



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 held
remotely via Zoom.

Regular Meeting November 18, 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: Bello, Bredehoft, Dunn, Knierim, Nelsen, Wallace, Rose
ABSENT: Murray, Michell
STAFF: McWilliams, Bzdek, Bertolini, Yatabe, Schiager

- **THANKSGIVING**

Chair Dunn discussed the Commission's appreciation of the Cameron Peak Fire Fighters' efforts to save historic structures. She discussed some historic structures that were lost in the fire as well as the many that were saved in the Poudre Canyon area. She also noted the YMCA camp in Estes Park and the Bobcat Ridge buildings were saved.

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

There were no changes to the posted agenda.

- **CONSENT AGENDA REVIEW**

No items were pulled from the consent agenda.

- **STAFF REPORTS**

None.

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

None.

- **CONSENT AGENDA**

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 21, 2020

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the October 21, 2020 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

Mr. Bello moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the Consent Agenda of the November 18, 2020 regular meeting as presented.

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

- **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

2. STAFF DESIGN REVIEW DECISIONS ON DESIGNATED PROPERTIES

DESCRIPTION: 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.

Ms. Bzdek provided a brief explanation of the report.

3. ALPINE BANK (1608, 1610, 1618 S COLLEGE) – CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

DESCRIPTION: Proposed redevelopment of 1608, 1610, and 1618 S College for Alpine Bank project, requiring demolition of two non-historic resources and onsite relocation of one historic resource, which would require approval of a modification of standards in section 3.4.7 of the Fort Collins Land Use Code. Development site is in the General Commercial (GC) zone district, and the decision maker for this Type 1 Review will be a hearing officer.

APPLICANT: Zell Cantrell, Galloway

Ms. Bredehoft recused herself from this item due to a conflict of interest.

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report. She reviewed the project location at the southeast corner of College and Prospect, noting it was originally developed as a residential block, and discussed surrounding properties at the intersection. She noted the properties at 1608 and 1618 South College are being proposed for demolition and the craftsman-style home at 1610 South College is being proposed to be moved to the south and adaptively reused as part of the development plan.

Ms. Bzdek stated the applicant is proposing the construction of a 2-story, 7,800 square-foot bank building with an associated drive-up teller and ATM component. Additionally, improvements to the northbound deceleration lane will be required as will the installation of a tree lawn and detached sidewalk.

Regarding the property at 1618, the intensive-level site survey completed by the independent professional surveyor did not show the property rose to the level of individual significance for a Fort Collins Landmark designation and expressed concern about the loss of integrity of the property.

Ms. Bzdek stated the property at 1610 South College did receive a determination of eligibility and is being treated under the review process moving forward as a historic resource on the redevelopment site. She discussed the history of the structure and its features and alterations over time.

Ms. Bzdek stated there are two primary areas for the Commission to consider for its conceptual review comments: the review following the Secretary of the Interior standards of the proposed treatment for historic resources, and the design compatibility analysis under the Land Use Code requirements in Section 3.4.7. She also noted the applicant has applied for a modification of standard to move the building on the site and discussed how modifications are considered.

Applicant Presentation

Zell Cantrell, Galloway, introduced the team members in attendance: Ben Van Hoose, Alpine Bank local branch president; Glen Davis, Alpine Bank Chief Retail Officer; and Todd Goulding, development consultant.

Mr. Cantrell gave the Applicant presentation and detailed the proposed project and associated intersection and sidewalk improvements. He stated relocating the historic resource not only allows for the site to be redeveloped functionally, but also allows for some historical context to be created and for the formation of a proper foundation for the building.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Rose asked when the house was repainted to the existing colors. Ms. Bzdek replied she would investigate that detail. Mr. Rose commented on the more contemporary color choice.

Ms. Nelsen noted the applicant had mentioned complementing the existing colors of the house with the proposed design. Mr. Cantrell replied they are currently working with materials that will both complement the house and work within the Midtown Plan. He asked if the Commission has a preference on materials and colors and whether they are meaningful in this situation. Mr. Rose replied it is significant and commented on the original painting of the structure likely being whitewashed. He stated it would not be inappropriate to revert to the original color scheme.

Chair Dunn questioned whether the gable shingles were likely stained wood. Mr. Rose speculated they were likely painted at some point in order to preserve them.

Ms. Nelsen asked about the proposed use of the building after its relocation. Mr. Cantrell replied they have yet to make a final determination on its use, but stated it could continue to be used commercially or be returned to a residential use, though that may not be feasible given the location.

Ms. Nelsen asked how the grading will be managed for the relocation. Mr. Cantrell replied the grading across the site is similar from north to south; however, the fall from west to east is less than he originally thought. He stated the team is trying to determine whether the garage can be relocated or incorporated into a new foundation.

Chair Dunn commented on the garage door not being original; therefore, a different door could be used, and it does not necessarily need to be operable. Mr. Rose agreed and stated the opening would be the most important part of preserving the garage.

Mr. Knierim agreed that is a creative way to keep the integrity of the look and would meet the standards.

Ms. Nelsen stated that while she likes the idea of showcasing the door, she is not sure it is essential to the overall building and its role in the community. She expressed concern with marked changes to the grading that would change the proportions of the door.

Mr. Cantrell stated a non-operational door would be much more conducive to flood control and stated his team could determine a creative solution. Ms. Nelsen stated that is an acceptable solution as long as the proportions of the opening are maintained.

Mr. Bello stated he does not see the opening as a character-defining feature and stated it could be eliminated altogether. Mr. Rose stated the interior layout may be critical in knowing if the garage was the original function.

Mr. Van Hoose stated he has been inside the structure and he does not recall there being access from the garage structure to the home.

Ms. Bzdek noted the intensive-level site form identifies the garage structure as an original feature with an altered opening, though it is not a typical craftsman feature.

Ms. Nelsen noted the public is going to have much more interaction with the rear of the building given the proposed site plan, which would be another factor in considering the preservation of the opening.

Chair Dunn stated the Commission would definitely want to know how it will be treated if moved.

Chair Dunn asked if the brick foundation skirt is original noting it would be an important feature to preserve if so. She asked about the plans for reusing the sandstone at the Lewan and Vern's buildings. Mr. Cantrell replied there is not an option to incorporate it into the new building, however it could be incorporated into some site features such as the plaza to the south. He noted it could be made available for people to salvage to ensure it is not wasted.

Chair Dunn requested Commission input regarding the applicant's rationale for the modification of standard that would allow moving the building.

Mr. Rose stated there is rationale for moving it for several reasons, particularly as it would encourage rehabilitation by securing the foundation. He stated moving the house further to the south gives it a bit more of a residential setting given the required deceleration lane.

Mr. Knierim agreed with Mr. Rose and noted the building would only be moved a short distance.

Ms. Wallace commented on the points of integrity, noting the short move helps to maintain integrity.

Chair Dunn stated that while it may not be nominal to move a building, it does end up being inconsequential in this case as the setting was already altered and the proposed changes help to retain the setting better than if it were left in the current location.

Mr. Rose commented on the need to research how the back porch is configured relative to the house itself, noting it is not of the craftsman style. He also commented on saving the bricks as part of the building's foundation when relocated.

Mr. Bello asked if salvaging the brick goes contrary to providing an indication of representing a true craftsman construction type. Mr. Rose replied there is no agreed-upon taxonomy of a craftsman style and stated, if the brick is original, it is a unique part of this structure making it all the more important to save. He stated there is no need to recreate a museum quality craftsman.

Chair Dunn commented on the importance of landmarking properties that are uniquely Fort Collins.

Chair Dunn stated the porch could remain as is. Ms. Nelsen encouraged replacement in-kind of any damaged stairs or railings.

Chair Dunn requested Commission input on landscaping.

Mr. Rose supported the placement of as much green space as possible around the relocated home, though stated it does not need to be lavish per the historic photos.

Chair Dunn requested Commission input on the new construction.

Ms. Nelsen asked about the proposed materials. Mr. Cantrell replied they are considering a primarily brick or stone base in concert with the Midtown Plan criteria. Chair Dunn noted the sandstone in the other two buildings could potentially be used and the local sandstone is quite hard. She supported the use of the brick, however.

Ms. Nelsen supported the use of any sturdy material for the base. She commented on the modern interpretation of the craftsman approach for the new building and stated the porch is nice from a massing standpoint. Mr. Cantrell stated Alpine Bank has yet to build the same building twice and they have been excited about the craftsman style.

Mr. Davis commented on the bank's strong historical sensibility and appreciation for craftsman design. He stated Alpine Bank tries to reflect the communities it serves. He commented on the repurposing of buildings for its banks in Snowmass Village and Basalt.

Mr. Rose noted the craftsman style is purely residential in America; however, he appreciated the scale, respect for materials, fenestration, window placement, and residential vocabulary.

Ms. Bzdek explained the next steps in the process for the applicant noting they will be returning before the Commission for a recommendation. Mr. Cantrell stated this will be a Type I review and he is about two weeks from submitting an initial PDP application. He anticipated coming back before the Commission early in 2021.

Chair Dunn stated the proposed design is definitely moving in the right direction and she commended the welcoming, pedestrian-friendly design.

Mr. Van Hoose and Mr. Davis thanked the Commission for their time.

Ms. Bredehoft returned to the meeting.

[Secretary's Note: The Commission took a short break at this time. A roll call was conducted upon return to confirm all were present.]

4. HISTORIC STRUCTURE ASSESSMENT OF FORT COLLINS WATER WORKS-FORT COLLINS WATER TREATMENT PLANT NO. 1

DESCRIPTION: Ashley Russell from RATIO Humphries Poli Architects will provide a short presentation on the highlights from the HSA report.

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek briefly explained the project, noting a grant was received from the State Historical Fund in 2019 to conduct the historic structure assessment of the treatment plant, which was recently completed. Ms. Bzdek noted the Water Works is a complex of buildings that sits in what is now Gateway Natural Area and all buildings were constructed between 1910 and 1955. She noted the property is also home to a seasonal little brown bat population and explained it is not eligible to be a Fort Collins Landmark as it is outside the city's growth management area; however, it is eligible for listing on the National Register.

Ms. Bzdek introduced the consultant, Ashley Russell, to summarize the results of the historic structure assessment, Mark McLean from Operations Services who is responsible for the management plan for the buildings, and Jenny Roberts from Natural Areas who oversees the bat research at the site.

Consultant Report

Ms. Russell discussed the site location and its history. She showed photos and detailed conditions of the buildings. She stated the treatment plant retains excellent integrity overall and has the ability to be repurposed for public use, though that would require a change in occupancy.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Ms. Nelsen commended Ms. Russell's work and presentation. She asked about the hazardous materials that were mentioned. Mr. McLean replied asbestos and lead paint were found in the buildings.

Chair Dunn asked if hazardous materials need to be dealt with if a building is to be moth-balled or if that only needs to occur if a building is set to be reused. Mr. McLean replied some of the work would need to be done if the building is moth-balled as there is some asbestos on window glazing; however, the interior hazardous materials could be addressed if the building were to be repurposed.

Chair Dunn asked about the bat colony. Ms. Roberts replied there are a number of research organizations interested in the bat roost and noted it is the largest known maternity roost for little brown bats, at least in Northern Colorado, though they hibernate elsewhere. The bats are at this location from mid-April through September.

Chair Dunn asked if work would need to occur outside those months. Ms. Roberts replied that would be the best practice. She went on to detail the research being done on the bat population.

Ms. Nelsen asked about the best way to proceed with the roost. Ms. Roberts replied the best option would be to secure the 1910 portion of the building for the bats as attempting to relocate them is risky as this species does not necessarily readily take to alternative structures.

Chair Dunn asked how moth-balling would affect the building's environment for the bats. Ms. Roberts replied anything that affects air flow, temperature, humidity, or the ceiling structure could have negative impacts.

Chair Dunn asked about the future of the building and how priorities would be determined. Mr. McLean replied he would like to think that portion of the building could be reserved for the bats moving forward regardless of the future use of the property. Ms. Bzdek replied Historic Preservation staff has taken the stance of providing assistance from a technical and planning standpoint to consider potential solutions while ensuring no possibilities are ignored. She stated staff would like to see the most critical issues addressed per the assessment and would like the City to be able to leverage support from the State Historical Fund. She stated this assessment work has provided a good foundation for addressing the next phases.

Chair Dunn commented on the need for the historical plan to match with the ecological plan.

Ms. Russell commented on the need to research how moth-balling would impact air flow and temperature.

Staff discussed funding constraints and possible paths forward for the buildings.

- **OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

- **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by TriPoint Data and respectfully submitted by Gretchen Schiager.

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on 12/16/20.



Meg Dunn, Chair