



Meg Dunn, Chair  
Alexandra Wallace, Co-Vice Chair  
Michael Bello  
Mollie Bredehoft  
Kurt Knierim  
Elizabeth Michell  
Kevin Murray  
Anne Nelsen  
Jim Rose

Location:  
This meeting was conducted  
remotely via Zoom

---

## Regular Meeting September 16, 2020 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Dunn called the meeting to order at 5:35 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 teleconference.]*

- **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Bredehoft, Dunn, Knierim, Michell, Murray, Rose  
ABSENT: Bello, Nelsen, Wallace  
STAFF: McWilliams, Bzdek, Bertolini, Yatabe, Schiager, Albertson-Clark

Chair Dunn read a statement regarding the purpose and procedures for meeting remotely.

- **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 AUGUST 19, 2020

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the August 19, 2020 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

***Mr. Knierim moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the Consent Agenda of the September 16, 2020 regular meeting as presented.***

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

● **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

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.

Staff Report

The Commission did not request a staff report for this item.

Commission Questions and Discussion

None

3. 724 AND 726 SOUTH COLLEGE: APPEAL OF DETERMINATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY

**DESCRIPTION:** This item is to consider the appeal of the determinations of eligibility for Fort Collins local landmark designation of two residential properties at 724 and 726 South College Avenue. On July 1, 2020, in fulfillment of a pre-submittal requirement for development review applications, staff determined both properties are landmark eligible based on evidence and conclusions presented by an independent historic survey contractor in intensive-level survey site forms. When undergoing development review, landmark-eligible properties are subject to the historic resource requirements in Fort Collins Land Use Code Section 3.4.7. Staff decisions may be appealed to the Landmark Preservation Commission.

**APPLICANT:** Gannett Properties, LLC (Property Owner)

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report. She provided a summary of the item and pointed out the development area on a map. She reviewed the role of the Commission and the applicable Code section and noted that the decision on this item can be appealed to City Council.

Ms. Bzdek provided a timeline of numerous activities related to the development of this property, including City Council decisions that impacted the relevant Code. She talked about Staff's role in reviewing independent surveys and determinations of eligibility and stated that a finding of eligibility does not mean a property will be designated as a landmark.

Ms. Bzdek talked about the two requirements for landmark eligibility: Significance and Integrity. She pointed out that Context is no longer part of the evaluation. She talked about specifics to the evaluation of local significance under Criterion 3. She also explained that the term "vernacular architecture" refers to the special qualities about the local built environment that speak to the history of the area, and discussed the materials, workmanship and design that speak to vernacular wood frame dwellings.

Ms. Bzdek explained that not all seven aspects of integrity must be present, but those relating to character-defining features that were in place during the period of significance should be intact. She noted that evaluating integrity is based on the current condition of the property but does not require the property to be in good repair, assuming that repairs can be made. She said for buildings which are eligible because of their architecture, the most important aspects of integrity are workmanship, materials, and design.

She talked about the previous assessments of 724 South College in 1998, 2014 and 2019. The 2014 review found the property to be ineligible due to loss of context. Code changes since that time informed the finding of eligibility in 2019.

Ms. Bzdek reviewed the history of 724 South College and the Shantz family that resided in the home from 1902-1963. She pointed out the features of the design and construction that are particularly important to vernacular wood frame dwellings, such as the front porch columns, wood shingle cladding, steeply pitched roof and gabled dormers. She talked about the setting and context, and reviewed changes to the property over time.

Ms. Bzdek talked about the results of the previous assessments of 726 South College. The property was owned by Frank Shantz and used as a rental since 1903. She spoke about the significance of the design and construction, pointing out specific features such as the hip roof, decorative front gable and front porch with balustrade railing. She talked about the setting and context, and reviewed changes to the property over time.

#### Applicant Presentation

Nicole Ament, attorney for the Appellant, stated that they do not believe these properties are eligible under Section 14-22(b). She explained that Heritage Consulting Group had been retained to provide a second opinion on the eligibility of the property.

Mick McDill and Todd Rosenzweig, owners of the property, spoke to the Commission about their history with the property, noting that they would not have bought the properties had they known they were eligible to be landmarked. Mr. McDill stated they were unaware that the previous determination of ineligibility could change and did not know it was being reevaluated. He talked about the hardship a determination of eligibility would have on their business.

Michael LaFlash, Heritage Consulting Group, provided his credentials before reporting on his findings. He utilized Google Maps to show the surrounding area of the property. Mr. LaFlash discussed the eligibility of the properties and pointed out that these properties were not included in the boundary of the Laurel School Historic District. He asserted that the reasons for the 2014 determination of ineligibility were still valid.

Mr. LaFlash talked about the lack of context as well as how zoning plays a significant role in the future of this area. He said these properties are not individually significant under Criterion 3 and should not be considered eligible for landmark designation.

#### Public Input

The Secretary read into the record a statement from Gwen Denton sharing her memories of 726 South College Avenue where her great uncle and aunt lived for 12 years. She expressed her hope that the building would be preserved.

#### Commission Questions

Chair Dunn reminded the Commission that their role was strictly to determine the eligibility of these properties, per Chapter 14, Section 22 of the Municipal Code, and the discussion should center around Significance and Integrity. The Commission is to review all the most current information and make a new, independent determination. She reviewed the order of proceedings for the appeal hearing.

Chair Dunn apologized to the Appellant for the confusing process and noted that the changes to the Code were needed to clarify and improve the process, but unfortunately, these properties straddled those time periods.

Chair Dunn asked whether Mr. LaFlash had done a written survey of these buildings, whether he lives in Fort Collins and if he had looked at the properties in person. He responded in the negative to all. Ms. Ament explained that they tried to find a local consultant, but those that were available had conflicts based on relationships with Staff.

Mr. Murray asked for clarification of the timeline, particularly whether the owners were made aware of the recon survey done in 2019. Ms. Bzdek stated that when the 2014 determination was made, the property owner was notified that it was good for five years. Sherry Albertson-Clark, Historic Preservation Survey Consultant, explained that the owners were not notified of the 2019 recon survey, since an intensive survey would be required.

Mr. McDill stated that they did not receive notice in 2014, or at the time of their submittal in November 2019, that the 2014 determination of ineligibility was nearing expiration. Chair Dunn commented that the process in the past did not include those notifications.

Mr. Knierim asked whether the Commission is only to look at the post-March 2019 code. Mr. Yatabe said the Commission is to make their determination based on the current code.

Ms. Michell asked whether the context information from 2014 was to be disregarded. Ms. McWilliams explained the Code changes that took place in 2019 specifically excluded context since it was already covered under the setting aspect of integrity. Mr. Murray asked whether the context that was considered in 2014 was the same as setting that is currently part of the Code. Ms. McWilliams responded that it is similar, but the context was added for a couple of years to address neighborhood changes.

Ms. Bredehoft asked whether future changes to the neighborhood should be considered. Ms. McWilliams said the Commission should consider current conditions, not what may happen in the future.

Chair Dunn asked for clarification on why Staff stated that design, materials, and workmanship were key aspects of integrity for this property under Criterion 3, while Mr. LaFlash chose setting, feeling and association as key aspects. Ms. Bzdek referenced the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Bulletin 15 and stated that while all seven aspects of integrity are considered, if a building is eligible based on its architecture and it has a loss of integrity in design, materials and workmanship then it cannot convey that significance.

Mr. LaFlash agreed with Ms. Bzdek's statement, but since they don't believe the properties are significant under Criterion 3 individually, they should be looked at as if they were contributing toward a historic district, giving setting, feeling and association a higher weight. Chair Dunn asked why Mr. LaFlash had dismissed Criterion 3. He responded that the properties lacked architectural integrity in terms higher artistic value as required by the National Register.

*[Secretary's note: The Commission took a short break at this time. A roll call was conducted upon reconvening to establish all were present.]*

Chair Dunn asked Ron Sladek, former Landmark Preservation Commission Chair, to speak about the 2014 determinations. He explained that there was very limited information available for that determination, so the decision was largely based on context and setting with context having the higher priority.

Chair Dunn asked how long the forms were valid, and Mr. Sladek thought it was less than 5 years. He suggested the period of construction be considered. Ms. Bzdek noted that the period of significance for 724 South College is defined as 1901 – c. 1964, which was when its use changed from single-family dwelling to student rental property. For 726 South College, the period is defined as 1901.

Ms. McWilliams confirmed that in 2014 the determinations were valid for one year, but that became cumbersome, so it was later changed to five years. Ms. McWilliams said property owners were notified by mail, however Ms. Bzdek added that the letter did not include the expiration date.

Chair Dunn asked Jason Marmor, the consultant who completed the recent surveys, for clarification on the extensive period of significance for 724 South College. Mr. Marmor explained that the significance for 726 was based only on architecture and stated if he were to do the survey again, he would limit the period of significance for 726 South College to the year of construction as well.

*[Secretary's note: The Commission took a 20-minute break while Ms. Bredehoft prepared a motion. A roll call was conducted upon reconvening to establish all were present.]*

#### Commission Discussion for 724 South College Avenue

##### *1. Location*

Ms. Bredehoft said location is the same.

##### *2. Design*

Mr. Murray commented on the home being largely obscured by the tree. Chair Dunn said the actual design elements of the home are intact.

Ms. Michell said the overall design features such as the gables, front porch and original siding are intact, but the setting is compromised. It is not high style but makes a statement as a vernacular home. Ms. Bredehoft said it is a great representation of middle-class homes in Fort Collins. The front entry, column detail, and the dormers that intersect with the roof are interesting and unusual.

Chair Dunn said the window pattern on the front is not common.

Mr. Rose talked about the delineation between the upper and lower story, and the aesthetic of the two different materials.

Mr. Knierim asked if the screened-in porch was added. Ms. Bzdek stated the 1938 permit was to screen in the porch. Chair Dunn said a screened-in porch was a common change during that period.

### *3. Setting*

Ms. Bredehoft disagreed that the setting is lost. It still sits on College Avenue, across from CSU. The two buildings on either side, as well as the commercial building to the north, have a residential feel, and there are numerous homes along College being used as commercial. The setting is slightly diminished, but mostly intact.

Mr. Rose said the filling station is still there, just with a different use. To the west, there have been no changes since the college was started. He noted that historically, South College developed with a mix of residential and commercial. He agreed that the setting is not lost.

Chair Dunn said the setting is probably 50/50 intact, and while mixed, maintains a sense of residential.

### *4. Materials*

Mr. Murray asked if the windows are original. Ms. Bzdek said both properties retain many original windows. Mr. Murray said most of the windows maintain the original style if not the original sashes. He also commented that the cottage style window which was common in sitting rooms is probably original. The upper windows are double hung and appear to be original.

Chair Dunn agreed that many of the windows appear to be intact.

### *5. Workmanship*

Mr. Knierim noted that great care was taken in the design and construction of the home and the selection of materials. Mr. Murray commented that these homes were built for specific people.

Ms. Bredehoft said many of the features discussed for design could also fall under workmanship.

Chair Dunn said the patterning and materials used for each story, and the columns on the porch, are examples of the workmanship of the time. The way the gable is worked into the roofline is stunning. Ms. Bredehoft added that the panels on the front of the porch under the windows are examples of the workmanship.

### *6. Feeling*

Ms. Bredehoft said it feels like a residential home, and the setback adds to that feeling. The wood details, wood columns and overall size of the house and its tall, narrow shape feel like 1901.

### *7. Association*

Ms. Bredehoft said the three houses, the commercial building to the north, and the gas station present a residential neighborhood feel.

Chair Dunn offered an additional thought about setting in that the use of College Avenue has changed. People used to park along College, but the experience is different when travelling by in a vehicle. From the pedestrian level the setting is that of a neighborhood.

### *Significance*

Mr. Murray stated that the architecture is outstanding for its time with the extra shingles on top, detailing of the cottage style windows and Tuscan columns in the front. The screened-in porch was well done.

Mr. Knierim said the home is well-preserved, so the architectural features are easy to see.

Chair Dunn said it is a good example of the architecture of the time and is supported by the integrity. She added it is a downplayed middle-class home but would almost be considered high style for the modest community of Fort Collins.

Mr. Rose commented about the construction type and the fact that the second story is not a full story, which is indicative of the balloon framing common in that period. Mr. Murray agreed that the method of construction has significance.

#### Commission Discussion for 724 South College Avenue Garage

##### *1. Location*

Chair Dunn said the location is the same.

##### *2. Design*

Chair Dunn said the design is close.

##### *3. Setting*

Ms. Bredehoft said it is still in the backyard, next to the alley and associated with the house.

##### *4. Materials*

Chair Dunn asked if the doors were original and wondered what material was under the stucco.

Mr. Rose said the stucco was an irreversible intrusion sufficiently detrimental to call into question whether it is a contributing resource. He speculated that the doors are original.

##### *5. Workmanship*

Chair Dunn said the workmanship of the door and the eaves is visible, but the gable end and side have been hidden. Chair Dunn stated that usually a house and garage have combined significance, but with the loss of workmanship and materials due to the stucco, its significance is questionable.

Mr. Murray commented that the side with doors still has an overhang and looks like it fits with the house and time period. The deterioration, stucco and shortening of the roof on the other side diminish the integrity.

The members speculated about the piece of wood protruding from the roof and wondered if it was related to a change in the operation of the doors from sliding to hinged.

Mr. Knierim expressed reservations about the integrity and significance of the garage on its own. Ms. Bredehoft said it contributes to the residential lot but is not significant on its own.

Ms. Bredehoft made a motion but withdrew it in order to clarify the eligibility of the garage.

Mr. Rose said due to its questionable integrity the garage would be not considered a contributing resource and therefore should not be included in the eligibility for 724 South College.

Chair Dunn said the doors are the only thing that would speak to the period of significance.

*[Secretary's note: There was a lengthy gap in the discussion at this time while the Commission waited for Ms. Bredehoft to prepare her motion. There was no official break at this time, so the audio and video recordings continued to run.]*

#### Commission Deliberation for 724 South College Avenue

***Ms. Bredehoft moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission find the residential building at 724 South College Avenue eligible as a Fort Collins landmark, according to the standards outlined in Section 14-22 of the Fort Collins Municipal Code, finding that 724 South College meets Criteria 3 under Significance as a good example of a vernacular wood frame dwelling in Fort Collins, in that it is a product of the local builder's experience, available resources and a response to the local environment, specifically in the balloon framing construction method that was used and additional wood design details and application of the materials, and finding that 724 South College Avenue meets all seven aspects of integrity, in that location, design, materials and workmanship are all intact, and although College Avenue has been altered with time, the setting of the residential character along the street frontage surrounding 724 South College is intact, and both feeling and association are intact. In addition, the garage building associated historically with the residence is***

***not found to be a historic resource contributing to the significance or integrity of 724 South College Avenue based on the finding that of the seven aspects of integrity only location and association are met, and it does not meet Criteria 3 under Significance.***

***Mr. Knierim seconded.***

Mr. Murray proposed an amendment to specify that the garage does meet two aspects of integrity: location and association. Ms. Bredehoft and Mr. Knierim accepted the amendment.

***The motion passed 5-1, Michell dissenting.***

Ms. Michell explained her dissent, stating that while the house is intact, the residential setting of that block is no longer intact.

#### Commission Discussion for 726 South College Avenue

##### *1. Location*

Chair Dunn stated the building has not moved.

##### *2. Design*

Mr. Murray said the classic hip-roof box is a standard design throughout Old Town Fort Collins. All the features are intact including the original porch.

Chair Dunn stated that the hip-roof box is obvious, and the porch and railing are original.

##### *3. Setting*

Ms. Bredehoft commented that the feel of the Book Ranch has the same feel as the gas station would have, and the setting is intact.

Mr. Rose said the setting for 726 is better than 724 due to its location.

##### *4. Materials*

Mr. Rose said the materials are the most common in wood-framed construction. He said it was a good example of the use of materials that were available at the turn of the century.

Mr. Murray said the siding may have been replaced. Chair Dunn said even if the siding is not original, it does fit with the era.

Mr. Rose pointed out the siding appears to have multiple layers of paint and is not uniform, which may indicate it was not replaced in recent years. Also, the siding under the porch is protected which would explain the apparent difference in condition. He stated that it retains the necessary integrity.

##### *5. Workmanship*

Mr. Murray commented on the likelihood that the front and back porches are original. He stated the gapping in the railings, the floor, the shingles on the dormer and the handrail all appear to be original, which is an indication of quality workmanship. The rooflines are very straight.

Chair Dunn pointed out the leaded glass window on the front porch is still intact. She also noted that the transom window speaks to the time period.

##### *6/7 Feeling & Association*

Ms. Bredehoft said both the feeling and association are similar to the other house.

##### *Significance*

Chair Dunn said it is a more modest house.

Mr. Rose said it is a high-quality vernacular and the architecture is a good example for that period of time. He commented that the porches are an architectural expression of interaction with the community.

*[Secretary's note: The Commission did not take a formal break but paused the discussion for 8 minutes while Ms. Bredehoft prepared a motion. The audio and video continued to record during this time.]*

**Ms. Bredehoft moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission find 726 South College Avenue individually eligible as a Fort Collins landmark, according to the standards outlined in Section 14-22 of the Fort Collins Municipal Code finding that 726 South College meets Criteria 3 under Significance as it is a good example of a modest vernacular wood frame dwelling in Fort Collins, in that it is a product of the local builder's experience, available resources and a response to the local environment at the turn of the century, specifically in the simple design elements including the porch balusters, the diamond pattern under the gable, the lead glass transom and additional wood design details and application, and finding that it meets all seven aspects of integrity, including location, design, materials, workmanship, and although College Avenue has been altered with time, the 726 South College setting is intact specifically considering its relationship to the adult Book Ranch lot to the south which was once a local gas station, and the residential buildings directly to the north, and that feeling and association are also intact.**

**Mr. Rose seconded. The motion passed 5-1, with Ms. Michell dissenting.**

Ms. Michell explained her dissent, stating that the property doesn't retain its residential setting.

Chair Dunn suggested voicing concerns earlier in the discussion rather than after the motion.

Chair Dunn suggested the Appellants speak with staff about options such as adaptive reuse of the property and mentioned Ginger and Baker or the Goff House as examples. She also reminded the Appellants they have the right to appeal to Council.

#### 4. OVERVIEW OF WILLIAM B. "BILL" ROBB HISTORIC CONTEXT PROJECT

**DESCRIPTION:** This item introduces the Landmark Preservation Commission and the community to a historic context project on local architect William B. "Bill" Robb.

##### Staff Report

Sherry Albertson-Clark introduced the item and reminded the Commission about the grant the City received for this project. She explained why Bill Robb was chosen for the project. She mentioned that Bill Robb's granddaughter, Susan Downing, will be working on this project with Ron Sladek.

Mr. Sladek spoke about Bill Robb's impact on the City, mentioning several specific projects.

##### Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn asked how many buildings would be included. Mr. Sladek responded that he would be looking several dozen scattered all over the City.

Ms. Downing told the Commission she is excited about the project.

#### ● **OTHER BUSINESS**

Jim Rose, a new Commission member, introduced himself and described his background in architecture and historic preservation.

Chair Dunn reminded the Commission about the upcoming Boards & Commissions Super Meeting on the City's 2021 budget and the "Reimagine Boards & Commissions" project.

#### ● **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 9:59 p.m.

---

*Minutes respectfully submitted by Gretchen Schiager.*

---

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on 10/21/20.

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