



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

This meeting was conducted
remotely via Zoom

Regular Meeting March 17, 2021 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Dunn called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

- **ROLL CALL**

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

ABSENT: None

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

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**

Mr. Bertolini stated that item #2 had been pulled from the 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 FEBRUARY 17, 2021
3. SINGLE FAMILY DEMOLITION NOTIFICATION – 511 N GRANT
4. SINGLE FAMILY DEMOLITION NOTIFICATION – 420 WEST ST

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

Ms. Nelsen seconded. The motion passed 8-0.

Chair Dunn commented on the environmental and affordable housing cost of losing the two properties at 511 North Grant and 420 West Street.

- **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

5. 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.

The Commission did not request a presentation or have a discussion on this item.

6. 247-249 LINDEN – CONCEPTUAL DESIGN REVIEW (REHABILITATION AND ADDITION)

DESCRIPTION: The applicant is seeking conceptual review comments from the Landmark Preservation Commission for a mixed-use project at 247-249 Linden Street in the Old Town Historic District, to identify any key conflicts with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* and the *Old Town District Design Standards*.

APPLICANT: Randy Shortridge, [au] workshop (architect); Drew Fink (owner)

Ms. Nelsen and Mr. Murray recused themselves due to conflicts.

Staff Report

Ms. Bzdek presented the staff report noting the applicant is seeking the Commission's input regarding the design's compliance with the adopted Old Town design standards and the Secretary of the Interior standards for rehabilitation. She detailed the architecture and history of the building and showed several photos of the building and surrounding properties. She noted there was a previous project presented for conceptual review that was approved by the Commission in 2019; however, that project did not proceed, and this project is entirely new.

Ms. Bzdek mentioned certain aspects of the proposal and noted staff's recommendations are included in the staff report and they have particularly highlighted the rear sunroom addition and hipped roof proposal. She discussed the proposed rehabilitation work as well.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Shortridge introduced the owner of the property, Drew Fink, who addressed the Commission briefly about the project.

Mr. Shortridge gave the Applicant presentation. He explained the design goals for the project, which include rehabilitation of the front and rear façades and adding a rooftop and rear addition. He commented on the importance of providing safe nearby parking in an apartment environment.

Mr. Shortridge provided details on the proposed design, color palette, and materials and showed several photos of the property. He discussed the proposed roll-up door replacement and plan to salvage the Joe's Upholstery sign. He detailed the proposed roof design and noted there are examples of other non-flat roofs in the area.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn explained how the discussion would flow with topics covered to be windows and door openings, the rooftop addition and roof line, and the rear addition.

Openings

Mr. Rose commented asked about the function of the garage door on the Linden Street side that is proposed to be replaced. He noted he did not see a clear photo of the door at 253 Linden looked like in the 1940s. Ms. Bzdek replied there is not a better photographic record of the configuration during that era, and she noted there were previous discussions about the possibility that the door could have been replaced several times during the Joe's Upholstery tenure in the building.

Mr. Rose suggested the applicant consider giving a more authentic interpretation of the opening since the door is planned to be replaced.

Chair Dunn stated there may not be enough historical evidence to ask the applicant to do that.

Chair Dunn asked about the age of the transom. Mr. Shortridge replied the transom would have provided context for a double-opening door.

Chair Dunn suggested leaving the transom as a four-window transom as it is likely older than the doors. Mr. Rose concurred.

Mr. Shortridge commented on the roll-up doors at Illegal Pete's and stated those doors have an overwhelming number of mullions. He suggested the possibility of using a two light door which would recall the earlier swinging doors and afford more transparency.

Ms. Michell stated things do not always need to be symmetrical and stated she likes the 3x5 arrangement. Mr. Dunn concurred.

Chair Dunn asked if the applicant would be willing to keep the three panels. Mr. Shortridge replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Knierim stated he likes the double doors.

Chair Dunn asked when the door had been changed. Ms. Bzdek replied it was after 1983 and it is not historic.

Mr. Shortridge commented on the man door into the commercial space and noted the head height was adjusted to make it compatible with the roll-up doors. Chair Dunn supported that change and stated it meets the Secretary of Interior standards.

Mr. Fink asked about the Commission's position on the vertical composition of the roll-up garage door. Ms. Michell and Mr. Bello supported the idea of all glass. Chair Dunn noted the door is not historic; therefore, nothing about it needs to be emulated specifically as long as the four transom windows remain.

Regarding the second story windows, Mr. Rose supported the proposal.

Regarding the proposed changes on the back side, Chair Dunn asked if the header above the current garage door will be replaced. Mr. Shortridge replied the opening was likely modified at some point and the header was perhaps added to strengthen the wider opening.

Chair Dunn requested the applicants take photos during deconstruction if there is any evidence of the previous status.

Chair Dunn asked if there is no door going into this once the addition is completed. Mr. Shortridge replied the door is six feet closer to the alley and cars will need to extend the majority of their mass into the existing building.

Chair Dunn asked how the brick will be protected from drivers nicking the edge of the building. Mr. Shortridge replied an edge protection could be provided. Chair Dunn noted the attachment to the brick of a protective device would be of importance.

Chair Dunn asked if there are reuse plans for the brick that will be removed. Mr. Shortridge replied in the negative but noted there is a plan to use the existing floor structure inside, particularly the roof sheathing perhaps as interior wall paneling. He stated the brick could be used for any repair and will certainly not be sent to the landfill. Chair Dunn supported reusing any of the materials in the new building.

Chair Dunn asked if there is currently a transom on the man door on the left. Mr. Shortridge replied in the affirmative and stated it is similar to the transoms above the other doors. No members expressed concerns with removing the man door.

Regarding the rear windows, Chair Dunn requested input regarding extending one window into a doorway. No members expressed concern.

Mr. Shortridge noted the windows that are being replaced could be single-pane wood windows as they are only separating two interior spaces.

Rooftop Addition and Roof Line

Chair Dunn commented on the two center windows and corner windows distinguishing themselves from the rest of the building which helps identify the addition as not being original.

Mr. Rose commended the choice of weathering steel noting it provides a distinct material departure from brick.

Chair Dunn asked if there are chimneys in the design. Mr. Shortridge replied in the affirmative noting there will be ceiling-hung fireplaces in each unit.

Chair Dunn asked if there will be planters around the terrace. Mr. Shortridge replied in the affirmative.

Chair Dunn asked if the entire roof is going to be supported by the new structural system. Mr. Shortridge replied in the affirmative.

Regarding the hipped roof, Mr. Bello stated the design works. Chair Dunn agreed and stated it is nominal and inconsequential compared to a flat roof.

Chair Dunn noted the addition is on its own structural support and could therefore be removed without damaging the historic structure.

Rear Addition

Chair Dunn supported the sunroom idea.

Ms. Michell agreed and complimented the planter boxes. She asked if the sunroom terrace is a shared amenity or just for one apartment. Mr. Shortridge replied it is just for one apartment and noted each apartment has its own unique features.

Chair Dunn commended the setback from the edge wall and top.

Chair Dunn asked how the rear addition is going to be attached. Mr. Shortridge replied that has yet to be determined but there should be fairly light attachment points and no brick should need to be removed.

Mr. Shortridge thanked the Commission members for their input.

Mr. Bello asked about the back garage door being five windows high. Chair Dunn noted it is not historic therefore there is no historic precedent that must be followed.

Mr. Fink thanked the Commission members for their input.

Chair Dunn thanked the applicants for seeing the value in historic buildings and she commended the use of retail on the first floor.

Ms. Nelsen and Mr. Murray returned to the meeting.

[Secretary's Note: The Commission took a short break at this time.]

7. 220 EAST LAUREL STREET, LONG APARTMENTS – AFTER-THE-FACT DESIGN REVIEW

DESCRIPTION: This is a request for final design review of work to the Landmark-designated Long Apartments, 220 East Laurel Street, that was undertaken without approval and has already occurred.

APPLICANT: Jordan Obermann, Forge and Bow Dwellings, on behalf of Kent Obermann, Rarem LLC.

Staff Report

Ms. McWilliams presented the staff report. She reviewed the history of designation, ownership and previously approved work. She noted staff recently noticed the revisions to the applicant plans showed work that had not been reviewed, and when contacted the applicants, discovered the work had already occurred. She stated the applicant has requested final design review and the Commission's role is to apply the Secretary of the Interior rehabilitation standards to the work to determine compliance and any work that is found to not comply will need to be reversed.

Ms. McWilliams commented on the building's form and key features and outlined the alterations. She summarized the staff findings and specified which parts of the work staff has found do not comply with the standards. She stated staff is recommending denial of a certificate of appropriateness for the work that does not meet standards.

Applicant Presentation

Jordan Obermann introduced his father, the owner, Kent Obermann, who briefly addressed the Commission about his history owning the property. He stated he was unaware the building was historic until 2019. Jordan Obermann stated many of these changes were done prior to his father taking ownership of the building and discussed the reasons for the changes stating things have to be updated to maintain the building. He noted he received his permit without question and assumed Historic Preservation had reviewed and approved the permit and changes. He stated there was no ill intent on his part.

Ms. McWilliams discussed the previous meeting during which this project was reviewed and noted the applicant was told multiple times at that meeting that all work would need to be reviewed by the Commission. Regarding the rear door that was filled in, she stated Historic Preservation cleared the permit because staff was told there would be no exterior work by the applicant. She noted the requirement for any reversals will be dealt with through staff.

Jordan Obermann replied he was not planning on doing any exterior work initially; however, those items were discussed at the Historic Preservation meeting. He disagreed with Ms. McWilliams' timeline.

Public Input

None.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Chair Dunn stated she would like this meeting to focus only on the issues with which the Committee can deal. She acknowledged this building was purchased by the Obermann's prior to staff taking more effective steps to ensure owners are aware of the historic status of buildings.

Chair Dunn asked if any Commission members disagree with staff's finding that the alterations to paint color, driveway elevation, rear entry step, and hardware on the entry door are not significant character-defining features. No Commission members disagreed.

Mr. Rose commented that changing the trim color from white to black made a significant difference; however, he agreed it is a reversible change. Chair Dunn agreed.

Chair Dunn requested input on the three lower-level wood windows that were replaced.

Mr. Bello stated there is justification to replace them if they were in poor condition.

Mr. Murray stated it is somewhat of a moot point; however, he would like to ensure there is some investigation into whether windows could be repaired for any future replacements.

Chair Dunn stated the windows have already been changed and it not likely possible to restore them. She stated the replacement is acceptable if the windows were truly irreparable.

Remaining work

Regarding the gutters, Ms. Nelsen commented on the changing downspout configuration and end profile. Ms. McWilliams reiterated the Commission's role is to comment on whether replacing the gutters would meet the standards and it would be staff's role to determine when the work occurred and the details relating to replacement.

Chair Dunn asked if the Commission would have approved the change. Ms. Nelsen replied water is one of the biggest enemies to the building and the gutter replacement appears to be more or less in-kind and does not have a detrimental effect on the building. Chair Dunn agreed the type of gutter does not seem like a character-defining feature.

Ms. Nelsen commented on whether some type of water diversion feature was present at the time the building was constructed. Mr. Murray stated there was likely some type of water diversion that was integral with the original design.

Chair Dunn stated it seems the Commission would have agreed to a replacement in-kind if this work had not yet been completed. Ms. Nelsen stated her only comment would be related to the termination of the new downspout. Jordan Obermann replied the property manager took care of the gutter replacement and there was an issue with water coming back into garages; therefore, he believed the solution was to terminate the gutter into the grass yard.

Ms. Nelsen stated she would have recommended a civil engineer or structural engineer review of water diversion if this work had not already been completed. She asked if there are resources available for the property owner for a drainage management plan to help preserve the structure. Ms. McWilliams replied the City has different programs that could be utilized and the owners were made aware of those during the 2019 review. She noted staff will work with contractors and engineers to ensure the property remedy for any of the work not approved by the Commission. She stated staff will work with the owners to ensure proper drainage. Jordan Obermann stated part of the 2019 landscape plan did address grading and drainage; however, the landscaping was not all approved and they are somewhat uncertain about how to move forward at this point.

Chair Dunn stated she believes the Commission wanted the landscaping to be simple. Ms. McWilliams stated the resources of the design assistance program were offered to the owners to allow them to hire a specialist in historic landscaping; however, they have not utilized that service. She provided additional details on the program and noted funds have currently been reduced due to the pandemic.

Chair Dunn noted what was discussed in the 2019 meeting regarding the landscaping and design assistance program. She commented on the discussion around the pavers which the Commission did not believe fit with the character of the building.

Jordan Obermann requested additional detail on whether the Commission wants to see a landscape that matches the historic nature of the building or one that reflects a different era. Ms. McWilliams replied that when staff reviews a project with that type of issue, typically the existing landscape has relevancy in its own right; therefore, it is better to leave the existing landscape than to create something that is false for this property.

Chair Dunn recommended the applicants utilize the design assistance program for the landscaping.

Mr. Murry asked if the two storm doors were stored so they could be replaced. Jordan Obermann replied the storm door from the 1951 addition may have been removed when the building was painted prior to his ownership. He stated it may be in storage. Regarding the other storm door, he stated he had no recollection of it being there. Kent Obermann stated he did not recall a storm door being on the north door and he does not believe it is in storage.

Mr. Murray asked about the infilled courtyard door and stated it should be replaced. He commented on the 2019 minutes indicating the applicants stated it would remain. He stated the basement egress is quite close to where the door was and is close to the traffic pattern. Chair Dunn stated the Commission has previously suggested leaving a presence of a door, but it does not have to be operable. Jordan Obermann replied that could have been done; however, there was a concern about security. He stated he did not recall if this door infill was part of the LPC 2019 review.

Chair Dunn stated a door replacement was discussed, but not an infill. She noted a solid wall could still be placed behind the door as long as the sense of an opening remained to retain the historic sense of the building while still allowing for a change of use. Jordan Obermann reiterated his belief that this was not discussed in 2019 and noted it was on the 2020 permit and he was under the assumption the infill was therefore acceptable.

Ms. McWilliams stated she can get that type of door and asked if the Commission would like it to be restored. Jordan Obermann noted that type of door is too short and would not likely be allowed from a permit. Ms. McWilliams stated the door would be inoperable; therefore, building code should not be an issue.

Ms. McWilliams noted the Commission will need to decide if the door infill meets the Secretary of Interior standards and if not, it will be up to staff to determine the solution.

Ms. Nelsen stated she would not have voted to infill the door. Mr. Murray agreed but stated it would be up to staff to determine whether the door should remain operable, and the Commission must only determine if the work that was done meets the standards. Mr. Yatabe confirmed that interpretation is correct.

Chair Dunn asked if the Commission would have approved the tile in the front entryway. Ms. Nelsen replied in the negative.

Mr. Rose asked if it is known what the tile replaced. Chair Dunn replied there is a photo in the packet that shows it was in poor repair; however, it was not replaced in-kind per the Secretary of the Interior standards.

Mr. Rose commented on the damage already having been done with the door infill and paver removal and stated neither of those conform to the standards.

Mr. Murray commented on the hardware boxes and noted there is one that is required to be by the front door per the fire department. Jordan Obermann noted that was installed when the fire department installed smoke detectors prior to their ownership.

Regarding the tile, Jordan Obermann stated another material would have been used if he had known the building was historic. Chair Dunn replied this project has been a lesson for staff regarding informing property managers of historic status and opportunities.

Regarding the mechanical equipment and conduit, Jordan Obermann commented on the contractor pulling their own permit. He noted a substantial amount of the equipment is on the roof.

Ms. Michell asked why two of the units had to be placed on the wall thereby disrupting masonry. Jordan Obermann replied he was unsure, but it may have had to do with the commercial nature of the units.

Chair Dunn stated the Commission would have likely asked for the units to be placed on the floor.

Ms. McWilliams reiterated the Commission is only to decide whether the work meets standards and it will be up to staff to determine whether it will cause more damage to the building to remove and replace conduit or if it should be left as is. Ms. Nelsen stated this change would not meet standard 9.

Ms. Nelsen asked if there is a Code reason the condensers would need to be mounted above the ground. Mr. Anderson, Chief Building Official, replied there must be at least 3.5 inches of ground clearance, but there is no requirement for a wall mounting; however, more distance may be required per manufacturer instructions.

Ms. Nelsen asked if there was some City Utility requirement to move from a single electric meter to individual meters for each unit. Mr. Anderson replied the permit for the new electric meters was issued in 2010 and was part of the Fort Collins Light and Power Project. He assumed the conduit was run outside due to cost.

Jordan Obermann asked if the Code requires electric meters to be a certain distance from doors and access points. Mr. Anderson replied they need to be a certain distance from vents or any source of combustion.

Chair Dunn asked the Commission for input on what it would approve in this instance. Ms. Michell replied she would expect the Commission to discuss minimizing the damage to masonry and visual impacts.

Chair Dunn noted part of the Secretary of the Interior standards is that buildings should still be usable without damage to materials being caused. She noted these changes are on the rear of the building, which is recommended by the standards. She stated she was unsure what should have been done that would have met the standards. Ms. McWilliams replied the Commission should examine whether it would approve these changes if they were to come before the Commission right now.

Chair Dunn stated she would have a difficult time voting as she does not know if there are alternative ways to accomplish this. Ms. McWilliams noted Mr. Anderson told her the conduit could be interior to the building; however, the meters and disconnect need to be on the exterior.

Ms. Nelsen stated it is clear that there is not enough information for this part of the project to issue a certificate of appropriateness.

Chair Dunn suggested discussing the removal of the sconce light on the addition.

Mr. Murray stated the sconce appears to have been the same in 2019. Ms. McWilliams replied staff would need to do some more research; however, her speculation based on the date of the addition is that the sconces were similar to the front building sconces. Jordan Obermann commented on his belief the sconce is original but the globe was likely broken.

Ms. Nelsen thanked the Obermann's for their patience and stated she does not see a lot of good evidence for what was there originally in terms of the sconce. Chair Dunn noted it appears to have been there in 1997 and the issue would only come before the Commission if there was going to be a change.

Chair Dunn asked about the removal and replacement of wood screens with aluminum on the front of the building. Ms. McWilliams stated the original screens in the photos appear to be wood due to their thickness. Mr. Murray stated the photos are not detailed enough to decipher the material and he commented on what materials have been used over time.

Commission members discussed which items they believe meet the Secretary of the Interior standards.

[Secretary's Note: The Commission took a short break at this time to allow Mr. Bello to craft a motion. A roll call was conducted upon reconvening to confirm all members were present.]

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Bello moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint color, driveway elevation, rear entry step, hardware removed from the apartment building's front entry, gutter on the garage structure, and removal of three lower-level historic windows and replacement with fiberglass windows to the Long Apartments, 220 East Laurel Street, finding that these items meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties as required under Article IV, Chapter 14 of the Fort Collins Municipal Code. This decision is based upon the materials and information provided to the Commission for this item and the Commission discussion. The Commission adopts the findings and conclusions contained in the staff report provided for this hearing.

Mr. Dunn seconded. The motion passed 8-0.

Mr. Bello moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for the items listed below to the Long Apartments, 220 East Laurel Street, finding that the proposal does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties as required under Article IV, Chapter 14 of the Fort Collins Municipal Code, specifically:

- ***The entry tile does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2, 5 and 6.***
- ***The mechanical and electrical equipment placement does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2 and 9.***
- ***The courtyard door and infill openings do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2, 4, 5 and 6.***
- ***The Commission does not have enough information to ascertain whether the Scotch sconce meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.***
- ***The Commission does not have enough information to ascertain whether the aluminum screening meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.***

This decision is based upon the materials and information provided to the Commission for this item and the Commission discussion. The Commission adopts the findings and conclusions contained in the staff report provided for this hearing.

Mr. Rose seconded. The motion passed 8-0.

8. 1306 W. MOUNTAIN AVE, CONCEPTUAL REVIEW, REHABILITATION, ADDITION, AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES

DESCRIPTION: This item is to complete a conceptual review of the applicants' project, identify key conflicts with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and outline alterations to the proposed project plans so that the project will better align with the Standards. The applicant is proposing an addition onto the side and rear elevation of the main building, demolition of all accessory structures, and construction of a new garage building.

APPLICANT: Brian and Barbara Berkhausen (property owners), Rick Zier (legal counsel)

Chair Dunn disclosed knowing Bob Bailey but stated it would not bias her decision in any way.

Mr. Murray also disclosed having known Bob Bailey, but since it is no longer his house, he stated there was no conflict.

Mr. Bertolini stated that due to the lateness of the hour, the Applicant requested that this item be continued to the next meeting. Mr. Berkhausen confirmed this was his request.

Mr. Yatabe explained the noticing requirements.

Mr. Knierim moved for a continuance of agenda item 8, 1306 W. Mountain Ave, Conceptual Review, Rehabilitation, Addition, And Accessory Structures, to the next regular meeting of the LPC on April 21, 2021. Mr. Dunn seconded. The motion passed 8-0.

Chair Dunn agreed that the applicant should be first on the next agenda.

● **OTHER BUSINESS**

- Election of Officers (Chair and Vice Chair)
 - ***Ms. Michell nominated Ms. Dunn to serve as Chair. Mr. Bello seconded. The motion passed 8-0.***
 - ***Mr. Murray nominated Mr. Knierim to serve as Vice Chair. Ms. Nelsen seconded. The motion passed 8-0.***
- Chair Dunn reported the Loveland delisting meeting on Timberlane Farm has been postponed.
- Ms. McWilliams commented on the recently adopted changes to Boards and Commissions adopted by Council. She noted the name of the Landmark Preservation Commission has been changed to the Historic Preservation Commission. Mr. Bertolini commented on the benefits of that name change. Chair Dunn also noted not all landmarks are historic.

- **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 10:14 p.m.

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

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on April 21, 2021.



Meg Dunn, Chair