



**MANITOU SPRINGS
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, May 3, 2017**

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, May 3, 2017, in Council Chambers at 606 Manitou Avenue. Chairwoman Nichols declared a quorum present and called the meeting to order at 5:59pm. The following Commissioners attended:

- PRESENT:** Chair ANN NICHOLS
Vice Chair LISETTE CASEY
Commissioner DEBORAH MOORE
Commissioner ROBERT JACKSON
Commissioner NEALE MINCH
Commissioner ROGER ARMSTRONG (Alternate)
- ABSENT:** Commissioner TAMMILA WRIGHT (Excused)
Commissioner PATRICIA MCLEAN (Excused)
- STAFF:** Wade Burkholder, Planning Director
Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner
Karen Berchtold, Planner II
Dylan Becker, Planner I
- GUESTS:** Amy Carr, Graduate Student at University of Colorado, Denver

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ITEM 1. April 5, 2017

MOTION:

Commissioner Moore moved to approve the April Minutes as presented.

SECOND:

Commissioner Armstrong seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 3-0. Commissioner Jackson, Commissioner Minch, and Vice Chairwoman Casey abstained as they were not present for the April Meeting.

III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

ITEM 2. Brook Street Bridge – The City received three proposals for rehabilitation of the bridge on March 10, 2017. A committee reviewed the proposals the following Wednesday and made a recommendation. City Council was to consider whether to rehabilitate the bridge or demolish it at the April 4, 2017, meeting. However, there were questions remaining to address with the design/build bidders so the repair options/costs can be compared side-by-side with the demolition option. This has not yet been rescheduled for City Council review. Staff will update the Commission, as information is available.

At this time, Chairwoman Nichols explained the public hearing procedures to the audience and asked if any Commissioners had ex parte communications or conflicts of interest to declare. Commissioner Minch stated he had ex parte contacts through discussions with the petitioner regarding Hiawatha Gardens. Ms. Anthony stated the Commission had been privy to those discussions and it was therefore not an issue. Ms. Anthony also commented the property was owned by the City which also made the situation a little different. Hearing of no further conflicts of interest or ex parte contacts, the meeting continued.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

ITEM 3. MCAC 1706 – Petition for Re-Inclusion in Local Historic Preservation District – 10 Old Man’s Trail (Hiawatha Gardens) – Brian Murphy, Petitioner

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, presented the staff report dated April 28, 2017. Ms. Anthony commented it was worthy of note to mention Mr. Murphy, the petitioner, was a former member and chair of the Historic Preservation Commission at the time the district boundary was redefined and Hiawatha Gardens was removed from the Local Historic District. Ms. Anthony stated had the City known how intact and preserved much of Hiawatha Gardens was, it would not have been removed from the district.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if staff had selected criteria for evaluation of Hiawatha Gardens for inclusion in the Local Historic District. Commissioner Minch replied he felt Criterion A was the best fit of the options listed concerning criteria for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Chairwoman Nichols stated she was referring to page three, section B of the staff report regarding criteria for Historic District designation, not for the National Register of Historic Places, and remarked she felt numbers three (3) and four (4) were the most applicable regarding Hiawatha Gardens. Chairwoman Nichols also commented criteria number one (1), referring to geographic patterns associated with different eras of settlement and growth, was also applicable and stressed the Commission needed to evaluate what the key characteristics were which qualified the property for inclusion in the Local Historic District. Ms. Anthony stated it might be easier to exclude the criteria which the Commission felt were not a good fit or did not apply. The Commission only had to make their recommendation based on one criteria, but could list as many as they felt qualified. Chairwoman Nichols stated if the Commission wanted to make a recommendation for inclusion to Council, it must move forward within sixty (60) days.

Vice Chairwoman Casey asked for clarification if the Commission needed to select at least one of the six criteria listed in the staff report and use the criteria for the National Register of Historic Places to support a recommendation to City Council. Chairwoman Nichols responded the Hiawatha working group had looked at including Hiawatha Gardens on the National Register of Historic Places. However, the State Historic

Preservation Office gave some push back in regard to a nomination. Local Resident and Archeologist, Beau Schriever, who also had an extensive background in National Register evaluations, argued Hiawatha Gardens met all four (4) criterion for inclusion on the National Historic Register and that the City would be able to get the property listed. Chairwoman Nichols stated the State felt there was more to be done in terms of demonstrating the historic integrity of the building was still intact, which was what Mr. Schriever's evaluation addressed. As far as inclusion in the Local Historic District, the Commission needed to look at the six (6) criteria listed on page three, section B of the staff report, which were taken from the City's Historic Preservation Regulations for inclusion into the Local Historic District.

Commissioner Minch inquired how contributing versus non-contributing status was approached in the proposed ordinance. Ms. Anthony responded the City could only designate a property as contributing or non-contributing and stated the Commission could go either way. Ms. Anthony stated she went ahead and said it was contributing, noting the building had been significantly altered but original materials and features were still present within the structure and restoration and rehabilitation could restore its appearance. Ms. Anthony stated the Commission could also choose to say it was currently non-contributing, but removal of inappropriate additions and restoration of the structure would render it contributing because there was enough material still evident underneath the exterior, applied materials.

Commissioner Minch inquired if the map was correct in showing a portion of the parcel protruding across El Paso Boulevard. Ms. Anthony responded it was correct because the actual street did not follow the right-of-way and actually cut through the property.

Commissioner Minch inquired if the map included the parking lot or just the building. Ms. Anthony stated it was intended to include the entire property.

Chairwoman Nichols commented once the property was included in the Local Historic District, any new work or development on the property, such as a parking garage, would be subject to Historic Preservation Commission standards which would delineate whether or not proposed alterations degraded the historic character of the building. Ms. Anthony stated, in regard to grants, trying to exclude the parking lot would be problematic for the funders.

Commissioner Moore requested she be notified of any excavations on the property as she would like to know what was uncovered. Chairwoman Nichols commented Mr. Schriever mentioned there could be a wealth of archaeological material at the location. Ms. Anthony commented it would be fun for all to participate in those discoveries.

Chairwoman Nichols stated she had heard when the City was trying to find the well associated with the property, they came across a bottle dump containing bottles from the Sundown Lounge. Ms. Anthony confirmed Chairwoman Nichols's statement pertaining to the bottle dump site and commented they found greenstone structures, but were unable to confirm what those structures actually were in terms of a planter or a ditch or something else entirely. Ms. Anthony also commented she felt the site would be a really good candidate for archaeological excavation.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired whether Ms. Anthony had a position on if the well had been found. Ms. Anthony responded she did not have a position; she had looked at the site, but it was too difficult to determine if the actual well had been found or if it was a flagpole base which was shown on old documents.

Hearing no further questions for staff regarding the report, Chairwoman Nichols invited the petitioner to the podium.

Brian Murphy, 129 Cave Avenue, stated he was on the Historic Preservation Commission when the boundaries were redrawn for the Local Historic District and had the Commission known then what they know now, the property would have remained within the boundaries.

Hearing no further comment from, or questions for, the petitioner, Chairwoman Nichols opened the Public Hearing.

Molly Wingate, 129 Cave Avenue, stated she was excited to get the property included in the Local Historic District and felt it was a great opportunity for the City of Manitou Springs to do the right thing. Ms. Wingate stated she felt the Commission could argue the building met all six (6) of the criteria for inclusion and volunteered to help do so.

Doug Edmundson, 7 Keithley Road, stated he felt heartbroken on the day the greenstone fireplace was dismantled and taken apart. Mr. Edmundson stated approximately ninety percent (90%) of the historic integrity of the building was intact, including the main ceiling in the southern part of the building and stated this was a golden opportunity for the City of Manitou Springs to preserve and save a historic building from the wrecking ball. Mr. Edmundson commented either way the Commission went in their decision, the City would be six figures in the abatement alone should they decide to tear the structure down and, should the Commission choose that route, they would end up with a half-million-dollar hole in the ground. Mr. Edmundson commented the City was under a big crunch to provide space for an expanding administration due to what seemed to him to be an ever-expanding government system and felt some good preservative efforts could be taken on the building to expand administrative offices which would provide a nice facility for public meetings and functions at the location. Mr. Edmundson also stated he felt the design concepts put forth by Deborah Harrison and her husband really hit the nail on the head as far as keeping the building historic with some modern flair.

Hearing no further comment from the public, Chairwoman Nichols closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Moore inquired about the timeframe to get the ordinance approved and forwarded to City Council, as well as for the project as a whole. Ms. Anthony responded the initial part of the process would be much shorter and the City had a lot of capital needs at the moment. The project would take a while to figure out funding and uses for the property. Ms. Anthony stated funding would likely be in increments and it could take five to ten years to complete anything. Commissioner Moore stated she thought it would be in stages, but wasn't sure. Ms. Anthony stated, alternatively, it was possible the City could get very lucky with a public-private partnership and it could happen in another couple of years. It was too early to project how long the project might take.

Chairwoman Nichols stated once the building was actually re-included in the Local Historic District it would open up funding opportunities and better treatment if the building was found to be in the floodplain.

An informal consensus was reached regarding approval for Re-Inclusion in the Local Historic District and that the building met the requirements for re-inclusion per the City Code.

Commissioner Moore stated she felt criteria number four was applicable to the property.

Commissioner Minch stated he thought the Commission should keep the language and criteria used in line with the State of Colorado's criteria, avoiding the use of City arguments for re-inclusion, in an attempt keep conversations with the State open and on-going regarding the property.

Chairwoman Nichols stated she felt the ordinance was the place to call out where the property met the City's Code requirements for inclusion and inquired if Ms. Anthony wanted the Commission to call out specific criteria for the ordinance. Ms. Anthony responded she thought the Commission had to do so and she had listed 7.04.040 B, numbers one through six (1-6) in the draft ordinance as the starting point. Ms. Anthony stated the Commission could call out the specific criteria in the motion or in the ordinance and a description of the characteristics and key features would also need to be included per the code requirement for including the property Historic District.

Chairwoman Nichols stated the Commission could split Section One into two parts, where the property characteristics would be listed and the Commission could call out which of the six criteria were applicable. Ms. Anthony agreed with Chairwoman Nichol's proposal and stated the key features were similar to the ones she had listed.

Chairwoman Nichols stated she felt the ordinance would be a continuing record and it seemed like the Commission should put in the characteristics which allow the property to be included in the Local Historic District. She also commented criteria three (3) and criteria four (4) seemed direct and as clear to her, as the property was associated with a historically significant period and retained a high degree of integrity.

Commissioner Minch stated he felt the Commission needed to call out the half walls in the key features because it was a vital information when developing a plan for rehabilitation and those areas would also provide the original window dimensions. Chairwoman Nichols agreed with Commissioner Minch's assessment.

Ms. Anthony commented the property was associated with different eras of settlement and growth, which was criteria number one (1), and thought when it came to the gentlemen's club/dance hall era, when many of the larger, community gathering-type structures were built would be a good fit for criteria number three (3), but would be more clear under criteria number four (4) and did not feel the City would lose anything by not specifically calling that one out. Chairwoman Nichols agreed and commented she thought Criteria one (1) was a little strange. Ms. Anthony stated the property met criteria number two (2) and conveyed a sense of historic cohesiveness from the era of the dance halls and open pavilions which were geared towards large gatherings of people. She noted the majority of the property had historic significance and retained a high degree of integrity which met criteria number three (3); the property was also associated with a historically significant period in the development of the community during the late 1880s through the 1920s when Manitou Springs experienced a boom in building, visitors, and population which would meet criteria number four (4).

Commissioner Minch inquired how the dance hall era of the 1920s, 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s fit into the property. Ms. Anthony responded the property was used as a dance hall during the big band era of the 1930s and went into the 1950s and 1960s with the country and western era. Ms. Anthony stated she wanted to make sure whatever period of significance or era the Commission decided upon had a great deal to do with the structures still remaining at the location so the features and characteristics still intact matched with the period of significance. Commissioner Minch stated the Commission came to consensus the earliest era would be the 1920s because that was when both buildings were located on site. Ms. Anthony stated he was correct.

Chairwoman Nichols stated the property was tied to the history of music in Manitou Springs and it was the dancehall era which really characterized the building.

Vice Chairwoman Casey commented when people read about that history, the narrative went into how exquisite the building was as a gentlemen's club. Ms. Anthony stated the dance hall was there during the same time as the gentlemen's club and stated the dance hall went back to 1895. Ms. Anthony also stated after the gentlemen's club burned down was when the current building on the north end was erected, which was the first time both of those structures were there in their current form and felt it was worth noting there were aspects of the building which predated that, such as the foundation and remnants of the gentlemen's club, but the most significant period for the current building was circa 1920.

Commissioner Moore commented when she moved to Manitou Springs two years ago, she was amazed when she first saw the building and thought it looked inconsistent from the majority of the City. However, after reading the report on the building she felt it was most important to focus on the interior. Ms. Anthony responded she thought it would be a simple job to expose the exterior underneath the stucco and would help bring out the historic nature of the outside of the building.

Chairwoman Nichols stated the intent would be to restore the building to the way it looked when it was fairly open and to retain the appearance it had during the 1920s. Ms. Anthony stated one of the things to note, in regard to criteria number five (5), the queen trusses were an important part of the construction of the building and were distinctive characteristics of the period and of dance halls. Ms. Anthony stated the section of the building which used to be the gentlemen's club was called the concession building and they used the construction layout they did because they did not want structural members obstructing the dancers and view of the band.

Chairwoman Nichols stated she assumed criteria number six (6) did not apply. Ms. Anthony responded the City did not know who built the buildings or who the architect was, but more research could possibly render that information.

Chairwoman Nichols commented it seemed the Commission had at least four (4) solid points for re-inclusion, criteria numbers two through five (2-5). Commissioner Minch stated he agreed with that assessment along with the other Commissioners.

Commissioner Jackson commented he had heard rumors Rudolph Valentino and Elvis had played at the location and inquired if that could be verified. Ms. Anthony responded Rudolph Valentino is confirmed to have played there, but she had never come across anything on Elvis. Ms. Anthony also commented aside from Rudolph Valentino, Count Basie and many other well-known big bands thought it was interesting Fannie Mae Duncan, who owned the Cotton Club, talked about the Hiawatha Gardens in her book which served as her inspiration for doing the Cotton Club. Commissioner Jackson commented when Rudolph Valentino played at the Hiawatha Gardens it was only his second United States appearance on his world tour.

Chairwoman Nichols stated she felt the Commission was in agreement in Section One of the ordinance the Commission would call out criteria numbers two through five (2 – 5) as being the justification for inclusion of this property in the Local Historic District and then the Commission would elaborate on the features which should be preserved, including the half walls.

Commissioner Minch inquired if the Commission needed to specify, as per the report, the additions added in approximately the 1950s. Chairwoman Nichols stated she believed that was an issue for funding rather than an issue of whether or not it is justified in being included in the District. Ms. Anthony also responded she thought the Commission could elude to the fact although the resource had been altered, there were still original materials and features present within the structure and restoration and rehabilitation would restore its historic value and appearance.

Chairwoman Nichols stated she felt the Commission needed to make a motion for recommendation to City Council of the justification for inclusion of Hiawatha Gardens which would identify, based on the ordinance, the key characteristics of the resource and recommend the ordinance to City Council as well. Ms. Anthony agreed with this approach.

MOTION:

Commissioner Minch moved to forward MCAC 1706 to City Council with a recommendation for approval of inclusion of the Hiawatha Gardens property at 10 Old Man's Trail with the following criteria for Designation of Historic Districts from Section 17.04.40B of the Municipal Code:

2. The majority of the properties convey a sense of historic or architectural cohesiveness through their design, setting, materials, workmanship, or association.
3. The majority of the properties have historic significance and retain a high degree of integrity.
4. The area in general is associated with a historically significant period in the development of the community or is associated with special historical events.
5. The majority of the properties embody distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction, or are a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.

And with the specification the key features and characteristics of the property which shall be preserved under Section 1 of the proposed ordinance to read:

Existing Materials and Design Features dating to the period of building significance ca. 1890-1920, including original rooflines, building dimensions, stone fireplace, half walls, window and door openings as exist or for which evidence is found, the Queen trusses in the dance pavilion, and the original dancefloor(s) in the building.

SECOND:

Commissioner Jackson seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Minch stated he also wanted to make sure the map forwarded to City Council included the Parking Lot. Ms. Anthony responded she would double check the map and make sure it was accurate.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 6-0.

V. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business to discuss.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

ITEM 4. Presentation by Amy Carr, University of Colorado – Denver: Graduate Capstone Project “Hazard Mitigation Strategies for Historic Structures in Manitou Springs”

Karen Berchtold, Planner II, introduced Amy Carr, Graduate Student from the University of Colorado, Denver. Ms. Berchtold stated Ms. Carr’s project pertained to the action plan of Plan Manitou and provided private property owners of historic properties with research on best practices and guidance to mitigate risks from fires and floods. Ms. Berchtold commented she wanted the Commission to provide feedback and how the City should consider moving forward.

Amy Carr commented she was happy to have worked with the City of Manitou Springs and thought it was a lovely place to be. She stated the Plan Manitou Risk Assessment called attention to three natural hazards the City was at high risk for and those were wildfires, flooding, and geologic hazards. Planning Staff had helped her to select properties within Local Historic Districts to research specific ways in which those properties could reduce risk from natural hazards and provided a brief description of wildfire, flooding, and geologic hazards in Manitou Springs and the surrounding area. Ms. Carr stated the Ruxton corridor (Engelmann Canyon) was at a high risk of wildfire and there were three factors: weather, fuels, and topography, in determining how a wildfire would behave. Fuels were the only factor which homeowners could do anything about and homeowners should not only look at the vegetation surrounding the property, but at the structure itself as a source of fuel. Ms. Carr stated, in regard to flooding, the risk had increased due to the lack of vegetation on the Waldo Canyon burn scar, which not only put the City at risk for high water levels coming down the canyon, but high volume of debris as well. The City had experienced and was at risk of flash flooding, which meant there were high velocity along with greater depths of water and not all flood mitigation strategies could be applied to that type of flooding. Ms. Carr noted the City had provided a list of eighteen (18) properties, both historic and non-historic, which all had a risk of wildfire, flooding, or geologic hazards. She and Ms. Berchtold visited each property and performed a windshield survey.

Commissioner Moore inquired if a windshield survey meant they drove by the properties to look at them. Ms. Carr confirmed that was what the term meant.

Ms. Carr continued she was able to narrow down the selection to seven (7) properties which were at the highest risk. She and Ms. Berchtold completed site visits of the properties and further narrowed the list to five (5); three (3) at risk of flood and two (2) at risk of wildfire. The other two properties on the list were at risk of geologic hazards, but she was not able to assess those properties in the scope of her project. Ms. Carr stated she was able to talk to some of the property owners during site visits and Bobby White from the Fire Department had also given her a tour of the area with his assessment of wildfire risk and suggestions for how property owners could help in mitigating risks. Surveys had been sent out to all eighteen (18) property owners to see how they assessed their risks and learn of any repairs, damage, or mitigation work already done on the properties. Ms. Carr stated she chose to use the building vulnerability assessment because it had been mentioned in much of the research she had done as a best practice in regard to not just applying a mitigation strategy, but having a good record of the building for restoration purposes. She modelled her building vulnerability assessment after a FEMA checklist and commented some of the factors she took from the checklist were site conditions, architectural elements, building envelope, and structural systems for use in evaluating properties. She presented the form via PowerPoint.

Ms. Carr presented her findings on the Nichols’ Cabin, as follows:

- not an historic property
- log cabin which was a popular style within the City and a style at a high risk of wildfire
- showed the Nichols' Cabin in relation to the FEMA Wildfire Risk Assessment Map and a vegetation map in the area of the property, which demonstrated it was at high risk of wildfire

Ms. Carr stated she had noticed some mitigation efforts on the property and recommended removal of vegetation running up to the property so to have at least a five to six inches (5" - 6") between the vegetation and the foundation. Ms. Carr also noted cracks in the logs which could harbor embers; the logs themselves were not of much concern in regard to fuels, but the site conditions were more of a factor with surface fuels, vegetation, topography, proximity to other buildings, architectural elements like roof type and material, and the structural system in regard to if there was an internal or external sprinkler system. Ms. Carr stated the building envelope was concerned with how complex the building was and noted the more complex the building, the greater the wildfire risk. In reference to the Nichols' Cabin, the structure was at a high risk of wildfire because it was isolated with only one road providing access, sits on top of steep topography, there were a few cracks in the log siding, and there was dense vegetation surrounding the building. Ms. Carr's recommendations were made with minimal alterations, as she felt that was key in working with historic properties. In reference to the Nichol's Cabin, she recommended installation of chimney screens, hard surfaces which are five to six inches (5"- 6") from the foundation, filling in cracks and gaps in the log siding, continuing hazardous fuel removal which should focus on branches obstructing or near the chimney and windows, and simple maintenance procedures like cleaning the gutters and eaves.

Ms. Carr stated the next property her project looked at was the Davis Block in regard to flooding and noted the property was on the National Historic Registry. She commented Fountain Creek was directly behind the building and flood waters often rose above the level of the roadway. There was a basement in the building, which was boarded up from the outside, but was still at risk from encroaching floodwaters.

Commissioner Moore inquired if, during the flooding in 2013, the building had mud deposits inside like the four foot (4 ft.) mud wall which occurred at Joanne Garrison's house (1228 Manitou Avenue). Ms. Anthony responded that property did not have any water in living areas, but the basement was inundated. She further noted the Davis Block's basement was almost completely full of mud as a result of the 2013 flooding.

Ms. Carr continued with her presentation on the Davis Block and stated the building was in the one-hundred year (100 yr.) floodplain and directly in the floodway. In assessing the flood risk of the property she used the same four (4) factors as with the Nichols' Cabin, but the questions she had asked were different and focused more on base flood elevation, which was the estimated level FEMA said water levels could rise to in a flood event. Having a basement in a flood zone made a property much more vulnerable to flood risks. The vulnerabilities for the Davis Block were:

- it was in a one-hundred year (100 yr.) floodplain
- was in the floodway
- had a basement which had been previously flooded
- there were openings into the basement
- was subject to flooding on three sides

Ms. Carr noted the majority of her recommendations for the Davis Block were focused on the basement area because it created the greatest vulnerability. Her recommendations were: 1) fill in the basement

completely with sand or gravel, with the installation of flood vents below the Base Flood Elevation (BSE); or 2) in order to keep the basement open, install the flood vents but remove any utilities or storage in that area and installing flood resistant materials in the basement. Ms. Carr commented flood vents would be used to let water flow in and out of the basement.

Commissioner Moore inquired if allowing water to flow in and out of the basement would cause erosion of the foundation. Ms. Anthony responded the building had a stone foundation and it would likely not be good for there to be water in the basement with the stone exposed. Ms. Carr responded her recommendation was based on flash flooding, which occurred quickly with a high depth. Sealing off the building completely could lead to hydrostatic pressure which could move the building off of its foundation and it was actually better for the building to allow the water to flow through it.

Ms. Carr stated her recommendations for property owners, in general, were to be careful not to drastically alter the historic aspects and nature of the building, to consult the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties, to consult the Historic Preservation Commission, and to contact the State Historic Preservation Officer to ensure mitigation efforts did not harm the historic integrity of the building.

Ms. Carr concluded her presentation stating natural hazards were not going to go away anytime soon and commented on how vital historic properties were to the City of Manitou Springs. Ms. Carr stated she felt the Historic Preservation Commission's mission could be enhanced through helping property owners mitigate their hazard risks while preserving the historic aspects of the structures.

Commissioner Minch inquired if shake shingle roofs posed any greater risk to wildfire than other roofs. Ms. Carr responded she had attended the Colorado Wildland Fire Conference and was told by an expert in retrofitting that, when they are installed the correct way, wooden shingle roofs actually decrease the risk.

Commissioner Minch asked if risk would be increased if they were installed improperly or with gaps. Ms. Carr confirmed that would increase the vulnerability to wildfire. Correct installation was tight and flush and referred to the methodology as "hardening the house".

Commissioner Moore inquired as to why the logs, as in the Nichols' Cabin, were not as big of a concern in terms of wildfire mitigation. Ms. Carr responded it was because logs were slower burning and were harder to ignite. Ms. Anthony drew the analogy of making a fire in a fireplace - you split the log so the internal part with the little nooks and crannies were what actually got the fire going. The outer surface of a log was less susceptible to fire than if it were opened up and bark was fairly fire retardant.

Commissioner Minch inquired if the assessments were meant to be informational to people who were assessing their houses. Ms. Carr stated she did them for individual property owners to help provide an idea of where to start in mitigating and reducing hazard risks.

Commissioner Minch stated he felt it would be good to call out some of the things Ms. Carr had discussed including the Fire Department Guidelines and if there were any funding option available to those who cannot afford to do the mitigation themselves. Commissioner Minch inquired if Ms. Carr had come across any grants property owners could use to help fund mitigation. Ms. Carr responded she had not and her project was more focused on general strategies and best practices for mitigation.

Ms. Anthony commented Ms. Carr's efforts were especially beneficial to the Commission and staff because they were tailored to Manitou Springs and felt the Commission should consider amending the Design

Guidelines. The Commission could look at items which were low-impact to historic properties that staff could approve. She noted the Historic Design Guidelines from Corpus Christi, Texas, where they elevated buildings out of the floodplain may have limited applicability in Manitou Springs. However, those guidelines provided some insights of things to look out for, such as someone proposing to elevate more to provide for a garage underneath the buildings and she felt there was some good guidance for how the City could amend its guidelines.

Commissioner Minch suggested an interim step of including the self-evaluation as part of the Material Change of Appearance Certification process to help get people thinking about mitigation even before staff and the Commission could flesh out handling implementation.

Chairwoman Nichols commented the Commission could add a section to the guidelines about hazard mitigation, hazard risk assessment, and include the self-evaluation for property owners to fill out.

Commissioner Minch stated he liked the fact the project and self-evaluation had the potential to accomplish a lot without much funding.

Chairwoman Nichols commented the project and paper presented by Ms. Carr would be useful in amending the Historic Design Guidelines and there was a need to get the word out regarding mitigation to the public. Ms. Berchtold stated it would be good to think about how the City wanted to publicize this and recommended using the Pikes Peak Bulletin.

Commissioner Minch suggested the City make a general announcement to property owners stating “Here are a list of things you can do to help reduce your risk and if you live in a Historic District, here are some additional things you can do to reduce your risk” and felt it was important to make the communication broader than just the Historic Districts. Ms. Berchtold commented what Commissioner Minch suggested was about to occur in a big way as the Fire Department was about to implement the Community Wildfire Prevention Plan, an action plan in Plan Manitou, to look at every parcel in the City in a more detailed manner and providing guidance to homeowners.

Commissioner Minch stated he would like to see the Fire Department communicate their findings with other departments and commissions. Ms. Anthony commented she felt it would be good to have a discussion with Fireman White to make sure everyone is on the same page and it would be beneficial to have information regarding if a property is in a floodplain and other information in informing both staff and property owners on hazards.

Commissioner Minch inquired if staff had a list of properties which were on the National Historic Register. Ms. Anthony responded there were only thirteen (13) properties listed, but there were at about one-thousand (1,000) properties within the local district, many of which were eligible for listing.

Commissioner Minch commented if the City was able to expand the pool of cases, it would give the Commission the background to tackle eighty to ninety percent (80%-90%) of the issues they came up against.

Commissioner Moore inquired if becoming registered on the National Historic Register was initiated by homeowners. Ms. Anthony responded it was typically initiated by the homeowner and for a period of time the State did not want individual properties to register, but preferred National Register Districts. She thought

the State had moved past that idea. Ms. Anthony commented the town clock and public library were not on the Register.

Chairwoman Nichols thanked Amy Carr for her work and presentation to the Commission and opened the floor to public comment. Hearing no comment from the public, Chairwoman Nichols moved on to the next item on the agenda.

ITEM 5. Preservation Month Activities – Selection of Honor Awards Recipients and Scheduling Honor Awards Reception

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if staff had received all the Commissioner votes for Historic Preservation Awards. Ms. Anthony responded she had received votes from two (2) Commissioners and suggested the rest of the Commissioners go through the list, decide who they felt should get awards, and then the Commission could move to approve the entire slate of awardees.

Chairwoman Nichols stated the nominees highlighted in blue were the staff's recommendations and she agreed with the recommendations. Ms. Anthony stated if any Commissioner was uncomfortable making decision, it would not count against the property; she would add up the number of votes and compare them to the number of votes possible using a median point.

Ms. Anthony stated Commissioner Wright had emailed her votes and inquired if Commissioner Minch would like to start and go through the list naming the properties he would like to nominate. Commissioner Minch stated he agreed with the staff recommendations. The remaining Commissioners also stated they felt the same way.

Commissioner Minch stated he had noticed Ms. Anthony had indicated one property needed to be confirmed in regards to what they had actually done. Ms. Anthony responded Commissioner Wright had called the project manager and they had told her they were ninety-eight percent (98%) complete, but when Ms. Anthony drove by it looked like they had not started. Chairwoman Nichols commented she also noticed it did not look like the project was completed. Commissioner Minch stated the project manager must have been confused by which project Commissioner Wright had asked about.

MOTION:

Commissioner Minch moved to approve the nine (9) properties recommended by staff to receive Historic Preservation Awards.

SECOND:

Commissioner Armstrong seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 6-0.

Commissioner Minch inquired if there would be any special awards given out this year. Ms. Anthony responded in regard to the Preservation Pioneer award, there were two people who were involved in starting

the Historic Preservation Commission which had not yet been recognized; one was Bill Koerner and the other was Charles Smith. Commissioner Minch commented Charles Smith had been in front of the Commission a few times recently. Chairwoman Nichols stated she felt Charles Smith was a good nomination for the Preservation Pioneer Award. Commissioner Minch commented since he had seen Charles Smith several times in meetings throughout recent times, he was obviously still engaged in preservation. Ms. Anthony stated she felt this was a good tie in because she also had a recommendation for a Special Recognition Award which would go the parishioners of Our Lady of Perpetual Help for jumping in and stopping the diocese from closing the church.

Ms. Anthony also stated she was thinking about holding the awards at the church. Commissioner Moore stated she would help set that up.

Commissioner Armstrong confirmed the awards reception would be held on Thursday, May 18, 2017.

NON-AGENDA ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Minch stated he had an announcement and asked everyone present to purchase their tickets for the History Express. Ms. Anthony explained it was a special event put on by the Cog Railway with a presentation on the train, goodie bags, and dinner at the Craftwood Inn. Chairwoman Nichols inquired if that information had been emailed out. Ms. Anthony stated she had emailed information from the Heritage Center, and believed most of the Commission was on that list. Commissioner Minch stated he would also be emailing people about the event. Ms. Anthony stated if someone wanted to attend and was a Heritage Center Member, the cost would be \$109 and \$129 if they were not.

Commissioner Jackson also made an announcement about the grand opening of the Black Bear Distillery in Green Mountain Falls on Memorial Day weekend. Commissioner Minch inquired if the Black Bear Distillery would be interested in sponsoring the Brew Festival. Commissioner Jackson stated he was actually looking into that.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, Chairwoman Nichols adjourned the meeting at 7:38 p.m.

Minutes Prepared by: Dylan Becker, Planner I