



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

This meeting was conducted
remotely via Zoom

Regular Meeting April 21, 2021 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

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

- **ROLL CALL**

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

ABSENT:

STAFF: Karen McWilliams, Maren Bzdek, Jim Bertolini, Brad Yatabe, Aubrie Brennan, 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**

Mr. Bertolini reviewed the Agenda, noting Item 2, 528 W. Mountain Ave, would be moved from the Consent Agenda to Discussion Agenda after the last listed item, Item 6, 336 E Magnolia St.

- **CONSENT AGENDA REVIEW**

No items were pulled from consent by the Commission. Mr. Murray requested Mr. Bertolini explain the Commission's role regarding 501 Edwards St in the Consent Agenda. Mr. Bertolini explained the

Commission did not need to take action, but could elect to do so, that Single Family Demolition properties were on the Consent Agenda as notification to the public and the Commission.

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

None.

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

None.

- **CONSENT AGENDA**

[Timestamp: 5:39 p.m.]

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 17, 2021

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the March 17, 2021 regular meeting of the Landmark Preservation Commission.

- ~~2. SINGLE FAMILY DEMOLITION NOTIFICATION – 528 W. MOUNTAIN AVE~~

3. SINGLE FAMILY DEMOLITION NOTIFICATION – 501 EDWARDS ST

Mr. Bello moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the Consent Agenda of the April 21, 2021 regular meeting as presented.

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

[Timestamp: 5:41 p.m.]

- **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

4. REPORT ON STAFF DESIGN REVIEW DECISIONS FOR DESIGNATED PROPERTIES

Staff is tasked with reviewing projects and, in cases where the project can be approved without submitting to the Landmark 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

None.

5. ~~1306 W MOUNTAIN AVE, CONCEPTUAL REVIEW, REHABILITATION, ADDITION, AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES~~

This item was not discussed, because it was continued to May 19, 2021 at the owner's request in advance of the April 21, 2021 Regular Hearing.

6. 336 E. MAGNOLIA ST, NATIONAL REGISTER DESIGN REVIEW

DESCRIPTION: This item is to complete a National Register Design Review of the applicant's project, identify key conflicts with the Secretary of Interior's Design Standards for Rehabilitation, and make recommendations as to whether the property would remain historic at the conclusion of the project. The applicant is proposing an addition onto the building's North/rear elevation, including necessary demolition, as well as a full-width, partially covered replacement porch, including necessary demolition.

APPLICANT: Ian Danielson

Staff Report

Mr. Bertolini presented the Staff Report. He discussed the role of the Commission on a National Register Review is to review proposed alterations and issue a report to the owner for properties designated as national, not local, landmarks. The report deals with whether the proposed changes meet the Secretary of the Interior's Design Standards for Historical Preservation.

Mr. Bertolini discussed the location of the property and the significance of its build date for the Laurel School Historic District, listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Proposed alterations included a two-story addition onto the rear of the home, including a deck and spiral staircase, a new front porch, expansion of the patio deck, and modification of the gable on the front of the residence. The Standards relevant to this project were Standard Two – Preservation of Overall Historic Character, Standard Three – Avoids a False Sense of History, Standard Five – Preserving Historic Features and Materials, and Standards Nine and Ten which deal with design, construction, and location of any additions, requiring them to be compatible, distinguishable, subordinate, and reversible. He clarified for the Chair the pictures of each elevation in the presentation were not to scale. Staff found the property was contributing to the Laurel School Historic District, and the proposed rehabilitation did not meet the Standards, rendering the property non-contributing due to the loss of historic integrity.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Ian Danielson, homeowner, and Mr. Bud Danielson, project lead, gave the Applicant presentation. Mr. Ian Danielson read a letter written by project architect Mr. Stewart King. Mr. King stated he took the age of the house into account when designing the alterations, matching many design elements of the original home as closely as possible and matching original houses in the neighborhood. A second story working toward the front of the house was the only solution for an addition due to the 50% footprint rule. All elements were chosen to protect the original feel of the house and match the age of the house, making the addition indistinguishable from the original house.

Mr. Bud Danielson thanked the Commission for their work and stated the alterations were to make Mr. Ian Danielson's home livable. He offered to answer questions and looked forward to the Commission's comments.

Public Input

None

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Bello asked to clarify the roles of the Danielsons in relation to the project. Mr. Bud Danielson stated Mr. Ian Danielson was the property owner, and Mr. Bud Danielson was supporting him as his father.

The Chair suggested the Commission focus on the Draft report. Mr. Bud Danielson asked the purpose of the draft report. The Chair explained the report's purpose is to comment on the alterations so the State can later decide if the property is still contributing to the National Register Landmark District for tax incentive purposes. The Commission's role is to lend their thoughts on the alterations to the property owner, not approve or deny them.

Mr. Murray commented he appreciated the architect's desire to match the existing home, but size and volume of the alterations do not lend themselves to fitting the Standards. He understood the applicant's need for more space, and the architect did a good job, but the Staff Report looks good.

The Chair agreed the Staff Report is accurate, as to the alterations not meeting the Secretary of the Interior Standards and noted the report called out the faux sense of history on the alterations. The alterations change a minimal traditional home to a Victorian style home, which is important to note as a significant change to the structure because it changes the history and the time period of the home. She suggested adding language to the report that property owner was knowingly choosing to significantly alter the home, understanding he was removing himself from consideration for tax benefits and zero interest loans. The Chair did not see how the State could find property contributing to the historic district after the proposed alterations. It would be useful to explain to property owners in the future why they did not have access to financial assets that others within the district could access. Mr. Murray was concerned about singling out this one property for special language and suggested adding a standard paragraph to reports in similar situations. Mr. Rose agreed standard language should be added to all reports in this situation because the Commission has a responsibility to inform owners of the potential consequences of alterations. He asked if the Chair if he should make a motion to amend the Staff Report.

Mr. Yatabe said the Commission can adopt the report with explicit language or pass the report now, but request Staff draft general language and bring it to the Commission for approval. Mr. Murray did not want to delay the owners waiting on Commission approval of Staff's new language to move forward with their project. The Chair wrote and read proposed language she had drafted, "The loss of contributing status will directly result in the loss of state and national tax credits, as well as interest free loans from the City of Fort Collins." Mr. Bertolini made the correction owners would not be losing financial benefits from the City because the property is not a City landmark, benefits would only be lost in the form of national and state tax credits. The Chair read the corrected language, "The loss of contributing status will directly result in the loss of state and national tax credits."

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Knierim moved the Commission approve the report as drafted by Staff, with the following modification: that there be a sentence added to the report that says, "The loss of contributing status will directly result in the loss of state and national tax credits," with the finding that the proposed plans and specifications for the rehabilitation of the Christ Horst Property at 336 E Magnolia Ave as presented do not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and the findings shall be conveyed to the Colorado State Historic Preservation Officer to update the documentation on this property at an appropriate time.

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

Mr. Murray asked if the Commission needed to list the Standards not met. The Chair stated the Commission was adopting the draft Staff Report which addressed the Standards, and Mr. Yatabe clarified this was the case.

Mr. Bud Danielson requested the report not be delayed based on additional language. Mr. Bertolini clarified the report will be issued as soon as modifications are made and it is signed by the Chair, which will release the City's hold on permits for the property.

Mr. Murray requested applicants review the report with their architect to consider making changes to the proposed alterations in order to retain tax credits. The Chair suggested the Commission could provide a letter in favor of a footprint variance to the 50 percent rule so the property could retain its historic character. Mr. Bud Danielson thanked the Chair and stated he and the property owner had already talked through the loss of incentives with their architect and could not afford a second cycle with the architect. The Danielsons had pursued a different variance and it was a lengthy process, and they could not afford another long delay. He appreciates Mr. Bertolini explaining the report to them and walking them through the process.

[Timestamp: 6:18 p.m.]

● **CONSENT AGENDA REVIEW**

2. CITY LANDMARK NOMINATION PROCESS – 528 W. MOUNTAIN AVE

Mr. Bertolini presented staff report outlining the City of Fort Collins Single Family Demolition and Landmark Nomination process. The City had received a Landmark Nomination from three residents but the owner had not consented. There would be no discussion at the hearing and the nomination process would begin. There was no action for the Commission at present, Staff was merely providing an informational presentation about the process for next month's hearing and the future. The main intent for the Single Family Demolition Process is to provide public notice to the neighborhood about the demolition of houses over 50 years old to be replaced by another single family home. If the property proposed for demolition is significant, the individuals outlined in the Code may nominate it for City landmark status. In this case, three citizens nominated the property and the owner did not consent to the designation, which means the designation will be considered at two LPC hearings tentatively scheduled for May and June.

Mr. Yatabe stated because the Commission was taking no action at the current hearing and because landmark nomination was a quasi-judicial item, his recommendation was public comment would not be appropriate. The first step is for Staff to determine if the property meets landmark status. The public should not comment on the merits of landmark status until after Staff makes a recommendation at a hearing held to evaluate the merits of landmark status. Mr. Bertolini clarified the nomination would be considered at two regularly scheduled meetings, tentatively the May and June regular hearings. The

Chair stated members of the public may comment at the May meeting. Mr. Yatabe noted permits for alterations to the property or demolition will be stayed until a determination on landmark status is made. The Chair asked if repairs to maintain the integrity of the house are excepted to the stay, and Mr. Yatabe stated exceptions are for health, welfare, and safety and should be run by Staff prior to any action. Mr. Murray noted members of the public that did not get to speak at the current hearing may submit written comments to Staff in advance of the hearing, and the Chair noted they could also wait for the posted packet on the Friday before the hearing in order to have more information. Ms. Nelsen found Mr. Bertolini's presentation useful, but requested more guidance on the process in the future.

- **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Murray requested emails in the packet be rearranged so replies can come after original emails. Mr. Bertolini agreed to rearrange.

The Chair had an informational update Timberlane Farm in Loveland. The applicants requested the Loveland Historic Preservation Commission overturn the landmark designation on April 19. This is an issue the Commission should be watching regionally. The Loveland Commission continued the item to next month, because the applicants did not bring the Code-required data on why the property is no longer eligible.

The Chair discussed an article she had written regarding a former resident of a home the Commission had looked at recently regarding a change to a rear garage, possibly 714 W Mountain. The article is in The Senior Voice and will be coming out in May. It is about the first female pilot in Fort Collins. In the early 1930s, Mary Ault, granddaughter of the man after which the town of Ault is named, lived in house and she was the first female pilot in Fort Collins. The 1930s were around the time the City got a runway. She joined with a female pilot from Greeley and a female pilot from Denver to join the Betsy Ross flying Corps. The women had grown up during World War I and their goal was to deliver medical supplies during the next war. Unfortunately, the military did not officially recognize the organization and it ended in 1932, before World War II. Mary Ault later moved to Denver and sold aviation equipment.

- **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Dunn adjourned the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

Minutes prepared and respectfully submitted by Aubrie Brennan.

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on May 19, 2021.



Meg Dunn, Chair