



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

Regular Meeting December 18, 2019 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

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

- **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Bello, Dunn, Gensmer, Murray, Nelsen, Paecklar, Simpkins, Wallace

ABSENT: Bredehoft

STAFF: Bzdek, Bertolini, Jones, Yatabe, Schiager

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

Agenda Item 4 will be heard before Item 3, per the Chair's request.

- **STAFF REPORTS**

None

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

None

- **CONSENT AGENDA**

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 20, 2019 REGULAR MEETING.

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

2. REPORT ON STAFF DESIGN REVIEW DECISIONS FOR DESIGNATED PROPERTIES

This item is a report of all staff design review decisions for designated properties since the last meeting of the Commission.

Ms. Wallace moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the Consent Agenda of the December 18, 2019 regular meeting as presented.

Ms. Paecklar seconded. The motion passed 8-0.

● **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

[Secretary's Note: Agenda item 4 was discussed before item 3]

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. She provided background regarding the Old Town Historic District, noting the public right-of-way is part of the District, and explained the Commission's role. She reviewed the various components of the proposed design and reminded the Commission that the Secretary of Interior Standards and the Old Town District Standards provide the guidelines for the review. She presented staff findings, suggesting areas for further discussion, including looking carefully at the kinetic lighting feature and the resetting of the historic sandstone pavers that were in front of the Linden Hotel.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Lambrecht introduced himself and the other team members present. He briefly discussed the historical use and context for Linden Street.

Mr. Russell provided details about the overall site plan. He noted that patios and street trees have limited the current amount of sidewalk space and explained how the plan addresses that challenge by utilizing parallel parking rather than diagonal parking to essentially double the sidewalk width. He talked about new features such as umbrellas, bike racks, and bollards that would be temporary to make room for events. He discussed some of the amenities and materials such as seat walls, pavers, and lighting and how they relate to the adjacent and surrounding areas.

Mr. Russell shared some of the design considerations including topography, vegetation, drainage, circulation, and structures as well as accessibility, safety, energy and environmental concerns. He talked about selection and placement of street trees that wouldn't block visibility to the businesses and detailed the design of the planned kinetic light feature.

Mr. Meyer explained how drainage issues and snow removal would be managed. He also described the recent archeological language addition to the plan of protection, per the request of the Commission.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Bello asked about the impact of the loss of parking spaces. Mr. Meyer replied changing the parking to parallel has resulted in the loss of 30 parking spaces; however, an offset plan has been developed for additional spaces on Walnut and College.

Mr. Bello asked who initiated this project. Mr. Meyer replied it was part of a capital improvement plan package approved as part of a ballot initiative. Chair Dunn added that City staff and the DDA had been discussing this for some time. Mr. Bello asked how the businesses in the area are responding. Mr. Meyer stated the majority of stakeholders support the plan.

Mr. Murray asked about the location of the kinetic lighting fixture. Mr. Russell discussed creating interest at the convergence of two pedestrian paths and noted the fixture is designed to be more reflective and not to provide direct bright light.

Mr. Murray asked about settling near the Linden Hotel and inquired about meeting ADA requirements and providing proper drainage. Mr. Meyer explained how resetting the sandstone would address this.

Mr. Bello asked whether the Commission was to comment on whether this project was needed. Chair Dunn replied the Commission is only responsible for determining whether the project meets the Secretary of Interior standards. Mr. Yatabe explained the motivation for the project is not part of the Commission's purview.

Ms. Nelsen asked about the designer of the light sculpture. Mr. Russell replied there is 1% art budget; however, the light sculpture will not be part of that. The light sculpture is currently being designed with fabricators.

Chair Dunn requested additional details about the kinetic light feature. Mr. Russell replied the concept is for the feature to be brushed stainless steel and the light will be reflective and diffused. She asked about the likelihood of children crawling between the bars. Mr. Russell explained the code requirements regarding entrapment and stated the bars are far enough apart to meet those requirements. Chair Dunn also asked about the possibility of the feature collecting trash. Mr. Russell replied the blades are thin. The size and transparency of the feature and its base were discussed.

Ms. Nelson asked about the heart behind the design. Mr. Russell discussed the goal of maintaining simplicity and said it wouldn't be confused with historic features, though its columnar design helps it to relate to Victorian design and area façades. The inspiration for the design was discussed.

Ms. Gensmer asked if the kinetic features are near the sandstone pavers. Mr. Russell replied in the negative.

Ms. Gensmer asked about the resetting of the sandstone. Mr. Russell replied the pavers will essentially be leveled in order to address ADA requirements.

Mr. Murray asked if the dancing ladies' sculptures would be retained. Mr. Russell responded in the affirmative.

Chair Dunn asked how close the applicant is to finalizing the design of the kinetic sculptures. Mr. Russell replied this concept has received positive feedback and it is not likely to change significantly other than some technical adjustments.

Mr. Bello asked if one-way traffic was considered. Mr. Meyer replied it was considered; however, one-way streets become complicated with adjacent traffic flow.

Chair Dunn asked if it would be possible to grant a certificate of acceptability with the caveat the Commission could see the kinetic sculptures before they are finalized as she is concerned about obscuring historic buildings. Mr. Yatabe replied the design review does not appear to include the ability to impose conditions of approval.

Commission Discussion

Chair Dunn directed the Commission's attention to the Secretary of Interior standards.

Mr. Murray commented the applicant seems to have a handle on the settling of the sandstone pavers. He suggested ensuring there is a way for moisture to drain out. Mr. Meyer clarified the concrete underlayment has a permeable layer underneath it.

Ms. Gensmer said the resetting of the sandstone pavers seems appropriate and is glad they are making them ADA compliant.

Chair Dunn asked whether it would be important for the placement of the pavers to be the same. Mr. Murray replied that is important and is what is being proposed.

Mr. Murray discussed the use of salt weakening the sandstone material. Mr. Meyer explained the Parks department will be responsible for maintenance in this block. Mr. Murry commended the inclusion of that detail in the plans.

Ms. Gensmer expressed appreciation for the addition of the archeological section of the plan of protection.

Mr. Murray suggested that a website with a 3-D image would be helpful for the Commission to better understand the kinetic light feature. He wondered whether the final design of the feature could come back to the Commission or to staff.

Chair Dunn noted the top portion of the piece is fairly transparent, but she has concerns about the lack of transparency of the lower section. She wondered if the design could be thinned out for the Commission to examine later, while still issuing the certificate of appropriateness at this time.

Ms. Paecklar asked whether they could ask for sculptures to be removed after they are installed. Chair Dunn replied she thought it could be part of the discussion upon further redevelopment. Mr. Meyer said they would be happy to work with the Commission on the design of the piece but would ask that it not hold up approval.

Ms. Nelsen commented that the lower columns would be 13" apart, so it isn't likely to block anything. Mr. Russell noted the angle at which it is viewed might change how transparent it is.

Ms. Gensmer said they wouldn't want anything bigger than a 30" diameter and wouldn't want the structure to be any taller than presented. She stated the upper portion is sufficiently transparent and commented that primary views should be considered when evaluating transparency.

Ms. Simpkins stated there is merit to having something there to draw people to the area.

Ms. Nelsen stated context images would be helpful. Mr. Meyer agreed to provide that when available.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Bello moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Linden Street Development Project within the Old Town Historic District, finding it is in compliance with the standards provided in Chapter 14 of the Fort Collins Municipal Code, based on agreement with the findings of fact presented in the staff report.

Ms. Simpkins seconded. The motion passed 8-0.

3. THE FORT COLLINS EXPRESS/McCORMICK BUILDING AND THE McCORMICK APARTMENTS, 155 WEST MOUNTAIN AVENUE, APPLICATION FOR FORT COLLINS LANDMARK DESIGNATION

DESCRIPTION: This item is to consider the request for a recommendation to City Council for landmark designation of the Fort Collins Express/McCormick Building and the McCormick Apartments.

APPLICANT: Mountain 155, LLC/Hello Investments, LLC (Josh Harrison, contact)

Staff Report

Ms. Jones presented the staff report. She identified the location of the property and provided historic background of the Express newspaper building and McCormick Apartments. She detailed some of the architectural features of the building and previous alterations noting a window study was conducted for both buildings in 2019. She stated the Express building, constructed in 1907 and 1909, is significant under standard one, events, and standard three, design and construction. The McCormick Apartments building, built in 1917 and 1925, is significant under standard three, design and construction. Both structures retain all seven aspects of integrity.

Applicant Presentation

None

Public Input

None

Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn asked if anyone had concerns about the historic additions to the building, noting they all happened in 1936 or earlier; therefore, they are all historic of their own right.

Chair Dunn requested input as to the reconfigured and secondary entrance added to the Mason Street building. Mr. Murray commented that the windows could be put back where they were previously filled in.

Chair Dunn asked for comments on the modern alterations. Ms. Wallace and Ms. Gensmer did not think the alterations impact the historic character of the buildings.

Mr. Murray commented on the brick knee wall around the stairway which was installed after a flood. He stated it is important to keep for that reason but does not take away from the building.

Ms. Nelsen commented on the use of the building in its time.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Murray moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission recommend that City Council adopt an ordinance to designate the Fort Collins Express/McCormick Building and the McCormick Apartments, 155 West Mountain Avenue, as a Fort Collins Landmark, finding that this property is eligible for its significance to Fort Collins under Standards 1 and 3, events and design/construction, and 3, design/construction, respectively, as supported by the analysis provided in the staff report dated December 18, 2019, and that the property clearly conveys this significance through all seven aspects of integrity; and finding also that the designation of this property will promote the policies and purposes of the City as specified in Chapter 14 of the Municipal Code.

Ms. Gensmer seconded. The motion passed 8-0.

[Secretary's Note: The Commission took a short break at this time.]

5. 714 W. MOUNTAIN AVENUE – CARRIAGE HOUSE ALTERATION – CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

DESCRIPTION: The property owner is seeking input on two potential options to add additional indoor parking to their existing historic carriage house. Option 1 is an addition of one garage bay to the west elevation of the existing structure. Option 2 is the enclosure of an existing carport into a garage bay. The project also proposes replacement of the wood shingle roof with asphalt shingles, the replacement in-kind of the wood shingle cladding on the carriage house, and the replacement of the gable-end window on the upper floor.

APPLICANT: Henry P. Thode, III.

Chair Dunn and Ms. Nelsen recused themselves from this item due to conflicts of interest.

Vice Chair Gensmer chaired this item.

Staff Report

Mr. Bertolini presented the staff report noting the property still belongs to the Thode family. He provided background about the historic resources on the property. He noted that the garage doors are historic, but are coming off the tracks, which is part of the reason for the application. He clarified that this is a conceptual review only at this time and explained the Commission's role.

Mr. Bertolini stated the owner is hoping to increase the enclosed garage space to accommodate two vehicles, create a functioning garage door, and provide insulation for the structure, and has provided two options for consideration. The first option would place an addition on the west side of the carriage house, open the rear-facing garage bay that is currently shingled over, rehabilitate the wood windows, and replace the existing south-facing garage doors. He stated staff finds this proposal has problems with standards two, five and six, primarily dealing with the retention of historic materials.

Mr. Bertolini stated the second option proposed by the applicant's consultant involves enclosing the existing carport that was constructed in 1986 into a heated space for a second vehicle and the replacement of the wood windows along the west elevation. Staff finds there are issues with standards relating to retention of historic materials and compatible design for this option.

Applicant Presentation

Jeff Gaines with High Craft Builders gave the Applicant presentation. He discussed the efforts to address the owner's priorities, described the design process, and provided details about the plans and options. He discussed the weathered condition of the siding and noted there are composition shingles currently in place which would be replaced. He stated the carport is attached to the carriage house with a ledger and could be removed. He talked about structural issues with the garage from the bowing of the roof.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions

Mr. Bello suggested that option 2 would be most reversible. He asked if the asphalt shingles had to be replaced with wood. Mr. Bertolini replied replacement in kind is the requirement; therefore, asphalt shingles could be used. Mr. Bello noted the siding is wood shingles and asked if the City allows their replacement in kind. Mr. Bertolini replied they are allowed with certain fire-retardant treatments, mostly for historic buildings.

Ms. Simpkins asked about the date of the carport. Mr. Bertolini asked Mr. Thode to address that. Mr. Thode replied he believes the carport was installed in the mid-1970's but is not completely certain. Mr. Bertolini commented that information in the staff report may be inaccurate based on an error in the original nomination which mentioned a building permit for the carport from 1986.

Mr. Murray commented on the windows which appear to be arched. Mr. Gaines replied that the framing on the inside of the garage, which is visible in the attic, seems to have a square opening.

Ms. Simpkins asked about the sliding doors and proposed access for option 2. Mr. Gaines replied option 2 would retain the sliding garage doors.

Ms. Simpkins asked if the carport would be removed in option 1. Mr. Gaines replied the carport still serves a purpose. Mr. Thode explained his father built the carport to avoid scraping snow off the car windows and protect the car from tree debris.

Ms. Simpkins asked if the proposal is to replace the wood siding in kind. Mr. Gaines replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Murray recommended the applicant consider using the design assistance program. He asked if the door could be moved and reused and suggested they research old photos. He commented that the cedar shingles are expected to be disposable if they are in bad shape.

Mr. Murray asked if the upstairs would be used for anything. Mr. Gaines replied it would be used for storage. Mr. Murray stated it should be weather-tight.

Mr. Murray asked if the carport was present when the property was landmarked. Mr. Bertolini replied in the affirmative but stated the exact year of its construction is unknown. The property was landmarked in 2015. Mr. Thode commented on the trash enclosure his father built noting it is newer than the carport.

Ms. Simpkins stated carriage houses she has studied occasionally do have double doors on one side. Mr. Murray replied the lack of structure on the south wall is not good construction.

Mr. Murray commented on ensuring anything attached can be undone without destroying the original structure. Mr. Gaines stated either option could be removed as either would be structurally independent.

Mr. Bello asked why a free-standing garage that wouldn't impact the existing building couldn't be constructed. Mr. Gaines replied Mr. Thode does not prefer a second structure but would like a heated two-car garage and shop. Additionally, the creation of a new structure would make most of the rear yard covered in buildings and would also obscure windows.

Mr. Murray asked why the 9-pane windows are proposed to be replaced. Mr. Gaines replied they are proposed for replacement in option 2 because of their condition and lack of insulation power. Mr. Murray stated the Commission would prefer the rehabilitation of old windows if possible.

Mr. Murray stated there may be some design issues around fitting most vehicles into the original opening. Mr. Thode replied his second car is a 1967 Corvette and would therefore fit.

Commission Discussion

Vice Chair Gensmer requested input on reopening the north garage entry and installing a new operable door. Mr. Bello replied it would make sense to reinstall a door that was originally present, though he would like to see sensitivity in the type of door. Mr. Murray suggested being creative with the doors. Ms. Paeklar said this is a challenging project given the building's landmarked status, unless this is a rehabilitation project rather than a restoration.

Vice Chair Gensmer agreed a door was originally present and stated the Commission or staff would need to see the replacement as part of a final approval. Ms. Wallace agreed and stated the size of the door should remain the same as the current opening.

Vice Chair Gensmer requested input on wood shingle siding replacement. Mr. Murray replied it would make sense to replace the shingles if they are in bad shape and suggested that be further discussed.

Vice Chair Gensmer requested input on the replacement of the one-by-one window in the south gable end above the carport. Mr. Bertolini clarified there would be two windows replaced, one of which is currently just a screen. Vice Chair Gensmer stated the Commission would want details on those windows for a final review.

Vice Chair Gensmer requested input on option 1. Mr. Bello replied that option does more harm to the building's character than does option 2, which preserves three sides of the building. Ms. Simpkins replied option 1 is stylistically more typical of what would be seen as an addition on a historic building. She asked what cladding material would be used for either option. Mr. Gaines replied both additions would be lap siding.

Ms. Wallace asked to see views from other angles. Mr. Thode stated the large pine tree would almost completely hide the addition from the street. Vice Chair Gensmer said a rendering showing that would be helpful for final review.

Mr. Murray asked about the placement of the tree, which was answered by a photo in the presentation.

Mr. Bertolini stated it would be helpful for the Commission to provide enough feedback for the applicant to decide on the best option that could be approved by the Commission.

Mr. Murray said he would like either option not to structurally affect the original carriage house if it were removed. Ms. Paecklar stated the addition should be reversable and the original carriage house shouldn't be changed or affected.

Vice Chair Gensmer provided specific requests as to what additional information the Commission would want to see for the next review. She referred to standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Murray commented the carport exists now and affects the look of the carriage house. He suggested enclosing it may be the better option.

Ms. Wallace stated the doors are character-defining and they would be lost from the front elevation in option 2.

Vice Chair Gensmer asked if the goal is to replace the doors regardless of the option. Mr. Gaines replied there is no absolute preference and they are looking for guidance as to which option is the preferred route. He stated the general preference would be to have an overhead garage door which would be more functional and heat efficient. Mr. Thode discussed the existing air gap between the two doors.

Mr. Murray stated that while it may be difficult to insulate those doors, it could be done. He stated he would like to see that historic feature remain.

Ms. Paecklar stated option 1 seems to be more subordinate to the existing carriage house. She noted option 2 is almost 2 feet wider and is in front of the existing carriage house.

Vice Chair Gensmer stated she is struggling with the considerations of the removal of historic fabric and the identification of the character-defining features. She stated she is leaning more toward option 2; however, if option 1 is chosen, she would like to keep the door if possible.

Ms. Wallace asked if there were any other examples of additions to carriage houses on landmarks. Mr. Bertolini replied he was not aware of any, but staff could research that.

Ms. Paecklar stated there aren't many designated carriage houses in Fort Collins. Mr. Bertolini stated they are sometimes forgotten on older designations.

Mr. Murray stated option 1 is the best visually; however, the roof already exists in option 2 and putting walls below it seems to make the most sense.

Ms. Wallace stated she prefers option 1 citing the larger footprint of option 2 and option 1's sensitivity to the existing structure. She stated the carport appears like a large awning and not like a footprint addition to the property.

Vice Chair Gensmer asked about the footprint square footage of both options. Mr. Gaines replied option 1 would probably be about half the enclosed square footage. Ms. Simpkins noted option 2 doubles the length.

Mr. Bello agreed option 1 is visually more appealing; however, he expressed concern about putting a door in the side of the carriage house that was not historical.

Vice Chair Gensmer asked if the Commission could take an informal poll. Mr. Yatabe cautioned against it.

Mr. Murray stated the most important aspect should be keeping as much original fabric as possible and trying not to affect the original building as much as possible.

Ms. Wallace requested the applicant look at options for siding that may not be as stark.

Ms. Bzdek stated it may be helpful for the Commission to provide comments on an evaluation of the compatibility of any new construction with the primary residence.

Ms. Paecklar suggested making a list of other carriage houses that have had an addition.

Vice Chair Gensmer asked about the wall cladding on the primary residence. Mr. Thode replied it is now wood cladding, not shingles, and he believes the stonework on the step columns was done about 40 years ago.

Ms. Bzdek asked about the spatial relationship between the primary residence and new construction. Mr. Murray replied that is not an issue as the carport already exists and the proposed addition would be hidden behind a tree.

Ms. Simpkins asked if the applicant is planning to repaint the carriage house. Mr. Gaines replied there is some interest in repainting the new shingles and asked if paint color would be part of this review. Mr. Murray replied there was no paint on the shingles when the site was landmarked and suggested the applicant work with staff.

Ms. Paecklar suggested looking at an entire property site plan showing the primary building would be helpful.

Mr. Gaines asked Mr. Bello for more detail on his concerns. Mr. Bello replied he is concerned about the reversibility of the addition.

Vice Chair Gensmer suggested the garage door seems to be the primary feature; however, leaving windows intact helps with reversibility and maintaining historic fabric.

Chair Dunn returned to the meeting.

● **OTHER BUSINESS**

Chair Dunn thanked Ms. Gensmer for all her contributions to the Commission and for chairing the last item. Ms. Gensmer stated this was her last meeting as she was term-limited and made some parting comments.

● **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 8:47 p.m.

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

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on 15 January 2020



Meg Dunn, Chair