



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

Location:
This meeting was held
remotely via Zoom

Regular Meeting December 16, 2020 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Dunn called the meeting to order at 5:33 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, Bredehoff, Dunn, Knierim, Michell, Murray, Nelsen, Wallace, Rose
ABSENT: None
STAFF: McWilliams, Bzdek, Bertolini, Yatabe, Schiager, Overton

- **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 NOVEMBER 18, 2020

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the November 18, 2020 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

Mr. Bello moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the Consent Agenda of the December 16, 2020 regular meeting as presented.

Mr. Knierim seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

● **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 require a staff report, nor were there any questions or discussion.

3. 126 S. WHITCOMB ST: APPEAL OF STAFF DECISION ON DESIGN REVIEW (CONTINUANCE FROM OCTOBER 2020)

DESCRIPTION: This item is a continuance from October's Regular Meeting. The item is to consider the appeal of a staff design review decision for 126 S. Whitcomb Street. The applicant is proposing demolition of the historic 1932 garage and replacement with a new 1.5 story garage on its location. Staff denied the request on August 25, 2020, and the owner filed an appeal on August 26, 2020. Staff decisions may be appealed to the Landmark Preservation Commission.

APPLICANT: Tara Gaffney (Property Owner)

Mr. Murray recused himself from the discussion of this item due to a conflict of interest.

Staff Report

Mr. Bertolini presented the staff report noting the location of the property and discussing the proposed project to demolish the 1932 garage building and construct a new 1.5-story garage in the same location. He reminded the Commission of its role to determine the status of the garage and whether the project meets the Secretary of the Interior standards. He noted staff originally denied this project finding the garage was a contributing resource; therefore, demolition would not meet standards.

Mr. Bertolini discussed the issues that led to the continuation of this item, including which secondary structures in the landmark district contributed to the history and significance of the district, which unfortunately was not made clear in the 2013 landmark district nomination. He stated staff engaged Mary Humstone of Humstone Consulting to provide a report on the topic.

Mr. Bertolini noted other properties in the district have gone through garage demolition projects; however, those structures were not found to be contributing to the landmark district.

Applicant Presentation

Ms. Gaffney gave a brief presentation noting the pandemic is driving the desire for this space, which will ultimately be historical.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions

Chair Dunn asked Mary Humstone, consultant, to comment on her report on this property, particularly related to how outbuildings contribute to the district. Ms. Humstone replied outbuildings contribute to the overall understanding of the properties, and garages specifically represent a large change in American society in the first part of the 21st century. She stated garages are an important piece of a district and should be considered along with primary residences.

Mr. Rose asked Ms. Humstone about the dates of the house and the garage noting the garage was built during the depression era which tells a story of its own. Ms. Humstone agreed and noted there were few entire houses being built during the depression, just garages and additions.

Commission Discussion

Chair Dunn asked the Commission to weigh in on whether the garage is contributing.

Mr. Rose stated that he believes the garage is a contributing structure to the Whitcomb District and the property and any effort to improve its overall architectural quality may be a mistake as it does speak to the time it was built.

Ms. Wallace agreed and stated it is important to show the more vernacular style of the garage.

Mr. Knierim concurred as well.

Ms. Nelsen commented on the other garages that Ms. Humstone's report found to be contributing and stated it is important to stabilize the structure but opposed demolishing it or modifying it in any significant way.

Chair Dunn asked whether the Commission needs to vote on whether the garage is a contributing resource to the District. Mr. Yatabe indicated the Commission should vote on it.

Ms. Michell and Ms. Bredehoft agreed the garage is a contributing structure.

Mr. Rose moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission determines that the garage structure at 126 South Whitcomb Street is determined to be a contributing resource to the Whitcomb Street Landmark District.

Ms. Nelsen seconded. The motion passed 7-1, with Mr. Bello dissenting.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Bredehoft requested additional information regarding the approved removal of another garage on the block. Mr. Bertolini replied the main house was found to be contributing despite the 1994 second story addition, but only insofar as it reflected the overall development patterns of the district; therefore, the demolition and replacement of the garage was deemed to not have a significant effect on the historic district.

Karen McWilliams, Historic Planning Manager, noted the aforementioned property was not designated for architecture and both the main structure and garage had been significantly altered at the time of the district formation.

Chair Dunn suggested reviewing each standard.

Standard 1

Chair Dunn noted the property will retain its residential use.

Ms. Bredehoft commented on the need for a new garage to meet setback standards whereas the existing garage does not, thereby affecting spatial relationships.

Chair Dunn noted the demolition and reconstruction of the garage is not a minimal change.

Mr. Bertolini clarified that staff looked at the whole property, not just the garage.

Ms. Nelsen agreed the property will retain residential use; however, the proposed building would have additional uses.

Standard 2

Chair Dunn commented on losing the distinctive material of the garage.

Standard 3

Ms. Nelsen stated, contrary to staff's analysis, she believes the proposed garage seeks to mimic the house and does create a false sense of history.

Mr. Knierim agreed the new structure would change the story and not exhibit the physical record of its time.

Ms. Wallace agreed the proposed garage looks like a miniature version of the house and it therefore does not meet this standard.

Mr. Rose agreed the proposed garage is more contemporary.

Standard 4

Ms. Nelsen agreed with staff's analysis that the garage is significant in its own right.

Standard 5

Chair Dunn pointed out that demolition would not preserve distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques.

Ms. Nelsen commented on the simplicity in materials and craftsmanship being valuable for the structure.

Standard 6

No comments.

Standard 7 & 8

Not applicable.

Standard 9

Chair Dunn commented on the proposed garage creating a false sense of history as it is not differentiated enough from the style of the house.

Standard 10

Chair Dunn stated destroying the garage would damage its integrity.

Overall Comments:

Ms. Nelsen stated the proposal does not meet the standards; therefore, a Certificate of Appropriateness would not be warranted. She stated there may be other options that could help the applicant meet her needs.

Commission Deliberation

Ms. Wallace moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed project, according to the standards outlined in Section 14, Article IV of the Fort Collins Municipal Code, based on the finding that it does not comply with the Secretary of Interior Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10.

Mr. Knierim seconded. The motion passed 8-0. [**Secretary's note: Mr. Bello abstained which is counted as an affirmative vote, per Mr. Yatabe.].

Ms. Bredehoft suggested the possibility of adding on to the existing garage. Chair Dunn noted no construction could occur on top of the undergrounded ditch but stated there may be a possibility for a second garage or an addition to the rear of the house.

Ms. Nelsen and Chair Dunn mentioned several possibilities that may help the applicant.

Mr. Rose stated there is more potential for using the available land behind the garage without having a visual impact from the front of the property. He suggested not adding onto the rear of the house.

Ms. Gaffney asked if there is an existing Certificate of Appropriateness for the existing plans to stabilize and provide a six-foot addition to the current garage. Mr. Bertolini replied those plans were developed with the design assistance grant for the previous owners and were not ever approved; however, that would be a much quicker approval process. He noted Ms. Gaffney would need a full construction set of drawings for submittal.

Ms. Gaffney thanked the Commission members for their time and consideration.

[Secretary's Note: The Commission took a short break. Mr. Murray rejoined the meeting, and a roll call was taken upon reconvening to ensure all members were present.]

Mr. Yatabe explained to the Commission members that an abstention is treated as an affirmative vote.

Chair Dunn asked about the garage door being part of the record of the hearing. Mr. Yatabe replied it is part of the record; however, staff would be evaluating a new application should the applicant move forward with different plans.

4. 140 N MCKINLEY AVENUE (ROBERT AND ORPHA BUXTON HOUSE AND ATTACHED GARAGE) – REAR ADDITION – CONCEPTUAL LANDMARK DESIGN REVIEW

DESCRIPTION: This item is to provide a conceptual review of a proposed rear addition to the City Landmark at 140 N. McKinley Avenue, the Robert and Orpha Buxton House & Attached Garage. The owner is seeking initial feedback regarding their concept designs and their consistency with the *U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* prior to commissioning construction drawings and seeking final approval from the LPC.

APPLICANT: Casey Churchill and Shannon Altenhofen (Property Owners)

Staff Report

Mr. Bertolini presented the staff report stating this is a conceptual review of a proposed rear addition to the property at 140 North McKinley, which is a City landmark. He noted the Commission is being asked to review what the property owners have provided thus far and provide feedback to assist in the development of detailed plans that will follow preservation standards. He noted this project will come before the Commission seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Bertolini discussed the history of the property and its 1998 landmark nomination and designation. He stated the proposed project is a rear addition to provide additional bedroom space and a finished basement. He noted the massing of the addition is completely behind the historic home and the addition is differentiated. He stated staff's initial analysis of the concept plans is that they are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior standards for rehabilitation noting the plans meet the four main criteria considered with additions to historic buildings: compatible, distinguishable, reversible, and subordinate. He noted that while the addition is fairly large for a house of this type, the design should be complimented.

Mr. Bertolini stated he does not have a firm response from Zoning yet regarding the floor area requirements; however, it appears they should be compliant in looking at the Neighborhood Conservation District requirements as the basement space will not count against the floor area requirements.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Churchill did not have a formal presentation but discussed his ownership history of the property and desire for the addition to make the space livable for his family. He discussed the reasons for the proposed design to ensure the integrity of the front structure is maintained.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn asked if they have explored the possibility of digging out the crawl space. Mr. Churchill replied the expense of that was not feasible.

Mr. Bello stated this is a reasonable approach that provides a minimal impact to the existing home.

Mr. Rose commented on the need for delineation between the existing home and addition suggesting a change in siding width.

Ms. Nelsen asked about the treatment of the exterior corners and how the interior corners would resolve with the new siding meeting the old.

Mr. Murray also commented on the typical profiles of metal corners of this time and stated using the more standard straight corners could be a good way to differentiate the addition.

Ms. Nelsen commented on the size of the addition and stated it is done in a way to minimize negative impacts. She stated a hip roof would help minimize the massing.

Chair Dunn mentioned the state's preference that additions are not more than 33% of the size of the original house. She questioned whether allowing this large of an addition would prevent the owners from accessing state tax credits. Mr. Bertolini replied that while 33% is a general rule of thumb, there is no hard and fast size requirement, and the owners would still have access to tax credits and incentives, though most of the cost of this project would not qualify.

Ms. Wallace stated she was concerned about the size of the addition and questioned whether the Commission would have considered the property to be eligible for historic designation if it came before them after having the addition. She expressed concern the addition may diminish the integrity of the property.

Chair Dunn stated she is conflicted on the proposed size of the addition, though it is well hidden. She also questioned whether the Commission would landmark the property if it came before them with the addition. She commented on the tax credits being an asset that goes with the property and questioned whether this addition would remove that asset.

Mr. Murray noted this addition has limited visual impact from the front of the property. He suggested the possibility of a hybrid situation in placing some of the square footage under the existing house to reduce the square footage on the first floor.

Chair Dunn summarized the members' comments stating there is some concern about the addition size, but it is generally acceptable. She asked about the windows. Mr. Churchill replied the plan is to mimic the windows that are in the rest of the house.

Chair Dunn stated the window openings seem similar to the house. Ms. Nelsen agreed the window openings look similar but are distinguishable. She stated the existing versus new is clear in the fenestration.

Mr. Rose stated the wall penetrations are of the same scale though the new windows appear to be casement rather than double-hung. He supported keeping the overall scale and size of window openings similar to each other.

Chair Dunn requested input as to whether the addition is adequately differentiated and screened from public views by non-vegetation features.

Ms. Bredehoff stated she has no concerns about the visibility of the addition and commended the proposed design.

Mr. Bello stated a hip roof would help with visibility.

Ms. Nelsen stated the design is going in the right direction; however, the addition may be more visible from the front elevation roofline than the analysis makes it seem. She suggested there may be a way to improve the roofline by breaking up the roof forms.

Chair Dunn requested input on egress windows.

Ms. Nelsen stated it might be better not to see them from the front of the house.

Chair Dunn commented on adding space under the house being the best solution for these types of situations.

5. 711 PETERSON, THE W.E. BOYD RESIDENCE (ADDITION) – DESIGN REVIEW

DESCRIPTION: The owner is seeking to construct an addition to this contributing property in the Laurel School National Register Historic District (NCM Zone District).

APPLICANT: Richard Sadowsk, Kim Dickson (owners); Kim Morton (design representative)

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report noting the role of the Commission is to review the draft report, provide additional comments regarding how the project does or does not meet the standards, and what effects the project might have on the property's contributing status to the historic district. She provided information on the property's location and history and outlined the proposed project to add a main floor bedroom and bathroom allowing the owners to age in place. She stated the proposed design would demolish a section of the north wall and construct the new 223-square-foot addition on the north elevation. Additionally, a new gravel walk that would circumnavigate the north side of the addition is also being proposed.

Ms. Bzdek outlined the Commission's questions from the work session, including a request for explanation about the decision-making process that led to siting the addition in this location, a fuller explanation of the design inspiration and its relationship to the original building, what alterations would be needed to accommodate the addition, more detail about the material dimensions, and whether the decorative shingling would remain in place.

Applicant Presentation

Ms. Morton, design representative, introduced herself and the property owners. Mr. Sadowske spoke to the Commission about his history with the property and his goals for the addition noting it would allow for him and his wife to age in place with a first story bedroom and bathroom. He discussed the reasons for locating the addition where it is proposed citing the view to the backyard and potential future garage access from the alley. He discussed the importance of alley access for the property.

Ms. Morton provided further details about the proposed addition design. She noted the two-track drive does not continue the full length of the driveway to the garage.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Murray asked if the applicant has considered making the upstairs bedrooms accessible. Ms. Morton replied the staircase is quite small and steep and retrofitting that for a motorized chair would be difficult. She noted the existing bathroom is quite small and would be difficult for accessibility.

Ms. Nelsen asked about the proposed cantilevered areas and how they relate to the existing house. Ms. Morton replied the goal was to minimize the addition and work within setback constraints. She stated the cantilever allows for a workable bathroom that keeps the large window intact.

Ms. Nelsen asked if there is a precedent for cantilevers in the neighborhood. Ms. Morton replied the intent was to have it be something unique to mark the addition as being new.

Mr. Murray mentioned the four categories of consideration for addition per the Secretary of Interior standards: compatibility, distinguishability, reversibility, and subordination. He stated the addition is subordinate and compatible and can be designed to be distinguishable but questioned whether it is reversible.

Chair Dunn stated the size of the addition is quite small; however, it is highly visible from the front of the home and hides the garage so therefore may not be considered subordinate. She stated the location of the addition is her main concern.

Mr. Murray agreed the addition blocking the garage is a problem with the design.

Ms. Nelsen commented on the proposed cantilever being attention-drawing and not necessarily compatible with the existing house.

Chair Dunn stated the vertical elements on either side of the cantilever portion are what stands out to her.

Ms. Morton noted the garage will still be visible from the north and there will still be a visual connection between the proposed addition and the garage. She stated no one would be opposed to changing the siding material if suggested.

Ms. Nelsen questioned whether continuing the architectural language of the house with the addition is the correct treatment.

Ms. Bredehoft stated she would prefer the addition to have some unique treatment but be at the same level of craftsmanship as the house.

Chair Dunn questioned whether the continuation of the horizontal line confuses the addition with being part of the original house. She suggested carrying it over in a more modern way. Ms. Morton concurred.

Mr. Bello questioned whether this discussion is relevant given the addition may not be appropriate at all. Chair Dunn replied the Commission is responsible for sending a report to the SHPO as this is a National Register property. She stated the addition can still move forward even if the Commission does not feel it meets the Secretary of Interior standards.

Mr. Murray stated the proposed addition would not negatively affect the contributing factor of this property.

Ms. Bzdek clarified the role of the Commission stating it should provide some summary findings regarding the Secretary of Interior standards for any proposed work as well as a general comment regarding the property's contribution to the historic district.

Ms. Morton clarified the addition would not be removing any existing materials.

Chair Dunn stated a more simplified gable end would help differentiate the addition.

Mr. Murray stated a hip roof could be more subordinate to the home's gable.

Chair Dunn stated having an addition with a notably different roofline than the home would detract from the home's roofline feature.

Ms. Nelsen agreed the gable is appropriate for the addition.

Mr. Murray discussed the Secretary of Interior standards and related staff findings.

Ms. Nelsen stated there may not be a better solution to keep the house functioning for its owners in terms of the addition's placement and general massing.

Chair Dunn stated the proposed addition is done as sensitively as it can be in terms of standard 5.

Mr. Knierim discussed the importance of differentiation in terms of standard 9.

Mr. Rose commented on the lot and house being long and narrow and stated the addition being simpler and more clearly delineated could allow it to meet the standards.

Commission members discussed the ways in which the project does not meet the standards.

Chair Dunn stated any addition on the side of the home would not likely meet standards. She noted it will ultimately be up to the state to determine whether the home remains a contributing property to the district.

Mr. Murray suggested adding a comment to the motion indicating the addition would not affect the overall integrity of the property and its contributing to the historic district.

Ms. Nelsen and Ms. Bredehoft questioned whether that determination is appropriate.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Bello moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission find that the proposed plans and specifications for the alterations to the W.E. Boyd Residence at 711 Peterson Street as presented, do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, that our findings shall be conveyed to the owner, and shall be filed for potential transmittal to the Colorado State Historic Preservation Officer regarding the property's historic status.

Ms. Nelsen seconded.

Mr. Murray questioned whether the intent of the motion would make the property non-contributing. Chair Dunn replied that has not been the intent of similar motions in the past.

Mr. Rose noted the applicants have indicated these plans are conceptual and suggested a clearer delineation between the existing home and the addition could allow the home to meet the standards and still contribute to the district.

Ms. Nelsen agreed the project does have the potential to meet the standards; however, it does not as proposed, which is outlined in the motion.

Mr. Bello and Chair Dunn noted the proposed addition would still block the garage.

Chair Dunn stated voting on this letter does not suggest the applicants could not return with a different design; however, it would still allow them to move forward.

The motion passed 8-1, with Mr. Rose dissenting.

Chair Dunn requested staff arrange for someone from the state to come to a future work session to discuss this process in more detail.

6. CITY OF FORT COLLINS HOUSING STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

DESCRIPTION: For the Commission's consideration at this meeting, City staff members will provide a presentation on the Housing Strategic Plan outlining progress to date, public engagement feedback, work with consultant Root Policy Research, and outcomes from Council's Ad Hoc Housing Committee.

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek introduced the item and introduced Meaghan Overton, Senior City Planner.

Ms. Overton discussed the Housing Strategic Plan process that has moved quickly through public outreach, strategy identification and evaluation, and drafting. She noted the Plan is set to be considered by Council in February for first reading. Ms. Overton discussed the vision for the Plan: that everyone has healthy, stable housing they can afford.

Ms. Overton detailed the public outreach process and resulting input around housing challenges. She also discussed the list of strategies that have been identified and the draft criteria for evaluating those strategies. She commented on the goals of Council's Ad Hoc Housing Committee consisting of Councilmembers Gorgol, Cunniff, and Stephens.

Ms. Overton mentioned the six topics the Commission may want to discuss: conducting a displacement or gentrification analysis, considering a demolition tax or fee as a revenue stream for affordable housing, removing barriers to the development of accessory dwelling units, revising occupancy limits and family definitions, Land Use Code changes, and enhancing programs that support home rehabilitation of existing building stock.

Mr. Bello suggested an examination of design standards that increase home construction prices. Ms. Overton replied that was one of the driving factors behind the Land Use Code audit.

Chair Dunn commented on older housing typically being turned into multi-unit dwellings and on the possibility of placing accessory dwelling units in large lots in non-Old Town areas. She also mentioned the connection between housing affordability and transportation which affects gentrification. She noted occupancy limits negatively affect affordability.

Ms. Nelsen commended the staff work on this topic.

Ms. Overton noted the hope is that Council will adopt a Plan with clear priorities and metrics and a community summit is planned for the spring to begin implementation.

Chair Dunn commented on the benefits of a demolition tax.

● **OTHER BUSINESS**

Chair Dunn mentioned the Historic Larimer County Holy Places for the Holiday tour and noted this is Ms. Bredehoff's and Ms. Wallace's last meeting. Commission members thanked them for their service.

- **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 10:06 p.m.

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

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on January 20, 2021.



Meg Dunn, Chair