



Meg Dunn, Chair
Michael Bello
Walter Dunn
Kurt Knierim
Elizabeth Michell
Kevin Murray
Anne Nelsen
Jim Rose
Vacant Seat

Location:
This meeting was held
remotely via Zoom.

Regular Meeting February 17, 2021 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Dunn called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

- **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Meg Dunn, Walter Dunn, Kurt Knierim, Elizabeth Michell, Kevin Murray, Anne Nelsen, Jim Rose

ABSENT: Mike Bello

STAFF: Karen McWilliams, Maren Bzdek, Jim Bertolini, Brad Yatabe, Gretchen Schiager

Chair Dunn read the following legal statement:

“We are holding a remote meeting today in light of the continuing prevalence of COVID-19 and for the sake of the health of the Commission, City Staff, applicants and the general public. Our determination to hold this meeting remotely was made in compliance with City Council Ordinance 79 2020.”

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

Ms. Bzdek stated there were no changes to posted agenda.

- **CONSENT AGENDA REVIEW**

No items were pulled from consent.

- **STAFF REPORTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

None.

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

None.

- **CONSENT AGENDA**

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 20, 2021

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the January 20, 2021 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

Mr. Knierim moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the Consent Agenda of the February 17, 2021 regular meeting as presented.

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

- **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.

Commission Questions

Mr. Murray asked why aluminum clad vinyl clad windows were approved for 633 Remington. Mr. Bertolini explained the property is not a local landmark, therefore design review authority is advisory only.

3. TENNEY COURT NORTH AND WEST OAK STREET ALLEYS CAPITAL PROJECTS REVIEW

DESCRIPTION: The applicant is seeking conceptual review comments from the Landmark Preservation Commission for improvements to two alleys: Tenney Court North and West Oak Street.

APPLICANT: Downtown Development Authority

Mr. Dunn recused himself from this item stating his company did the survey for the project.

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek briefly introduced the item noting the LPC does act as a decision maker when alley improvements impact designated historic resources. She stated staff's assessment is that the proposed improvements will have no direct impact on the only historic landmarked property abutting the work, which is the Armstrong Hotel.

Applicant Presentation

Todd Dangerfield, Downtown Development Authority, gave a brief overview of the project, progress, and timeline. Kara Scohy, Norris Design, shared a video about the history of the alleys and evolution of the design.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn asked about the transformer box on Olive at the Armstrong. Mr. Dangerfield replied it will remain.

Chair Dunn asked how pedestrians will be kept from falling into stairwells near Jay's Bistro. Mr. Dangerfield replied some of that will be corrected when the alley paving is redone as grades will change. He noted the main issue with rear step entries has always been water infiltration and the grade changes will help with positive draining. He stated planters and enhanced lighting will also guide pedestrians away from stairwells.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Murray moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission finds the proposed alley improvements to Tenney Court and West Oak Street Alleys have no effect on the setting of the Armstrong Hotel, an abutting designated Fort Collins landmark, and therefore the work does not constitute alterations requiring review under Chapter 14, Article IV – Design Review of Proposed Alterations to Designated Resources.

Ms. Nelsen seconded. The motion passed 6-0.

Chair Dunn commended the DDA on its efforts to add art and pedestrian-friendly features in these projects and stated the historic downtown is enhanced by those efforts.

Mr. Dunn returned to the meeting.

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

DESCRIPTION: Proposed redevelopment of 1608, 1610, and 1618 S College for construction of a new Alpine Bank building with parking and drive-up teller lanes, 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

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report. She discussed the location of the project and noted the Commission's conceptual review comments were provided in November and the applicant is now requesting a formal recommendation to the Hearing Officer. She briefly reviewed the proposed project and discussed the historic features of the building that will be retained as part of the project.

Ms. Bzdek stated the Commission's recommendation will need to speak to two areas of review: the alterations to the historic building based on the Secretary of the Interior standards, and the design compatibility requirements for the new construction on the site. She also noted the Commission will need to consider whether the movement of the historic building on the site would create a false sense of history. She stated staff recommends approval of the proposed project.

Applicant Presentation

Zell Cantrell, Galloway, reviewed the proposed site plan, pointing out significant features. He discussed the required deceleration and right-hand turn lane, tree lawn, and detached sidewalk. He mentioned efforts to retain the 1610 historic structure at its current location; however, those plans were not successful and moving the structure to the south became the best option. He detailed foundation issues with the 1610 building and noted moving it to a new foundation would help maintain its integrity.

Kristoffer Kenton, Galloway, discussed the architectural design of the proposed new structure noting it pulls from the Craftsman structure of the historic building.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions

Mr. Rose stated the five parking spaces that are directly to the north of the historic structure seem to encroach on the structure. He stated he would rather see the historic structure set into its own lawn type of space for residential context but acknowledged the parking spaces may be a Code requirement. Mr. Kenton replied there is a 5.5 foot walk at the back of the parking spaces as well as a landscape area. He stated the building sits four to five feet away from the paving edge.

Mr. Cantrell stated the parking spaces will be critical to whatever use ends up in the building in the future. Additionally, he noted the primary customer access to the bank building will be from the south.

Mr. Rose noted the asphalt did not exist when this structure was part of a residential row along College. He stated it is imperative there are landscape features that delineate the home without overwhelming it.

Mr. Kenton noted there are 10.5 feet between the back of the curb and the face of the building. He commented on the constraint caused by the access, which is as far north as possible. Mr. Rose replied he is not concerned about the access drive, just about the parking spaces and their encroachment into a lawn barrier. Mr. Kenton commented on the parking being needed for any future tenant of the building.

Ms. Nelsen asked if any thought had been put into demarcating the location of the existing building. Mr. Cantrell replied any demarcation would be in the middle of the drive aisle, which did not seem appropriate. He stated they have considered placing a plaque on the building or on a stand outside the building to indicate the former context.

Chair Dunn stated she would like to see a sign indicating the locations of the houses versus the locations of the existing buildings and how this house was moved. She stated it may be worth having the sign both in the front and back of the building. Mr. Cantrell stated they may be able to find a photo of the homes for a plaque image.

Mr. Knierim suggested the possibility of putting a sign in the bank for maximum exposure given the possible lack of pedestrians in the area.

Chair Dunn suggested placing a sign in the bank and in front of the house.

Chair Dunn asked if there are other historic homes on this block. Ms. Bzdek clarified this is the only historic home on the part of the block that is part of this redevelopment project.

Chair Dunn asked if the stamped blocks on the wall of the building to the south that is going to be demolished will be repurposed. Mr. Cantrell replied the sandstone would be salvaged and available for individuals to pick up; however, there is probably not a good use for it on the site.

Chair Dunn suggested materials could be donated to Habitat for Humanity as well. Mr. Murray noted Mendoza Brothers in Commerce City collects concrete block to resell as well.

Mr. Cantrell stated the client may be reluctant to add the cost of pulling the building apart such that the blocks could be reused but stated they would be willing to have someone come pick them up.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Murray stated moving the historic home was the only way to save it and add some residential context.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Knierim moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission recommend to the Decision Maker approval of the Alpine Bank project at College and Prospect, finding that the proposal to move and rehabilitate the historic building complies with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, that the relocation of the building is sufficiently supported by satisfaction of three of four criteria for modification of standards, and that the design of the new bank building complies with all six of the design compatibility standards contained in Land Use Code Section 3.4.7 (E), Table 1.

Mr. Murray seconded.

Chair Dunn thanked the team for designing the new building to echo the time period without mimicking the historic structure. She commended the simplified roof form and skirting.

The motion passed 7-0.

5. MAGNOLIA DWELLINGS – DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

DESCRIPTION: Proposed redevelopment of 335 E. Magnolia, a single-family residence, to construct a four-unit multifamily building. Development site is in the Laurel School National Register Historic District. The existing zoning is Neighborhood Conservation, Medium Density (NCM), and the decision maker for this Type 2 Review will be the Planning and Zoning Board.

APPLICANT: Owner: 335 Magnolia LLC (Contact: Jordan Obermann); Applicant: Russell + Mills (Shelley LaMastra); alm2s (Ian Shuff)

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report noting this project would be an infill project in the Laurel School National Register Historic District. She stated this item has been continued from January to allow the applicants the opportunity to revise the plans based on comments provided by the Commission. She noted the intensive level survey done on the existing building showed it does not meet the requirements for Fort Collins landmark designation, nor does it contribute to the National Register District, based on lack of significance and integrity.

Ms. Bzdek noted the Commission agreed the proposal was compliant with the first five standards but was split regarding the project's compliance with the sixth standard, which requires the new construction to use select horizontal or vertical reference lines or elements to relate the new construction to historic resources in the area of adjacency.

Chair Dunn encouraged the members to point out the differences between the design in January and the revised design. Ms. Nelsen commented on the changes she observed.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Shuff gave a brief review of the site plan, area of adjacency and focus on the Queen Anne style. He pointed out the simplification of the porch and rooflines and discussed the building massing and site placement. He shared several perspectives of the context.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions

Mr. Murray appreciated the changes made to the rooflines based on the Commission comments last month. He asked about the historic buildings used as a reference in the applicant presentation and Mr. Shuff identified the buildings.

Commission Discussion

None.

Commission Deliberation

Ms. Nelsen move that the Landmark Preservation Commission recommend to the Decision Maker approval of the Magnolia Dwellings project at 335 E Magnolia, finding it complies with the design compatibility standards contained in Land Use Code section 3.4.7.

Mr. Dunn seconded.

Chair Dunn concurred with Mr. Murray on his assessment of the rooflines.

The motion passed 7-0.

6. 421 MATHEWS STREET (TOMLIN-ROBERTS PROPERTY) – NRHP DESIGN REVIEW

DESCRIPTION: Full rehabilitation of property including rear addition, window/door replacement, siding repair, porch repair, and chimney repair.

APPLICANT: Ryan & Bryan McCarty

Mr. Murray recused himself from this item stating he had been involved in design assistance with the applicant.

Staff Report

Mr. Bertolini presented the staff report noting this is a National Register Design Review for 420 Mathews Street, a contributing property in the Laurel School Historic District. He noted the Commission is not in a decision-making role but will review the proposed alterations and report that staff has drafted on behalf of the Commission, provide any additional comments or modifications as necessary, and either approve or modify the findings in the draft report.

Mr. Bertolini discussed the history of the property and flanking properties, both of which are landmarks. He detailed the proposed rehabilitation project which will include a rear addition and window and door replacement, siding repair, porch replacement, and chimney reconstruction. He discussed character-defining features of the property and showed several images of the site.

Mr. Bertolini stated staff finds that the overall project does not meet the standards largely based on the extent of replacement rather than repair of historic materials. He stated staff also finds the property will not likely contribute to the Laurel School Historic District after the rehabilitation is complete.

Applicant Presentation

There was no applicant presentation.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions

Chair Dunn asked about the planned removal of the historic surrounds. Ryan McCarty replied he will be refurbishing and reusing the surrounds as much as possible. Chair Dunn asked if the colonial style would remain. Mr. McCarty replied in the affirmative.

Chair Dunn asked why the chimney look is changing. Mr. McCarty replied a stone cap will be added as that would have been a viable historic option. He noted he will be using the same brick for the reconstruction but stated there is a need for a better water seal.

Chair Dunn asked the Commission for recommendations on keeping the historic look of the chimney while still keeping water out. Ms. Nelsen discussed the chimney and Mr. McCarty commented.

Mr. Bertolini noted the building does not have gutters and stated staff would suggest using a half-round gutter. Mr. McCarty replied that is part of his proposal.

Mr. Bertolini commented on grading negatively affecting water channeling.

Ms. Nelsen stated the chimney does not seem well-flashed. Mr. McCarty replied there is currently no flashing and stated he will be repairing the siding in that area.

Mr. Rose asked about the condition of the bay window and what reconnaissance was done to arrive at the conclusion it is beyond repair. He noted it is a central component of this style of architecture and stated everything possible should be done to attempt to repair it. Mr. McCarty replied he pulled the paint off and the entire bay window has fallen about two inches. He stated he will be reusing some of the window's unique features in the reconstruction.

Mr. Bertolini commented on the change on the front and the glazing pattern. Mr. Rose asked if the casements are original to the structure. Mr. Bertolini replied that is the case from what staff can tell as there are few historic images of the property.

Ms. Michell asked what it would take to retain the shape of the bay window when it is rebuilt. Mr. McCarty replied he would redesign it; he stated his proposal is a personal preference.

Mr. Rose asked about the use of board and batten on the addition and stated it is more emblematic of early 19th-century style. He suggested using a more subtle way to distinguish the addition. Mr. McCarty commented on another refurbished home he observed with board and batten but stated he would consider a change.

Ms. Nelsen agreed with Mr. Rose's comment and agreed a horizontal siding with a different scale could be useful. Mr. Rose stated an alternative could be using a beaded 4-inch lap siding or some other material to achieve the distinction without being quite so abrupt.

Ms. Nelsen encouraged Mr. McCarty to retain the size and shape of the bay window as it is a very unique feature. Mr. McCarty replied he would look into it and noted window sizing is important. Chair Dunn agreed the bay window is one of the most beautiful features of the house.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Nelsen asked if the interior drawings and floor plans are kept as historical records. Mr. Bertolini replied records related to historic properties are considered permanent as part of the state record retention policy.

Mr. Rose commended Mr. McCarty for taking on this project and seeing the potential in the property despite the challenges. He noted preservation is not necessarily an inexpensive endeavor.

Chair Dunn asked Mr. McCarty if he has considered using tax credits. Mr. McCarty replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Rose asked if it is conceivable the proposal could be revamped to include some of the suggested modifications and then potentially be considered to be contributing. Mr. Bertolini replied the Commission is documenting whether the proposed project meets the standards. He suggested not focusing too much on whether the property is contributing as that decision will be made by the National Parks Service. He stated the Commission should evaluate the project as proposed.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Dunn moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission issue the report as drafted by staff, finding that the proposed plans and specifications for the rehabilitation of the Tomlins-Roberts Property at 421 Mathews Street as presented, do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, and that our findings shall be conveyed to the Colorado State Historic Preservation Officer to update the documentation on this property at an appropriate time.

Mr. Knierim seconded.

Mr. Rose encouraged Mr. McCarty to not interpret this motion as a lack of support and welcomed him to return to the Commission. He thanked him for taking on the project.

Chair Dunn suggested there may be a way to stage the project to maximize tax credits.

The motion passed 6-0.

● **OTHER BUSINESS**

Chair Dunn commented on the Mayor requesting a subcommittee on historic preservation. Ms. Bzdek replied she had not seen the recent Council meeting but believed there were some questions around the impact of historic preservation on affordable housing. She stated staff will be sending a memo to Council.

Chair Dunn commented on the Ward School in Loveland, one of three stone one-room schoolhouses in Larimer County, recently being demolished. She also commented on Timberline Farm, which is a locally designated Loveland Historic District that was supposed to have been on this week's Historic Preservation agenda for delisting. She stated that item was postponed as there may be an interested buyer.

● **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 8:38 p.m.

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

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on 3/17/21.



Meg Dunn, Chair