



Meg Dunn, Chair  
Alexandra Wallace, Co-Vice Chair  
Kristin Gensmer, Co-Vice Chair  
Michael Bello  
Mollie Bredehoft  
Kevin Murray  
Anne Nelsen  
Katie Paecklar  
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 October 16, 2019 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

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

- **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Bello, Bredehoft, Dunn, Gensmer, Nelsen, Paecklar, Simpkins  
ABSENT: Murray, Wallace  
STAFF: McWilliams, Bertolini, Yatabe, Schiager

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

Mr. Bertolini stated there were no changes to the posted agenda. Chair Dunn requested that the order of items 3 and 4 be switched.

- **STAFF REPORTS**

Mr. Bertolini reported on the History Colorado outreach meeting to be held on October 23, 2019.

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

None.

● **CONSENT AGENDA**

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 28, 2019.

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the September 18, 2019 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

2. STAFF DESIGN REVIEW DECISIONS ON DESIGNATED PROPERTIES SINCE SEPTEMBER LPC MEETING

Staff is tasked with reviewing projects and, in cases where the project can be approved without submitting to the Landmarks Preservation Commission, with issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness or a SHPO report under Chapter 14, Article IV of the City's Municipal Code. This item is a report of all such review decisions since the last meeting of the Commission.

***Ms. Paecklar moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the Consent Agenda of the October 16, 2019 regular meeting as presented.***

***Ms. Gensmer seconded. The motion passed unanimously.***

● **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

*[Secretary's note: The order of items 3 & 4 was switched per Chair Dunn's request.]*

4. 249-261 S. COLLEGE AVENUE, ARMSTRONG HOTEL – REHABILITATION OF LEADED GLASS TRANSOM WINDOWS

**DESCRIPTION:** The purpose of this item is to consider the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness regarding the rehabilitation of leaded glass transom windows at 249-261 S. College Avenue, the Armstrong Hotel. The transom windows have experienced deterioration since their 2005 restoration. The project would repair the windows and improve the interior storm window units.

**APPLICANT:** CCC Armstrong, LLC

Staff Report

Mr. Bertolini presented the staff report. He stated this item relates to the transom window rehabilitation project at the Armstrong Hotel and provided historical information related to the hotel and windows. Mr. Bertolini stated the primary proposed solution is to install metal J supports inside the window frames with the intent to properly seat the leaded glass transoms in the window frames. Added bars and wiring are also planned for the storm units.

Mr. Bertolini outlined the staff findings of fact.

Applicant Presentation

Mark Wernimont, Colorado Sash & Door, provided additional detail on the project.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn asked if the metal J support will be visible from the outside. Mr. Wernimont stated they will be fully encapsulated in the metal caps that are over the top of the units themselves. He stated the glass will be centered in the panel.

Ms. Bredehoft asked how the glass would be supported. Mr. Wernimont responded.

Ms. Nelsen asked about the faulty installation from 2005. Mr. Wernimont replied the frames did not support the weight of the leaded glass.

### Commission Deliberation

**Mr. Bello moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the request for proposed rehabilitation of the leaded prismatic glass transoms for the Armstrong Hotel at 249-261 S. College Avenue as presented, finding that the proposed work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.**

**Ms. Gensmer seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

### 3. 629 S HOWES – DEVELOPMENT REVIEW - CONCEPTUAL

**DESCRIPTION:** Construct ten new townhouse units and convert existing historic building into an additional housing unit at 629 S Howes in the Community Commercial Downtown Zone District.

**APPLICANT:** Spencer Lindstrom, [au]workshop

**Ms. Nelsen recused herself from this item due to a potential conflict of interest.**

### Staff Report

Ms. McWilliams presented the staff report. She discussed the area of adjacency stating there are multiple historic resources within the 200-foot boundary; however, the historic resource on the site will be given more consideration. She stated this property connects two periods of significance: the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the second half. She discussed the criteria under which the property is eligible for historic designation.

Ms. McWilliams discussed the proposed alterations to the property and stated staff has determined rehabilitation is the most appropriate treatment for the site. She detailed the proposed project to construct ten new townhouse units and convert the existing historic building into an additional housing unit.

Ms. McWilliams noted this is a conceptual review and she outlined the role of the Commission.

### Applicant Presentation

Spencer Lindstrom, [au]workshop, discussed the site and existing structure and detailed the proposed project. He discussed the compatibility of the proposed project with the neighborhood and outlined the project's compliance with the Secretary of the Interior standards. He stated he would like to have additional discussion related to building materials.

Mr. Lindstrom discussed the project's goals of maintaining the 1905 aspects of the existing structure by removing the 1955 addition. He detailed possible options related to removing the addition as sensitively as possible noting there will be a plan of protection in place.

### Public Input

None.

*[Secretary's note: The Commission took a 5-minute break at this point and resumed the meeting at 6:53 pm.]*

### Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Bello asked if a restoration treatment might be appropriate rather than rehabilitation. Ms. McWilliams stated restoration is an option and explained what would be necessary in that approach. She noted removal of the rear porch would have an impact on a restoration. She explained that rehabilitation allows for more adaptive reuse than does restoration.

Mr. Bello commented that there are two different historic periods to be considered and stated it makes sense to eliminate the front commercial addition to make the structure more compatible with the neighborhood.

Chair Dunn stated the Commission must examine what makes the structure historic and determine the significance of the Geller Center to that history.

Ms. Paecklar stated the brick that is under the addition should be restored and an intensive survey documenting the addition should occur if it is removed and the foursquare building is rehabilitated.

Mr. Bello asked if the brick on the garage is the same as the brick on the house. Mr. Lindstrom replied in the negative.

Ms. Gensmer stated this decision hinges on the 1955 addition and the reasons the property is significant. Removing the addition would destroy any eligibility under the criterion related to the significance of the Geller Center. She stated she is unsure if there is enough historical context for the Geller Center to create significance.

Ms. Bredehoft agreed more context is needed.

Ms. Simpkins asked if the Geller Center sees this building as a significant part of its own history. Blake Carlson, property owner, stated he purchased the property from the Geller Center which did not seem to have much of an attachment to the building. He stated the Geller Center inhabited the foursquare as well and there is some element of preserving the Center with just preserving the foursquare.

Mr. Bello asked if the project would be viable from a pro forma standpoint if the Commission determined the 1955 building needs to remain. Mr. Carlson replied that would greatly affect the project as the removal of the addition has been planned with all of the project iterations. He stated the addition does not seem historically valuable to him.

Chair Dunn noted historic preservation relates to saving the history of the community, not just saving the attractive buildings.

Ms. Paeklar stated the intensive survey would be helpful in making that decision. Chair Dunn noted that would be up to the applicant to complete prior to their next appearance before the Commission.

Ms. Gensmer asked if the existing architectural inventory form is sufficient. Ms. McWilliams replied it would be best to complete a new form that details the Geller Center and its history in the community.

Mr. Carlson stated he does not mind the idea of completing an intensive survey but would only do so if he felt the project would be denied without it. Chair Dunn noted he did not need to make a decision on that this evening.

Ms. Paeklar stated the survey would help in the decision-making process and could provide enough detail and documentation about the structure that it would be okay to remove it.

Chair Dunn stated The Geller Center is a significant part of this building's history and she would like to honor that. She discussed other possible ways to acknowledge the existence of the structure should it be removed.

Ms. Simpkins suggested a name for the project could provide a nod to the history of the property.

Chair Dunn summarized the Commission does not have enough information about the importance of the Geller Center and that a survey could help understand that. She requested staff contact the Geller Center staff to determine their feelings about the building and suggested the applicant consider mitigation ideas for providing visitors to the building a historical context of what was there.

Mr. Bello stated he is not convinced this structure is the hallmark of the Geller Center. Chair Dunn replied that is what needs to be explored, noting it would be substantial if some type of movement first started in this addition in the 1960's.

Mr. Lindstrom asked if an intensive survey would be needed by the Commission to make a decision about demolition of the addition. Chair Dunn replied having the information would be helpful as would some mitigation ideas that would work for the project.

Ms. McWilliams noted historic preservation professionals are contracted to complete surveys and that may not be able to occur prior to the Commission's next meeting.

Mr. Yatabe suggested the Commission decide what treatment is needed for the property in order to provide some direction to the applicant.

Mr. Lindstrom confirmed they are not ready to submit a final application.

Mr. Bello asked about the ultimate decision maker for this project. Mr. Yatabe replied the decision maker would either be a hearing officer or the Planning and Zoning Board, either of which would examine the same standards and take into account a recommendation from the LPC.

Mr. Bello asked if the decision maker could ultimately bar the applicant from removing the addition. Mr. Yatabe replied in the affirmative.

Chair Dunn asked if Commission members agree with staff that rehabilitation is the most appropriate treatment in this case. Ms. Simpkins replied it would depend on whether mitigation is going to be required for the addition, or if it is going to be ignored and the rehabilitation is going back to the 1905 structure. Chair Dunn suggested both options be considered.

Ms. Paecklar stated the brick should be restored to the maximum extent feasible if the foursquare is going back to the 1905 date.

Chair Dunn requested input on the windows. Mr. Bello stated there may not have been a door there originally.

Ms. Paecklar asked if a specific pattern exists on the other side of the building. Mr. Lindstrom replied the relationship of all the windows is variable from side to side. Ms. Simpkins commented the windows are pretty stacked and stated there was probably a window on the addition side historically.

Chair Dunn stated the window rather than the door would be most appropriate for 1905. Ms. Gensmer agreed and stated moving the stairs back to the front would activate the pedestrian walkway.

Mr. Lindstrom asked what the Commission would recommend if the 1955 timeframe were utilized and the addition was allowed to be removed.

Ms. Paecklar questioned the compatibility of the scale of the proposed patch materials to the materials on the addition. Mr. Lindstrom replied the original intent of the patch was not to reference the 1955 addition in materiality, but that could be examined.

Ms. Paecklar stated the materials should relate to the addition.

Mr. Bello stated adding some type of patch to the side of the foursquare diminishes its historic character. He suggested outlining the addition on the ground could be more appropriate.

Mr. Lindstrom noted they will not know the condition of the brick until the addition is removed. Ms. Simpkins stated the use of a similar brick would be acceptable.

Chair Dunn asked about the porch roof angle. Ms. Paecklar suggested it was likely hipped. Chair Dunn stated leaving the roof angle shows an addition once existed.

Ms. Simpkins encouraged the connection to the front sidewalk be maintained.

Chair Dunn asked for input about removing the back porch and garage. No members expressed any concerns.

Chair Dunn suggested the possibility of reusing the garage brick somewhere on the property.

Commission members and Mr. Lindstrom discussed the relationship between the new townhomes and the historic structure.

Chair Dunn suggested the Commission consider massing under Section 3.4.7.

Mr. Bello stated the brick should be moved from a massing standpoint and stated the bow window is recessed or inverted on different façades.

Ms. Paecklar stated the bow window does not have the same dimensions as the window on the historic building which could lead to some confusion about the association. She also noted the bow window is on the side of the historic building rather than on the primary façade of the new building.

Mr. Lindstrom replied the windows are different dimensions but have the same proportional relationship.

Chair Dunn stated the inverted window is whimsical and interesting. Ms. Simpkins agreed.

Ms. Gensmer stated the proposed placement of the brick helps with the massing and stated the 3-story height is a good transitional height.

Regarding materials, Mr. Bello stated wrapping the lower level in brick could better associate the historic structure to the new buildings.

Chair Dunn commented on the need to match the materials of the addition as well if it is required to remain. She discussed the difference between a setback and an overhang and noted an overhang is closer to the historic structure; therefore, the material choice becomes even more important.

Commission members discussed specifics of the building materials and requested the applicant provide material samples as they get them.

Commission members discussed façade details.

Chair Dunn asked about the window with the large piece of stone. Mr. Bellow replied it does not reference the other façade and is a little awkward.

Chair Dunn suggested exploring glass brick or some other window look while still offering privacy.

Ms. Bredehoft asked the applicant if they intend to meet this portion of the Code through proportion. Mr. Lindstrom replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Bredehoft pointed out examples of windows not being in proportion and stated the intent of the Code may not be met by that.

Chair Dunn commended the horizontal connection. Ms. Gensmer agreed.

Ms. Bredehoft asked why the overhang does not align with any of the predominant features on the historic building. Mr. Lindstrom replied that is driven primarily by the cost of construction and desire to be efficient with studs. He stated he does not believe the alignment of the two would be noticed by a pedestrian at street level.

Chair Dunn requested input on the flat façade on the house side of the street compared to the hipped roof on the historic building. Ms. Simpkins replied it is a bit stark.

Chair Dunn stated the squareness of the new construction stands out.

Ms. Paeklar stated she likes the differentiation clearly showing the new design incorporated into the property of an historic building.

Ms. Bredehoft asked if the existing trees will remain. Mr. Lindstrom replied those aspects of the City process have yet to be completed. Ms. Bredehoft stated street line trees are important and suggested the applicant look at their preservation as much as possible.

Ms. Bredehoft asked about the detention on the front of the yard and making the connection to the street more prominent. Mr. Lindstrom replied the approach to the house can be redesigned; however, there was a thought that the wetland foreground provided an entry to the house and was not utilitarian.

Chair Dunn stated she likes the porches of each unit facing the house. She stated some design elements were done extraordinarily well.

*[Secretary's note: Ms. Nelsen returned to the meeting at this point.]*

## 5. ADOPTION OF THE LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION'S 2020 WORK PLAN

The purpose of this item is to discuss and adopt the Landmark Preservation Commission's Work Plan for 2020.

### Staff Report

Ms. McWilliams explained the requirement for, and purpose of, the work plan. She pointed out the changes made since the work session.

### Public Input

No members of the public were present.

### Commission Questions and Discussion

None.

### Commission Deliberation

***Mr. Bello moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission adopt the 2020 work plan as presented.***

***Ms. Nelsen seconded. The motion passed unanimously.***

## OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. McWilliams informed the Commission about efforts to install cell tower poles for 4G and 5G service, some of which may be in historic areas. She stated she would like to create a subcommittee of staff and Commission members to consider the issue. Ms. Gensmer and Chair Dunn volunteered.

Mr. Yatabe discussed quorum and public meeting notification requirements.

Chair Dunn stated she would like a committee of three and asked that staff send an email to absent Commission members to determine their interest. Ms. McWilliams noted there would be other City staff on the subcommittee. Chair Dunn said in that case, two members should be sufficient, but suggested keeping Ms. Simpkins in mind.

Chair Dunn suggested examining the materials references for the next round of Code revisions.

Chair Dunn discussed the Past Forward meeting, sharing key takeaways regarding diversity. She noted there will be an opening on the LPC at the end of the year which could be an opportunity for additional diversity. She would like to see different perspectives represented. Mr. Bertolini stated staff is looking to explore other aspects of Fort Collins preservation and civil rights history.

## ● ADJOURNMENT

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 8:53 p.m.

---

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

---

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on 11/20/19.



---

Kristin Gensmer, Co-Vice Chair