



Meg Dunn, Chair
Alexandra Wallace, Co-Vice Chair
Michael Bello
Mollie Bredehoff
Kurt Knierim
Elizabeth Michell
Kevin Murray
Anne Nelsen
Vacant Seat

Location:
This meeting was held remotely
using Zoom technology.

Regular Meeting July 15, 2020 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

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

*(**Secretary's Note: Due to the COVID-19 crisis and state and local orders to remain safer at home and not gather, all Commission members, staff, and citizens attended the meeting remotely, via Zoom.)*

- **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Bello, Dunn, Knierim, Michell, Murray, Nelsen, Wallace
ABSENT: Bredehoff
STAFF: McWilliams, Bzdek, Bertolini, Yatabe, Schiager

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

No changes to posted agenda.

- **CONSENT AGENDA REVIEW**

No items were pulled from consent.

- **STAFF REPORTS**

None.

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

None.

● **CONSENT AGENDA**

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JUNE 17, 2020

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the June 17, 2020 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

2. STAFF DESIGN REVIEW DECISIONS ON DESIGNATED PROPERTIES

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 regular meeting of the Commission.

Mr. Bello moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the Consent Agenda of the July 15, 2020 regular meeting as presented.

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

● **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

3. 359 LINDEN (GINGER AND BAKER) – SUNSHADE ADDITION

DESCRIPTION: This is a request for the addition of a sunshade structure to the north elevation of the historic building at 359 Linden Street (Ginger and Baker).

APPLICANT: Chris Aronson (VFLA); Jack and Ginger Graham (Owners)

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report. She provided a brief history of the building and defined the area of adjacency. She mentioned that since this property is not landmarked, the Commission is not the decision maker, but will make a recommendation. She reviewed the 2015 renovations and the proposed alteration.

Ms. Bzdek shared the staff findings related to the Code standards that apply to this review and asked the Commission to consider several key questions.

Applicant Presentation

Ginger Graham addressed the Commission and explained her desire to expand the restaurant's outdoor seating in a way that will provide usable space into the fall given the current restrictions related to the pandemic.

Mr. Aronson discussed the design considerations and shared the plans. He talked about color choices and showed details about the type of sunshade selected for the project. He said that no structural steel would need to be added to the building, only to the concrete. He talked about the openness of the design and the option for roll-down shades. He showed the Commission renderings from different views, both with the shades up and with them down. He discussed the balance between function and sensitivity to the historic character.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions

Mr. Murray asked if black was chosen for the frame to go with the upper railing color and if they had considered white to make it disappear more. Mr. Aronson said there was concern that white might make it appear to be part of the original building. Mr. Murray asked about the transparency of the screen. Mr. Aronson stated the material is available in a variety of opacities. Ms. Graham stated that they wanted the shades to be as transparent as possible, both as a business driver and for aesthetic reasons so that guests may enjoy the street scene.

Ms. Nelsen commented that the shades looked extremely transparent. Mr. Murray said the transparency was import in order to see the windows.

Chair Dunn asked if this was considered before the pandemic. Ms. Graham mentioned that the original designs included a completely closed-in patio, but at that time they decided to leave it open. The pandemic has heightened the desire to go forward with creating more usable spaces.

Ms. Michell asked if the permeability of the screen changes with the opacity. Mr. Aronson explained that sun protection would change with the opacity, but the holes in the screen are so small that wind and rain aren't a concern. Ms. Michell clarified that her concern with permeability was from the perspective of having sufficient ventilation during the pandemic, especially if the louvred shade was closed. Mr. Aronson responded that the required distancing between tables would allow for adequate ventilation.

Commission Discussion

Standard 3

Mr. Murray stated that the structure is sufficiently transparent, but he would still prefer to see a white frame to make it less noticeable against the building. The other members preferred the black frame, as it clearly differentiates what is new, is more compatible with the building and thus meets the standards.

Chair Dunn commented that the frame, screens and louvres are not ornate, which is also compatible with the building.

Standard 10

Members agreed the addition is removable.

Standard 2

Chair Dunn stated that no historic materials would be removed. Ms. Nelsen said the addition maintains visibility and does not detract from the building.

Standard 9

Members expressed no concerns.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Bello moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission recommend to the Decision Maker approval of a Minor Amendment to add a shade structure to 359 Linden, finding it complies with the standards contained in Land Use Code section 3.4.7, specifically the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties.

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

4. 330 EAST MYRTLE STREET, THE J.A. LEIBY RESIDENCE – DEMOLITION AND NEW SINGLE-FAMILY CONSTRUCTION – DESIGN REVIEW

DESCRIPTION: The owner is seeking to demolish the existing contributing building and construct a new single-family dwelling on the property.

APPLICANT: Douglas Bennett (owner), 521 N. Whitcomb St., Fort Collins, CO 80521

Staff Report

Mr. Bertolini presented the staff report. He defined the Commission's role, which is to issue a report on behalf of the Commission and provide additional comment regarding the impacts of the demolition and new construction on the Laurel School Historic District.

Mr. Bertolini provided some historic background on the property. He noted that the garage was constructed between 1925 and 1948 and both the house and garage were listed by the National Register as contributing to the Laurel School Historic District.

He provided contextual photos of neighboring properties and described the existing property and the proposed alterations, including sharing the site plan and materials information.

In response to the Commission questions at the work session, Mr. Bertolini showed an additional rendering provided by the applicant, as well as photos of a similar project from the same builder.

Mr. Bertolini explained it is Staff's finding that the overall project does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, but that the new construction generally meets Standard 9. He also posed some questions for the Commission to consider in their discussion.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Bennett spoke briefly to the Commission about the property and the proposed alterations.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions

Chair Dunn asked whether the garage or house was built first, as sometimes people would live in the garage while building the house. Mr. Bertolini did not find any evidence that was the case with this property.

Members discussed the locations of similar houses in Fort Collins, noting that there are very few.

Chair Dunn asked whether the eaves would line up with the house next to it, and why this house was going to sit lower than the neighboring houses. Mr. Bennett explained the surrounding homes had raised foundations, and this one will be lower to even out the eave lines.

Chair Dunn asked how the width of the neighboring houses compare with this one at 39 feet. Mr. Bennett said this home will be a little wider than others, adding that the driveway will not be in the front of the house. He mentioned another home that was 40 feet, but most of the others are about 30 feet. He noted they have conformed with City Code and setback requirements.

Chair Dunn asked if there are three main materials. Mr. Bennett said he is going to abandon the board and batten, so the home will be all stucco and lap-siding.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Bello said the building looks a lot bigger than the neighbors, but it seems to fit into the neighborhood better than the one on Oak. Mr. Bennett said it will look like the one on Oak.

Chair Dunn asked to see the surrounding homes. Mr. Bertolini displayed the neighborhood in Google Maps. Mr. Murray asked about the distance from the new construction to the neighbor. Mr. Bennett explained there was a 7' distance.

Chair Dunn asked whether the Commission agrees with Staff's finding that the new construction generally complies with the standards. Mr. Knierim said he was more comfortable with it after seeing the rest of the neighborhood. He stated this one blends in with the character of the neighborhood better than the other new construction in the area.

Mr. Murray said he was glad the foundation was lowered so the rooflines would be more aligned. He wondered if it presents any concerns with the floodplain. Mr. Bennett responded that this property is not in the floodplain. He explained they are using a zero-clearance foundation.

Ms. Nelsen asked about the status of reviews with City Staff. Mr. Bennett said there were no issues with Zoning, and that he didn't foresee any issues with Stormwater. Mr. Bertolini concurred.

Chair Dunn said this house meets the setbacks to align with the rest of the block, and the prairie style fits with the styles of the area. She also liked the hipped roof. She expressed concerns about the complexity of the roof form in contrast to the simple roof forms on the block. She thinks two materials will be better than the three that were originally proposed. She also thinks it is more ornate than others on this block and would fit in better on Oak Street.

Ms. Nelsen stated it will be the biggest house on the block, adding that it feels a little out of place. It's not really compatible with the houses on the block but still blends in fairly well. There is also potential for a false sense of history.

Chair Dunn expressed concern about signing the letter to the state without revisions that would more closely reflect the Commission's thoughts.

Mr. Murray said this is a little wider than most of the other homes in the neighborhood, but it generally fits due to the diversity of the neighborhood.

Ms. Michell stated it sticks out as a fancy house in a simple neighborhood. She likes the house, just not in that location.

Ms. Wallace said it could fit in the District but does not fit as well on that particular block. Chair Dunn said if it were on Elizabeth or Remington it might fit in better.

Mr. Knierim said since there is such a mix of houses on the block, he is not concerned with the size or ornateness. However, he is comfortable with adding some verbiage about those issues in the letter.

Mr. Bello said he is comfortable with the house.

Chair Dunn suggested amending the letter to say "somewhat compatible" rather than "generally compatible".

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Knierim moved that the wording of the letter be changed from generally compatible to somewhat compatible.

Ms. Nelsen asked if that was specific enough. Mr. Yatabe suggested the motion could include everything.

Ms. Michell seconded.

Mr. Yatabe suggested more detail and clarity in the motion would be helpful for Staff.

Mr. Knierim rescinded the motion.

Mr. Knierim moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission find that the proposed plans and specifications for the alterations to the J.A. Leiby Residence at 330 E. Myrtle Street as presented, do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, that the new construction does somewhat meet Standard 9 in relation to the Laurel School Historic District, and that our findings shall be provided to the owner and potentially transmitted to the Colorado State Historic Preservation Officer to update the property's historic status.

Mr. Murray seconded.

Mr. Bello asked about the impact of saying these alterations don't meet the standards. Chair Dunn stated that the property owner would no longer be eligible for tax credits or other financial incentives. Mr. Bertolini confirmed that was the case. Chair Dunn clarified that the Commission has less authority in this matter because the property is listed on the National Register but has not been designated as a local Fort Collins landmark.

The motion passed 7-0.

[Secretary's Note: The Commission took a short break at this time. Roll call was conducted at the end of the break to establish all members were present.]

5. OVERVIEW OF COLLEGE DOWNTOWN AND HOWES & MELDRUM HISTORIC PROPERTY SURVEYS

DESCRIPTION: This item is intended to introduce the Landmark Preservation Commission and community to two historic property surveys currently underway in the Downtown area. Both survey projects are being conducted by Ron Sladek, Tatanka Historical Associates, Inc.

Presentation

Ms. McWilliams introduced the item and turned the presentation over to Mr. Sladek.

Mr. Sladek talked about the purpose of the survey and defined the project area, which currently runs from Laporte Avenue to Mulberry Street. There are 41 properties in that area facing College, but the boundary may need to be expanded a little to include 50 properties. He said the buildings are predominantly Commercial. He discussed the survey process and the progress of the project.

He explained how significance is determined with regard to age, integrity and local criteria such as events, persons/groups, design/construction and information potential. Ultimately there will be a finding for each property as to whether it is eligible for designation with the exception of any cases where insufficient information is available.

Mr. Murray asked whether there is any information that can be viewed online. Mr. Sladek stated he would bring some completed site forms to the next meeting.

Chair Dunn asked whether the Commission would have input into the potential additional properties to be surveyed. Ms. McWilliams stated that Staff would bring those to the Commission at the next work session to get their input.

Chair Dunn asked about the timeline. Mr. Sladek said the grant goes through October 2021.

- **OTHER BUSINESS**

None

- **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Gretchen Schiager.

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on

19 August 2020



Meg Dunn, Chair