic structure.

Ms. Nelsen commended the perspective from the street.

Regarding standard 10, Chair Dunn noted the new structure is a separate building rather than an addition.

Chair Dunn requested materials samples when they are decided upon. She noted the historic structure has been covered in stucco and suggested its inclusion on the new building could be helpful.

### 3. 220 EAST LAUREL STREET – APPEAL OF STAFF DESIGN REVIEW DECISION

**DESCRIPTION:** This is a request for consideration of an appeal of Staff's decision to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed alterations to the Long Apartment Complex, 220 East Laurel Street. The property is an officially designated Fort Collins Landmark.

**APPLICANT:** Annie Obermann, Forge and Bow Dwellings, for D.L. Obermann Trust, Owner.

#### Staff Report

Mr. Yatabe explained the appeal review process stating the Commission will be making a decision to uphold or overturn the staff decision that is on appeal. He noted any changes to the proposed plan would require the applicant to come back before the Commission and if the Commission overturns the staff denial, it would be approving the plan as is.

Ms. McWilliams presented the staff report and discussed the property and staff's denial of a request for the replacement of a historic window and door on the addition, the request to paint unpainted brick on the addition, and the request to substantially change and modernize the front and side landscaping of the property. She stated the denials were based on the findings that the proposed work did not comply with the Secretary of Interior standards for rehabilitation. She noted staff approved a request for landscaping changes to the rear courtyard.

Ms. McWilliams showed photos of the property over time and outlined the role of the Commission.

#### Applicant Presentation

Ms. Oberman gave an overview of the proposal citing the reason for the requested door change and noting deficiencies in the brick are the reason for the painting request. She stated many of the requested changes would help the addition match the original 1920's construction of the larger building.

Ms. Oberman discussed the requested landscape changes which would pull sod away from the building to avoid water damage to the building, add raised planters, place a fence for privacy from the unkempt lot to the north, and place a metal screen in front of the dumpster area. She discussed the desire to increase outdoor amenities for residents.

#### Public Input

None

#### Commission Questions

Mr. Bello requested clarification on what staff did and did not approve. Ms. McWilliams replied the only item approved by staff were the landscape changes behind the addition. She noted she was unaware of the proposed pergola and requested additional information. She stated staff also tabled the dumpster screen and fence for lack of information at the time.

Ms. McWilliams stated staff was unaware of the changes made to the windows in the building as mentioned by Ms. Oberman and will therefore need to look at those changes.

Mr. Bello requested details about the proposed door and window replacement. Ms. Oberman replied the two would not be connected in one unit.

Chair Dunn outlined the way in which the Commission would address the discussion.

Mr. Bello asked what the new windows would look like. Ms. Oberman replied they would look the same but be more efficient. Chair Dunn noted the standards require first evaluating the existing materials to determine they need to be removed.

Chair Dunn asked for details relating to the door replacement. Ms. Oberman replied the door has a veneer layering that has been peeling up over time and it is not a high-quality door. She also stated the replacement would provide additional light. She stated replacing the veneer on the door would be more expensive than replacing it with a new door.

Chair Dunn noted the Commission is looking for the addition to retain the characteristics of its own time rather than have it look like the original structure.

Ms. Oberman stated they would like to replace the door with one that will function better for the new use as a fitness center and allow more light.

Chair Dunn reviewed standards and discussed mid-century design stating the door and windows fit with the time period the addition was constructed and should therefore be retained.

Ms. Gensmer noted replacement in-kind is required if replacement is necessary. Ms. Bredehoft agreed.

Chair Dunn stated there is a lack of information on whether the door actually needs to be replaced. Ms. Oberman replied the quality of the door is lacking. She stated she understands the intention of keeping the integrity of architectural styles; however, the issue with this building is that the matching of the two styles was not done well in the original build.

Chair Dunn stated maintaining the 1950's style of the addition is important.

Ms. Gensmer discussed the importance of not creating a false sense of history for the addition. Ms. Oberman discussed some of the architectural aspects of the addition that are significant to the 1950's and asked if items such as the door are considered to be as significant as the roof line or other features. Chair Dunn recommended Ms. Oberman review the Secretary of Interior standards for additional guidance, adding that all elements are of equal importance.

Chair Dunn discussed the standards for maintaining the same operability for windows to show craftsmanship and the requirement to repair rather than replace damaged distinctive features.

Mr. Bello commented that replacing the windows with more energy efficient windows complies the City's net-zero goals. Chair Dunn noted there is quite a bit of energy loss with replacement and stated there are ways to increase the efficiency of historic windows. She asked Ms. Oberman what has been done to research using the current materials. Ms. Oberman replied the windows were painted shut at one point and attempts to make the single-pane windows operable has left them only able to open partially. She stated they could be taken apart and stripped but they have not used contractors with historic experience.

Ms. McWilliams suggested Ms. Oberman could use the Design Assistance program for a window study.

Ms. Nelsen noted this is a landmarked building which is why the Secretary of Interior standards must be applied.

Chair Dunn requested Commission input regarding the brick painting. She stated seeing the difference between the addition and the original building is important.

Ms. Gensmer stated the brick painting seems to be related solely to aesthetics. Ms. Oberman stated the brick is in good condition; the painting was a matter of preference.

Ms. Gensmer noted brick painting would be difficult to reverse without causing damage to the structure.

Chair Dunn requested input as to the proposed landscaping changes. She asked if there are existing planters in the southwest corner. Ms. Oberman replied in the affirmative but noted they are quite dilapidated and are larger than the proposed.

Chair Dunn stated samples of the paver materials would be needed.

Ms. Bredehoft asked about the proposed use for the east side. Ms. Oberman replied it is designed to feel like a courtyard.

Ms. Bredehoft asked about the height of the proposed pergola. Ms. Oberman replied it is probably 8 feet tall, is freestanding, and is a combination of metal and wood. Chair Dunn commented that would be easily removed if necessary.

Chair Dunn stated the landscape has been minimal in the past and the proposed landscaping is more complex.

Ms. Bredehoft stated the landscaping seems quite modern and stated it is wise to pull the turf away from the building in order to protect it.

Ms. Oberman discussed the way in which the landscaping was designed to reflect the 1950's. Chair Dunn stated the 1950's structure is small in comparison to the two 1920's apartment buildings.

Chair Dunn requested input regarding the alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property. Ms. Bredehoft discussed the landscape plan and stated some of the pavers take away from the residential feel of the front of the building. She also asked about the spatial relationship of the adjacent front lawns.

Ms. Nelsen asked whether the landscaping is historic therefore falling into the Commission's purview relating to the Secretary of Interior standards. Chair Dunn replied the landscaping would be included in the landmarked property but stated its character may need to be defined.

Mr. Bello stated the proposed landscaping does not seem to match the rest of the neighborhood or the historic building. Ms. Oberman stated an apartment complex to the west has completed similar landscaping to make a larger buffer between the turf and the sidewalk.

Chair Dunn asked if the referenced complex is landmarked. Ms. McWilliams replied in the negative.

Chair Dunn commented the pavers in the middle of the lawn do not fit with the historic context. Ms. Oberman replied they are meant to fit with the 1950's historic nature of the addition. Chair Dunn stated there is a lot going on that does not match the largest 1920's building on the property. She suggested there are simple solutions that would not detract from the character of the building but would still serve the desired purpose.

Ms. Nelsen stated it is a reasonable request to pull the turf away from the building so as to not deteriorate building materials with irrigation.

Chair Dunn suggested the landscape should be simpler and more symmetrical. Ms. McWilliams suggested the design assistance program could also be used for landscape design.

Ms. Bredehoft stated the landscaping of the space in back is perfectly acceptable and stated the proposed dumpster screen could be removable.

Ms. Nelsen expressed concern about the height of the pergola and requested assurance it would not be visible from the front. Ms. Oberman replied it would not be visible.

Commission members and Ms. McWilliams discussed the pergola and the need to acquire additional information regarding materials as it is a semi-permanent structure.

Chair Dunn asked if a plan of protection is in place to ensure the garage is not disturbed by the formation of the concrete furniture. Ms. McWilliams replied in the negative. Chair Dunn stated that would be required.

Chair Dunn asked if shade awnings are planned. Ms. Oberman replied in the negative.

Commission members did not express concerns about the rear cedar fence other than ensuring it is not attached to the building.

Chair Dunn requested input about the dumpster screen. Ms. Oberman stated it would be free-standing but with some type of concrete footings.

Ms. Bredehoft noted the dumpster screen and raised planters are to be powder coated white and asked Ms. Oberman if they would consider using a different color. Ms. Oberman replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Bredehoft asked when the tiles in the front entry were added. Ms. Oberman replied they were added over the last few years. Ms. McWilliams stated those have not been reviewed.

#### Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Bello stated he did not have any concerns about the back area with the exception of ensuring the pergola height is appropriate.

Chair Dunn suggested reviewing the items in order with the windows first.

Ms. Nelsen stated the request for the window replacement does not meet the Secretary of Interior standards for a landmarked property and the Commission would need to see evidence that all other avenues have been explored first. Ms. Gensmer agreed.

Regarding the door replacement request, Ms. Nelsen reiterated her remarks about the windows and stated if the door were to be replaced, it should be replaced in kind.

Regarding painting the brick, Ms. Gensmer stated that would not meet the Secretary of Interior standards.

Regarding the visible landscaping, Mr. Bello stated the front should be simpler and the applicant could use design review assistance for developing something more appropriate.

Regarding the rear courtyard, Ms. Bredehoft stated the pergola height and ensuring a plan of protection is in place for the garage are the only concerns.

Regarding the cedar fence, Ms. Nelsen stated there are no concerns assuming it is not attached to the garage. She suggested the plan of protection could address that.

Regarding the dumpster screen, Mr. Bello suggested the applicant consider a different color. Ms. Bredehoft stated the applicant should work with design assistance. Chair Dunn stated she would like the design of the screen to be simpler.

Ms. Gensmer asked if the Commission could conditionally approve or deny the seven elements individually. Mr. Yatabe replied the Commission could approve or deny portions of the request and summarized the Commission's discussion and previous staff determinations.

[\*\*Secretary's Note: The Commission took a brief recess.]

#### Commission Deliberation

Ms. Gensmer requested clarification on the condition related to the pergola height. Commission members replied it must not be visible from the street.

**Ms. Gensmer moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission uphold the staff decision to deny Items 1-4 as listed in the August 21, 2019 staff report.**

**Ms. Gensmer further moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission uphold the staff decision to approve Item 5 with the following conditions: 1) limit the height of the pergola so the top is not visible from the street, and 2) provide an acceptable plan of protection to be reviewed by staff.**

**Ms. Gensmer further moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve Item 6 regarding the fence with the condition that it is freestanding and does not connect to the garage.**

**Ms. Gensmer further moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission deny Item 7 regarding the screen.**

**This decision is based on the materials provided for this hearing, testimony at this hearing and board discussion.**

**Ms. Nelsen seconded the motion.**

Commission members agreed staff could review the plan of protection.

Mr. Bello stated he is concerned about denying the request to replace the windows but will support the motion.

**The motion passed 5-0.**

#### 4. LINDEN STREET IMPROVEMENTS – DESIGN REVIEW

**DESCRIPTION:** Create a “convertible” street on Linden Street from Walnut to Jefferson, combining roadway, on-street parking, pedestrian walkways, event space, placemaking elements, and artwork.

**APPLICANT:** City of Fort Collins Engineering Department (Kyle Lambrecht); Ditesco (Keith Meyer); Russell Mills Studios (Craig Russell)

#### Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report noting the proposed alterations are within the Old Town Historic District established in 1979.

#### Applicant Presentation

Mr. Lambrecht briefly discussed the proposed project, budget, and schedule.

Mr. Meyer stated the 200 block of Linden Street has historically been a community gathering space which makes the concept of a convertible street ideal. He noted he and Mr. Russell have worked on nearly every Old Town alleyway project and Old Town Square so they are very familiar with the Secretary of Interior standards. He stated a plan of protection would be incorporated into the construction specifications prior to bidding.

Mr. Russell detailed various alternatives relating to establishing the street layout cross-section, parking, how pedestrian spaces relate to parking, landscaping, and lighting. He noted the importance of all modes of travel sharing the environment and discussed the integration of the historic pavers around the Linden Hotel building. He also discussed the importance of accessibility, safety, energy, and environment.

Mr. Meyer highlighted the applicable categories of the Secretary of Interior standards for this project, including the protection of existing trees and existing structure survey. He noted some of the Linden Hotel pavers may not meet accessibility standards at this point.

#### Public Input

None

#### Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Bello asked if area businesses have been concerned about a possible parking reduction. Mr. Meyer explained various options and stated the Old Firehouse parking garage at the Elizabeth Hotel, which is about 200 feet away, has provided 216 public parking spaces to offset any lost parking.

Ms. Bredehoft asked if the clock will be conserved. Mr. Meyer replied it was installed in 1995 and is therefore not historic. Ms. Bredehoft replied she was aware of that; however, she noted it was donated and suggested it be reviewed.

Ms. Bredehoft asked about the creation of a barrier between Old Town Square and Linden Street by adding more planters. Mr. Meyer replied there are currently linear planters along Old Town Square which are interrupted by the crosswalk locations. He stated the suggestion is to expand those locations to further narrow the pedestrian walkway.

Mr. Russell discussed the concept of a pedestrian refuge for the area.

Ms. Bredehoft asked how this project ties to Old Town Square. Mr. Russell replied the raised planter beds and pots, lights, material palette, and street trees tie the areas together.

Ms. Bredehoft asked how this project ties to the River District. Mr. Russell replied a bulb-out has been added and the intersection will be treated as a gateway with a seat wall and elevated planter pots.

Mr. Lambrecht discussed the improvement implementation noting the River District has its own palette.

Commission members discussed the Linden Hotel pavers.

Chair Dunn noted an Historic District sign on Linden near Jefferson will need to be replaced nearby if moved.

Chair Dunn requested input regarding the proposed circular paving patterns. Ms. Bredehoft replied she was unsure how they tied into Old Town Square. Mr. Meyer discussed the replication of the oval granite pavers in the Old Town play structure.

Mr. Bello asked how the other side of Jefferson was designed. Mr. Meyer replied that section of Linden Street was updated a few years ago.

Chair Dunn asked about opening car doors to the right and associated parking. Mr. Meyer replied that level of detail has yet to be determined but noted the concept of a convertible street is to have no curb and gutter.

Chair Dunn requested assurance the tenants go through the proper channels to ensure patio fencing is properly approved. Mr. Meyer replied those approvals would require an encroachment permit which mandates no attachment to the building.

Ms. Bredehoft asked about the plan to remove snow from diagonal parking islands. Mr. Meyer replied the standards require a certain radius to allow for a plow and there would be no curb there.

- **OTHER BUSINESS**

None

- **ADJOURNMENT**

- **OTHER BUSINESS**

None

- **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 9:47 p.m.

---

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

---

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on 9/18/19.

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