



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 March 20, 2019 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

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

- **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Wallace, Dorn, Gensmer, Murray, Nelsen, Simpkins (arrived at 5:57)  
ABSENT: Bredehoft, Dunn, Bello  
STAFF: McWilliams, Bzdek, Bumgarner, Yatabe, Schiager

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

Ms. McWilliams stated there were 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 FEBRUARY 20, 2019 REGULAR MEETING.

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the February 20, 2019 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

***Mr. Murray moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the minutes of the February 20, 2019 regular meeting as presented. Ms. Gensmer seconded. The motion passed 5-0.***

2. 525 SMITH STREET – CONCEPTUAL DESIGN REVIEW

**DESCRIPTION:** The applicant is seeking a report of acceptability from the Landmark Preservation Commission for a rear, 1-story addition to the George W. Coffin House.

**APPLICANT/OWNER:** Wes Gunter (contractor); Lisa Regan (owner)

Staff Report

Cassandra Bumgarner, Historic Preservation Planner, presented the staff report. She noted this is a conceptual review only and no motions will be made. She provided background information about the property and its designation as a landmark in 1996. Ms. Bumgarner described the proposed addition and displayed some photos of the property. She also reviewed the new information provided since the packet was published and provided answers to Commission questions noting the proposed addition will only tie into the 2002 addition, not to the original house.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Gunter, contractor, stated he wants to preserve the integrity of the house and subdivision by tying in to the addition only. Mr. Regan, owner, explained the reasons the addition is needed and stated his neighbors are not opposed to the project.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Murray asked about damage that might occur to the original house. Mr. Gunter replied the entire addition will be attached to the 2002 addition and will have no impact on the original house.

Mr. Murray asked about the total amount of alterations. Ms. McWilliams replied History Colorado requires no more than 33% of a property to be new renovations if it is to be considered for designation on the National or State Register.

Ms. Dorn asked about the percentage of the existing addition. Mr. Murray replied it is about 33%.

Acting Chair Wallace reminded the Commission of the relevant Code and Standards to consider in conceptual review. She asked whether anyone saw anything that didn't meet the standards.

Ms. Gensmer stated her concerns about rehabilitation standard 9 have been alleviated given the proposed addition will attach only to the 2002 addition.

Mr. Murray asked whether Staff felt the proposal meets the standards. Ms. Bumgarner replied in the affirmative.

***[NOTE: Ms. Simpkins joined the Commission at 5:57 p.m.]***

Acting Chair Wallace agreed that learning the addition would be attached to the 2002 addition alleviated her concerns. She noted the addition is also more obscured from the street.

Ms. Nelson read the Secretary of the Interior Standard 9 for the public and explained why the Commission is discussing the importance of differentiating the old from the new.

Mr. Murray asked about the possibility of using siding that would differentiate the addition and requested the Commission's input about the windows being short and wide versus tall and narrow.

Ms. Nelson asked how the window size was determined. Mr. Gunter replied he was using standard sizes and is attempting to match the 2002 addition.

Ms. Nelson commented on the lack of consistency with window sizing. Mr. Gunter replied the master bedroom windows tie in to the mudroom windows and mentioned he could change the bathroom window to a narrower window.

Ms. Nelson suggested using siding to differentiate the addition. Mr. Gunter asked if stone wainscoting could work. Ms. Nelson replied she is unsure there is a precedent for the use of stone and commented on the simplicity of the historic home. Acting Chair Wallace agreed the stone would feel less reversible and suggested using the siding to differentiate the addition.

Commission members commented on the importance of the addition being complimentary but not matching and stated the 2002 addition is almost too seamless a change.

Ms. Dorn asked if they had worked with the design assistance program. Mr. Gunter replied in the negative.

Ms. McWilliams explained the benefits of the program. Mr. Regan stated he used the program for the structural engineering plans and with Heidi Shuff for the original plans, though she is no longer part of the program.

Mr. Murray appreciated the letter from the engineer explaining why a rear addition is more feasible than a basement addition. He asked where the doors on the addition fall. Mr. Gunter replied the French doors are on the rear elevation.

Mr. Murray commented the French doors do not really fit the style of the original home; however, he noted there are sliding doors on the 2002 addition.

Ms. Nelson noted the proposed Craftsman style doors do not seem to fit. Mr. Regan replied he is open to suggestions. He also asked if a stone foundation or quarry stone façade could be considered as a differentiating feature. Acting Chair Wallace stated her concern is that the new work needs to be differentiated but also compatible with the historic materials and stone work would not maintain congruency.

Ms. Nelson agreed stating options could be considered, but at this point, it seems stone is not the best option.

Mr. Regan stated he likes the existing siding and would prefer a different solution for differentiation.

Ms. McWilliams stated Staff would be happy to share some ideas for differentiating.

Mr. Gunter stated the door could be changed but noted it is the egress to the bedroom. Ms. Nelson stated a great part of the style of the home is its vernacular character and a single door could be more sensitive to that style.

Acting Chair Wallace asked Commission members if they were satisfied that building out was necessary rather than building under. Mr. Murray replied it would be nice if the square footage of the addition were smaller given it is already over guidelines. Mr. Gunter replied he would examine the space for possible efficiencies.

Ms. Gensmer stated the engineer's report helped alleviate some of her concerns and noted digging under would cause damage to the historic stone material.

Acting Chair Wallace requested input as to how this addition would fulfill or hinder the standard relating to massing, size, proportion and scale. Mr. Murray replied the massing is much better than the 2002 addition and it does not overwhelm or take away from the original building.

Ms. Nelson asked if there is any part of a full basement. Mr. Gunter replied it is mostly crawl space other than a small potato cellar.

Acting Chair Wallace noted the addition drastically changes the size and shape of the building.

Ms. Dorn agreed noting the original house was very rectangular and this will make it more L-shaped. Mr. Gunter replied he was attempting to attach another rectangle while maintaining flow throughout the house.

Ms. Dorn stated that while the addition of the mass is subordinate and sensitive to the original building, she is still concerned about the percentage of the addition to the original structure. She stated she would like to get more information from the state regarding the 33% benchmark.

Acting Chair Wallace questioned whether the Commission would recommend landmarking the home with this addition.

Ms. Gensmer agreed that while the original form is rectangular, the Commission has discussed having additions narrow or bow out when coming off non-primary elevations, which this does.

Ms. Simpkins asked about the window placement pattern which is different from this historic structure. Mr. Gunter replied he did that to help differentiate the original from the addition.

Ms. Nelson asked if the Commission agrees standards other than Standard 9 have been met. Mr. Murray replied the square footage and double door at the back are his concerns. Mr. Gunter replied he can make those adjustments.

Acting Chair Wallace stated a size change could potentially eliminate her concern about the L-shape.

Ms. Nelson stated it may be possible to minimize the impact of the massing without changing the quality of the addition space. Mr. Gunter replied he has some ideas for how to do that.

Ms. Dorn noted the left side of the building is two-story while the right side is a single story. She commented on possible options for moving the massing to the two-story side of the home. Mr. Gunter replied that would take away from the rear porch area.

### 3. 247 LINDEN – CONCEPTUAL/FINAL DESIGN REVIEW

**DESCRIPTION:** The applicant is seeking approval from the Landmark Preservation Commission for a revised set of proposed alterations associated with the development of residential lofts and new commercial tenant space at 247-249 Linden Street in the Old Town Historic District.

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

***Mr. Murray recused himself due to a conflict of interest.***

#### Staff Report

Maren Bzdek, Senior Historic Preservation Planner, presented the staff report discussing the history of the property and description of the proposed work. She showed several historic and current images of the property and reviewed new information received since the packet was published. Additionally, Ms. Bzdek provided answers to questions previously asked by the Commission and discussed Staff findings and applicable Code standards. She stated the Plan of Protection should meet the basic required standards and there are remaining details that may better be flushed out at the building permit stage.

#### Applicant Presentation

Casey Adler, RB+B Architects, discussed the proposed project and changes made to the project's design since it was last before the Commission. He provided numerous material samples to Commission members and detailed window and door replacement plans.

#### Public Input

None

#### Commission Questions and Discussion

Ms. Nelson disclosed that she was not present for the meeting last month but has reviewed the minutes and is prepared to participate in the discussion.

Acting Chair Wallace thanked the applicant for considering the Commission's comments and making appropriate changes.

Ms. Dorn questioned whether the rooftop addition should fill the bay below. Mr. Adler replied it will not be visible from the street; this angle makes it look more pronounced.

Ms. Dorn commented she liked the top of the addition moving back at an angle and commented on the panels staying horizontal panels might minimize massing.

Ms. Gensmer appreciated the roofline mimicking the angle of the stairs.

Ms. Nelson stated she did not think the top addition needs to be moved as it won't be visible from the street. Mr. Adler stated it could be moved west if needed.

Ms. Dorn stated filling the bay with the addition provides a more sympathetic and harmonious nod to the existing building.

Ms. Nelson stated she prefers the addition being smaller and secondary and thanked the applicant for being thoughtful in their approach. She asked about the drainage from the rooftop and enclosure over the stairwell. Mr. Adler replied there is gutter on the top back side.

Acting Chair Wallace asked members if the design meets the standards regarding windows and doors. Ms. Gensmer replied in the affirmative.

Acting Chair Wallace stated the design is sensitive to the historic structure.

Ms. Nelson agreed and stated the windows will not be noticeable from the ground level. She asked when the masonry was added. Ms. Bzdek replied staff cannot say whether it was done more than 50 years ago.

Acting Chair Wallace stated she feels comfortable the design meets the standards.

Ms. Gensmer asked Commission members to comment on the previous discussion regarding wood versus metal windows.

Ms. Simpkins discussed other national historic landmarks that have aluminum-clad wood windows and stated the quality and longevity of the product is important.

Ms. Dorn asked if there is a specific period of significance to which the building is to be rehabilitated. Mr. Adler replied that was never clearly identified; however, the intent is to follow what is available in the building next door and in photos.

Ms. Dorn stated the windows should probably be wood. Acting Chair Wallace stated she would agree if the building were being restored; however, it is being rehabilitated rather than restored and the windows are already not historic.

Acting Chair Wallace requested input regarding the rooftop addition.

Ms. Nelson asked about the materials for the addition. Mr. Adler described the pedestal system and stated the front piece would be clad.

Ms. Nelson asked about the roof treatment. Mr. Adler replied it would be metal panels. Ms. Nelson commended the addition design as providing differentiation while still being complimentary.

Ms. Gensmer stated she likes the roof being lower and smaller to help the addition be subordinate to the original building.

Ms. Dorn asked if any historic materials would be damaged or removed in order to install the railing. Mr. Adler replied in the negative stating the railing will be attached to the deck surface and noted it is modular so it could be removed.

Ms. Gensmer appreciated the applicant's efforts at retaining the Joe's Upholstery sign within the building.

Ms. Dorn asked if there is any way to ensure the sign remains with the property in a conservation easement.

Acting Chair Wallace asked how the canopies are to be installed. Mr. Adler replied there are currently no plans to add canopies; however, they would be installed into the mortar.

Ms. Dorn requested input regarding widening the rooftop addition to fit the bay. David Kress, RB+B Architects, replied the structural line is along the stair edge at the entrance to the stairwell on the first floor and that is what the addition will be sitting on. He stated it would be possible to overlap onto the roof joists to increase the size.

Ms. Simpkins stated the current addition placement makes sense architecturally. Ms. Gensmer and Acting Chair Wallace agreed.

Ms. Dorn stated the change would provide a visual tie; however, she understands the structural reasons.

Ms. Nelson stated she is more concerned with how the addition looks and minimizing its massing is more important; therefore, she supported the existing design.

Mr. Kress noted the window openings are not being changed; therefore, it is a reversible item. Commission members agreed to support the windows as planned.

#### Motion to Proceed to Final Review

***Ms. Dorn moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission move to Final Review of the proposed work at 247-249 Linden Street. Ms. Gensmer seconded. The motion passed 5-0.***

#### Commission Questions and Discussion

Ms. Simpkins asked if a motion of support could be made pending review of the plan of protection.

Ms. Gensmer asked if staff would review the plan of protection. Ms. Bzdek replied staff works with the applicant to finalize the plan of protection as part of the final approval process for permitting. Commission members agreed staff should have the purview to do that.

Ms. Dorn asked about the fabrication of the reconstructed pedestrian entry based on the adjacent door. Pete Cottier, Cottier Construction, replied there are numerous companies on the front range that can do that work. Ms. Bzdek stated that would be examined by staff at final approval.

#### Commission Deliberation

***Ms. Dorn moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the request for approval for the plans at 247-249 Linden Street as presented, finding that the proposed work complies with Section 14-48 of the Municipal Code, based on the staff evaluation and summary of findings.***

***Ms. Simpkins seconded. The motion passed 5-0.***

***[Secretary's Note: The Commission took a short break at 8:07 p.m. and reconvened at 8:19 p.m.]***

***Mr. Murray rejoined the Commission.***

#### 4. REVIEW OF NOMINATION OF THE BENNETT PROPERTY, 816 WEST MOUNTAIN AVENUE, FOR LISTING ON THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

**DESCRIPTION:** Comments on the nomination of the Bennett Property, 816 West Mountain Avenue, for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

**OWNER:** Alan Braslau and Nathalie Rachline

#### Staff Report

Karen McWilliams, Historic Preservation Manager, presented the staff report. She reviewed the alterations of the property since 1990 and showed several photos of the property. She stated the property has very good integrity of all seven aspects and noted the home became a Fort Collins landmark in 1993. She explained that the Commission is asked to provide comments on the nomination and noted the National Historic Register is choosing to only focus on the house, not the garage, as part of the nomination.

### Applicant Presentation

Alan Braslau, property owner, addressed the Commission. He mentioned that he sits on the Energy Board and his wife sits on the Transportation Board. He said they are working on establishing a historic district in his neighborhood. He thanked Kylie Cole, Historic Preservation Intern, for her work on the nomination and discussed the importance of stewardship of a landmark property. He discussed the reasons for alterations that had taken place over the years.

Ms. McWilliams also acknowledged the high quality of Ms. Cole's work on the nomination.

### Public Input

Bill Whitley, neighbor, expressed support for the nomination.

### Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Murray thanked Ms. Cole for her work on the nomination.

Ms. Gensmer stated the nomination document was excellent and expressed support for recommending the placement of the property on the national historic register.

Ms. Nelson and Ms. Dorn agreed.

Ms. Simpkins also agreed and thanked the owners for being good stewards of the property.

Acting Chair Wallace thanked the owners for bringing this forward and stated the property would be a wonderful addition to the national register.

### Commission Deliberation

***Ms. Gensmer moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission finds that the Bennett Property clearly meets the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under National Register Criterion C, for the property's significance as a locally rare example of the Edwardian architectural style with very good integrity, and directs staff to prepare a report to this effect for submittal to the Colorado Historic Preservation Review Board for its consideration of this nomination.***

***Mr. Murray seconded. The motion passed 6-0.***

## 5. LETTERS OF SUPPORT FROM THE LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION FOR VARIOUS GRANT PROJECTS

### **DESCRIPTION:**

Staff is preparing two grant applications for submittal to the State Historical Fund and partnering on a third application through the National Park Service. Staff is seeking letters of support for these grants from the Landmark Preservation Commission.

### Staff Report

Karen McWilliams, Historic Preservation Manager, explained that the grant being pursued with the National Parks Service in cooperation with the Poudre Heritage Alliance has been tabled until possibly next year. She stated there are two grants being pursued, one for a survey project along College Avenue between Laporte and Mulberry, and the other for a historic structure assessment project for the Gateway water treatment plant.

Ms. Bzdek detailed the grant application for the Gateway water treatment plant and noted bats have infiltrated part of the building and are the subject of scientific research.

### Public Input

None

### Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Murray requested clarification on the area of College to be surveyed. Ms. McWilliams replied it would be 50 mostly commercial properties between Mulberry and Laporte.

Ms. Dorn noted the national register and local districts do not include buildings on the west side of College Avenue. Ms. McWilliams stated that is correct but noted there are several Fort Collins landmarks.

Ms. Gensmer supported pursuing both projects. Mr. Murray agreed.

Commission Deliberation

**Mr. Murray moved to enable the Chair of the Landmark Preservation Commission to sign letters of support on behalf of the Commission for these two grant projects, Gateway Park, and survey of College Avenue from Laporte to Mulberry.**

**Ms. Gensmer seconded. The motion passed 6-0.**

● **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Murray asked if Staff could provide guidelines about what state standards Fort Collins is expected to uphold at a work session. Ms. Dorn agreed that discussion would be valuable.

● **ADJOURNMENT**

Acting Chair Wallace adjourned the meeting at 8:49 p.m.

---

*Minutes respectfully submitted by Gretchen Schiager.*

---

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on 19 June 2019

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