



**MANITOU SPRINGS
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, July 5, 2017**



I. CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, July 5, 2017, in Council Chambers at 606 Manitou Avenue. Chairwoman Nichols declared a quorum present and called the meeting to order at 5:58 pm. The following Commissioners attended:

PRESENT: Chair ANN NICHOLS
Vice Chair LISETTE CASEY
Commissioner ROBERT JACKSON
Commissioner TAMMILA WRIGHT
Commissioner NEALE MINCH (6:00 pm)
Commissioner DEBORAH MOORE
Alternate Commissioner SAMANTHA BELDING

ABSENT: Commissioner PATRICIA MCLEAN (excused)

STAFF: Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner
Dylan Becker, Planner I

GUESTS: None

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ITEM 1. June 7, 2017

MOTION:

Commissioner Wright moved to approve the May Regular Meeting Minutes of the Historic Preservation Commission with the following changes:

- Under Call to Order, Present: Amend “TAMILLA WRIGHT” to “TAMMILA WRIGHT”
- Page 4, Line 15: Amend “Eric Wright” to “Erick Wright”
- Page 5, Line 21: Amend “each” to “east”
- Page 6, Line 9: Amend “The stated” to “She stated”

SECOND:

Vice Chair Casey seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 5-0. Commissioner Minch and Commissioner Moore abstained as they were not present for the May Regular Meeting.

III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

ITEM 2. Brook Street Bridge – a Public Meeting was held on June 14 to provide information and seek citizen input on the repair or replacement options of the bridge. An online survey was also conducted, with over 80% of participants in favor of rehabilitation of the historic bridge. At their meeting of June 27, Council discussed the item and the consensus favored the repair option. However, the approval of the construction contract with Murphy Constructors, was postponed to the July 18 meeting at the company owner's request pending final revisions to the contract.

ITEM 3. MCAC 1706 – Petition for Re-Inclusion in Local Historic Preservation District – 10 Old Man's Trail (Hiawatha Gardens) – Brian Murphy, Petitioner. At the June 13 City Council Worksession, First Reading of the District Inclusion Ordinance was scheduled for the July 18 Regular Council meeting.

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. Hearing none, the meeting continued.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business to discuss.

V. NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 4. MCAC 1707 – Exterior Alteration or Remodel (Garage Expansion) – 212 Illinois Avenue – Peter Davis, Applicant

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, presented the Staff Report dated June 29, 2017.

Commissioner Minch inquired if pages A2.3 and A3.3 were an old proposal or a new proposal. Ms. Anthony responded A2.3 and A3.3 were part of the new proposal. Commissioner Minch stated the new proposal still referred to the upstairs of the garage as a guest space and it should say office. Ms. Anthony confirmed.

Hearing no further questions or comment for Staff, Chairwoman Nichols invited the applicant to the podium.

Hillary Wallis, 212 Illinois Avenue, stated the original sixteen foot wide garage proposal was made initially just to get the application in and commented she felt the two car garage was a better fit for the neighborhood than the single car garage as it could help alleviate street parking and congestion issues.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if Ms. Wallis found the conditions of approval recommended by Staff to be acceptable. Ms. Wallis responded she found them to be amenable. Chairwoman Nichols inquired if Ms. Wallis had any plans for the outdoor fireplace which had, sadly, crumbled to dust. Ms. Wallis responded the fireplace was attached to the original structure, which was moved from Fort Carson, and was simply attached after the fact without any structure itself. Ms. Wallis stated she had planned to move the fireplace to serve as a buffer between her and her neighbor but now had the intention to recreate the fireplace as an outdoor fireplace area which would look fairly similar to the old one.

Commissioner Minch commented he had several people from the neighborhood ask about the fireplace. Ms. Wallis responded she was out of the country when the fireplace came down and she had not witnessed the event but heard of it from afar.

Commissioner Wright inquired if Ms. Wallis was ok with the dual garage doors. Ms. Wallis stated she actually liked the two door concept more.

Commissioner Minch inquired if there would be any alteration to the driveway. Ms. Wallis stated there would not be.

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

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

Commissioner Minch stated he felt the application was straight forward and he would like to make a motion.

MOTION:

Commissioner Minch moved to approve MCAC 1707 for the revised plan for construction at 212 Illinois Avenue with the finding the proposal promotes compatible architectural design of infill structures as called for in the Historic District Regulations and with the following conditions:

1. The vehicular access into the garage shall be changed to two, separate doors, both featuring Carriage-House styling.
2. All concrete walkways, driveways, patios, etc. visible from the street shall be colored per the City's approved mix. If these features are not proposed in concrete, the material shall be provided for Planning Department review and approval prior to purchase and installation.
3. Mortar used in new and repaired stonework shall be specified to match and blend with the historic mortar color. The stonemason will provide this information to the Planning Department.
4. Stone to be used on all new retaining walls shall be specified to confirm a close match to the existing, natural stone material and shall feature mortared application/joints that match the historic stonework. Dry-stacked stone walls adjacent to the street or on the property in front of the home are not appropriate, but can be utilized in less visible areas at the back of the property if desired.
5. The following shall be provided for the Planning Department's review and approval prior to purchase and installation:
 - The materials for the deck support posts and bases
 - Exterior lighting (location and design)
 - Verification windows/doors feature divided lite grids applied to the exteriors of all units
 - The specific, proposed garage doors
 - Recreated outdoor stone fireplace

SECOND:

Commissioner Wright seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 7-0.

ITEM 5. MCAC 1708 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (Two Window Alterations) - 1207 Manitou Avenue – Mike Edwards of New Vision Custom Builders on behalf of Gregory Cobble and Jennifer Parker, Applicants.

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, presented the Staff Report dated June 30, 2017.

Ms. Anthony stated she had also noticed concrete had been poured on-site which was not compliant with the Historic Guidelines based on color and asked Mr. Edwards to update the Commission regarding how he would handle the non-compliant concrete, be it through staining or replacement with compliant concrete, in addition to his proposal to keep the current windows in place. Ms. Anthony stated she felt a decent stain job on the non-compliant concrete would be acceptable.

Commissioner Wright inquired if the apron which extended on to Manitou Avenue was approved by the Colorado Department of Transportation, as she was under the impression it had not been approved by them, yet it had still somehow managed to occur. Ms. Anthony responded the applicants had obtained an access permit which basically stated they could not back out onto Manitou Avenue and since the applicants had the land area, they would need to provide a turn-around area for themselves.

Commissioner Casey inquired if Ms. Anthony could respond to the image depicting the originally proposed windows with what was actually installed. Ms. Anthony responded if you looked at the side elevation windows on page A-1 of the original plan, the Commission had allowed the bottom right slider window to be installed due to ingress and egress purposes and requirements, but had required the applicants to use a one-over-one double-hang style window as the upper right window, as opposed to a slider, to better match the rest of the windows on the house. Ms. Anthony stated when the plans were submitted, the newly required one-over-one double-hang was simply drawn in over the window on the plans of the original proposal to show the change.

Hearing no further questions or comment for Staff, Chairwoman Nichols invited the applicant to the podium.

Mike Edwards, New Vision Custom Builders, 1430 Sutherland Creek Road, on behalf of Gregory Cobble and Jennifer Parker, 1207 Manitou Avenue, stated this was the first home he had ever built in Manitou Springs, but had built over four hundred houses in El Paso County. Mr. Edwards stated he was claiming ignorance and was used to being able to do pretty much anything he or the homeowner wanted to in terms of home construction. Mr. Edwards stated he was certified as an engineer to make changes in the field which were meant for the betterment of the structure and the sliding windows were installed under the Pikes Peak Regional Building Department approved Permit of the floor plan. Mr. Edwards commented he felt Staff would have noticed this had they looked at the full plans rather than just the elevation plans.

Mr. Edwards inquired if the Commission had received his letter regarding his justification for the matter. The Commission stated they had.

Mr. Edwards stated the windows which were currently installed were standard windows for tub and shower areas and he felt this was reasonable as the applicants had requested privacy as well. Mr. Edwards noted frosted windows could have also provided the necessary privacy, but would not alleviate the problem of having water on the windowsill whether there was a sealant on it or not. Mr. Edwards stated with the windows up higher, there was little chance water could get onto the window sill because they were still below the shower head and the current windows also allowed for better ventilation and light in the home. Mr. Edwards stated, at this point, it would cost five or six thousand dollars (\$5,000 - \$6,000) for the homeowner to have to change those two windows.

Commissioner Wright informed Mr. Edwards of the existence of large frosted octagonal windows which were installed at the Spa Building some years back and stated Murphy Constructors had spent a great deal of time and money to make sure those could not be seen through for privacy reasons, in order to comply with the Historic Preservation Commission's request, and per the requirements for historic infill appearance. Commissioner Wright commented this house, at 1207 Manitou Avenue, was highly visible, especially the two windows in question, which she felt would set a standard for all of the homes around it and was the reason why the Commission was so careful about the guidelines they had established.

At this time, Chairwoman Nichols asked the Commissioners to keep their comments and discussion to a minimum and to only ask questions of the applicant.

Commissioner Wright inquired what options New Vision Custom Builders had looked at in regard to the two windows in question. Mr. Edwards responded he had not looked at anything because of the great cost to the homeowner but the least expensive option would be to replace the windows with a four foot wide (4ft.) window, which would take up the majority of the shower wall, and with a smaller window like the two-oh-three-ohs (2030s) which were on the elevation plans, he would have to replace all of the siding to make it look right which would be expensive. Mr. Edwards stated other than putting in a four-oh (40) the same width as what was already there, it would still need to be a slider because it could not be a single-hung window or a double-hung window given the size.

Commissioner Wright commented she understood the window issue as she had experienced issues finding them for her own house since last October.

Mr. Edwards stated the windows which were currently installed were the functional windows and were one foot by four foot (1' x 4') sliders which also provided ventilation and sunlight and with larger windows, the windows would need to be tempered in order to provide privacy which would cost the homeowners as well. Mr. Edwards also stated the requirement for larger windows would cause the windows to be below sixty inches (60 in.) from the tub deck and only windows above sixty inches (60 in.) would not require the tempering.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired what Mr. Edwards cost estimate would be to replace the two windows. Mr. Edwards responded it would cost about six-thousand dollars (\$6,000) to replace them according the Commission's request and per the elevation plans.

Commissioner Belding inquired if this type of window was a typical window he had installed in other homes and if he had ever installed a window similar to these in any other bathroom which could be an alternative option. Mr. Edwards responded he had not installed one in a tub/shower combination, but he had installed one similar in a standard walk-in shower and commented he actually had one in his home.

Mr. Edwards stated he used to build houses for Pulte Homes, as well as Vantage Homes, and felt this was a typical window for a shower/tub combination due to the fact other windows would need to be tempered if they were lower than sixty inches (60") and because it provided light and ventilation. Mr. Edwards stated the window sill was still an issue and would become wet often and, unless constantly wiped off, could cause problems down the road and lead to warranty issues with the windows.

Commissioner Wright inquired if option one was to leave the windows as they were and option two was the six-thousand dollar (\$6,000) replacements. Mr. Edwards responded the reason it would be so expensive was because of the labor, the need to replace the siding, and to change out the framing for the window. Mr. Edwards commented he was thankful he had not gone forward with putting tile along the interior walls of the shower because it would have been even more expensive to replace the windows. Mr. Edwards stated the house was supposed to be finished by July 21, 2017.

Commissioner Wright inquired if there was a façade option which was not functional, but from the outside appeared to be as with a previous Material Change of Appearance Certification which occurred off of Canon Avenue. Mr. Edwards stated he was open to any suggestions which would save him from having to replace the windows. Ms. Anthony responded she did not know how a four foot wide window could be camouflaged in this manner and expressed doubts it would look like a reasonable fit.

Chairwoman Nichols commented one of the issues the Commission also faced was trying to break up the very large wall space which was created by the current window configuration. Ms. Anthony commented there may be an option to dress it up a bit with trim. Mr. Edwards stated he had a suggestion for how he could break up the large wall space by adding second windows on the first and second floor master walk-in closets on the side of the house which he felt would be cheaper than altering the current window configuration. Ms. Anthony inquired if the closets were located in the front corner of the house. Mr. Edwards stated both closets, on the first and second floor, were located in the front corner of the house. Ms. Anthony stated this would allow Mr. Edwards to then put in the double-hung windows as requested by the Commission.

Mr. Edwards stated if possible, he would like to make the windows slightly smaller than the width for the sliders which were currently in place and requested he be allowed to use the two-oh-three-ohs (2030s) like those originally proposed for the bathroom. Ms. Anthony inquired if Mr. Edwards' request would be similar to the windows found on the back of the house. Mr. Edwards stated the windows would be identical to the ones on the back of the house.

Commissioner Minch inquired if this suggestion would actually cut costs in any significant way. Mr. Edwards stated it would save \$2000 per window by not needing to remove any of the siding. Chairwoman Nichols commented she felt this could be a viable option.

Commissioner Minch inquired if the faux windows in the previously mentioned house were located in a closet. Chairwoman Nichols stated she recalled this to be the case. Mr. Edwards commented in the case of this house the trim idea to accent the current windows would, in his opinion, look a little strange. Chairwoman Nichols stated she felt the real windows were the way to go, especially if it would be significantly cheaper for the homeowners. Mr. Edwards stated it would be less expensive. Ms. Anthony stated she thought it could work and felt it would be preferable to match the window sizes in order to avoid having three (3) different kinds of windows on one side of the house.

Mr. Edwards inquired which windows Ms. Anthony meant to match the new windows to. Ms. Anthony responded she was referring to the window drawn in over top of the other window in the Right Side Elevation plan. Mr. Edwards commented this would take up a lot of closet space and requested he have the option to replace the four-oh (4 -0) window in the bathroom with the two-oh-three-oh (2030) windows if the homeowner would accept the way it would look.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if the options were to complete the work as shown on the building plan or to add a three foot by five foot (3 ft. x 5 ft.) window in the closets on the side of the house on each floor. Mr. Edwards confirmed.

Ms. Anthony stated it would look nicer, from a visual standpoint, to use the windows as shown in the photos next to the doorways. Mr. Edwards inquired if the Commission would allow the installation of the two-oh-three-oh (2030) windows for the bathtub areas, instead of the four foot (4 ft.) windows as shown on the plans, what difference it would make if they were over to the side as two-oh-three-ohs (2030s) instead of a three-oh-five-oh (3050). Ms. Anthony inquired if what Mr. Edwards had originally proposed were the two-oh-three-oh (2030) windows. Mr. Edwards responded the original windows were supposed to be identical to the ones in the back of the house. Ms. Anthony commented there would actually be more fenestration this way.

Commissioner Minch stated he felt the options were to install two foot by three foot (2 ft. x 3 ft.) windows in place of the existing bathroom windows or to add a two foot by three foot (2 ft. x 3 ft.) window to each of the closets on each floor to break up the blank wall space while making the bathroom windows less of an outstanding feature. Commissioner Minch stated he felt this at least gave the home owners a choice. Ms. Anthony stated she felt it was a reasonable compromise. Chairwoman Nichols stated she thought it sounded reasonable as well and inquired if Mr. Edwards had any further comments or questions.

Mr. Edwards stated he would like to address the colored concrete issue and stated he was unaware of the requirement for colored concrete. Mr. Edwards further commented he had not heard of or seen anything in writing which stated the concrete needed to be colored and he had worked with Ms. Anthony to alter the front porch from a wooden deck to a stamped flagstone appearance. Mr. Edwards stated he had not heard anything from Ms. Anthony, the Colorado Department of Transportation, or anyone regarding the need for colored concrete and since the driveway was poured with standard concrete, he did not understand the necessity of it being colored. Commissioner Minch responded the Commission had most certainly discussed the need for colored concrete with Mr. Edwards at the last hearing regarding the property. Ms. Anthony stated the colored concrete was required as part of the conditions for his previous approval of MCAC 1613 and read condition number two for approval of MCAC 1613 which stated "Any concrete walkways, driveways, patios, etc. visible from the street shall be colored per the City's approved mix".

Chairwoman Nichols inquired how the conditions of approval were transmitted to the applicant. Ms. Anthony responded they were usually attached to the plans and although she did not personally approve these plans, Mr. Edwards attended the meeting which the colored concrete was an item of discussion. Chairwoman Nichols inquired if Mr. Edwards had attended that meeting. Mr. Edwards confirmed he had attended, but claimed he did not recall colored concrete being discussed otherwise he would have done it and inquired if the City sidewalk or Colorado Department of Transportation sidewalk needed to be colored as well. Ms. Anthony stated the City did require their sidewalks to be colored and the Colorado Department of Transportation would not necessarily be aware of this because their permit is only an access permit which

does not go into the specifications. Ms. Anthony stated when the Colorado Department of Transportation did work in the City they always asked for the specifications from the City and community.

Mr. Edwards inquired where in the City there was colored concrete. Ms. Anthony responded there was colored concrete, literally, everywhere in the City. Commissioner Moore commented there was concrete recently poured on Ruxton Avenue which was most definitely colored. Chairwoman Nichols stated it had been a standard requirement in the Local Historic Districts for years. Ms. Anthony commented the colored concrete was required for more than just the City sidewalks and was also required for on-site concrete work like driveways, walkways, and the like and stated the condition was clearly stated in his Staff Report, in the motion the Commission had made, and in the meeting discussion.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if Mr. Edwards would be opposed to staining the concrete. Mr. Edwards responded it seemed like the only option to him and he refused to tear it out to replace it because it would cost the homeowner twenty-thousand dollars (\$20,000) to do so. Chairwoman Nichols inquired if staining would be cheaper and just as effective. Mr. Edwards responded he assumed it would be.

Commissioner Minch commented he recently had his concrete, more specifically shotcrete, painted on his property and had found it peeled off incredibly easily, but his neighbor had done the same thing using a stain etching which was much more effective. Commissioner Minch further commented the staining was very tough and long lasting, as well. Ms. Anthony commented the etching compound seeped into the concrete and provided a long lasting stain. Mr. Edwards stated he thought because the concrete was new, there may not be need for the etching chemicals. Ms. Anthony stated there had also been instances which sealing the staining had been required to make the staining even more durable and longer lasting. Mr. Edwards stated he would look into the options and get back to Planning Staff.

Commissioner Minch commented the house seemed to have been built quickly and recalled taking a bike ride past the lot one day and it was empty and then passing by two weeks later to see there was a structure there.

Hearing no further comment from, or question for, the applicants, Chairwoman Nichols opened the Public Hearing.

Hearing no comments or questions from the public, Chairwoman Nichols closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Wright stated every window contractor she had contacted since October was aware of the Historic Preservation Commission and window alterations and stated they were not dumb about this. Commissioner Wright commented she felt it was impossible for the applicant to claim he was unaware and surprised and commented she felt the Commission's compromise was reasonable.

Commissioner Minch stated both of the compromise options would use two foot by three foot (2 ft. x 3 ft.) windows and Option A was replacing the existing sliders in the bathrooms and Option B was leaving the bathroom windows as is, but adding the windows in the closets on both floors. Chairwoman Nichols stated the Commission was amenable to either of the two options for reaching the standard the Historic Preservation Commission would like to see in respect to an historic appearance.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired how the Commission felt about stained concrete. Commissioner Minch stated he felt it was the only realistic option. Ms. Anthony stated there had been locations in the City which

had been stained and found acceptable and commented the Post Office stairs, when first stained, appeared almost bright lipstick red and nearly gave her a heart attack, but faded relatively shortly afterward to appear much more acceptable. Ms. Anthony stated she would like the Commission to require test patches of the staining be submitted for approval by Staff prior to installation.

Mr. Edwards stated the house would be final with Pikes Peak Regional Building Department by the end of the next week and he had a request for a reasonable timeframe for the City to allow him to make the alterations and inquired if he could obtain a Certificate of Occupancy or a temporary seal which would allow the homeowners to move in prior to the completion of the remaining work. Mr. Edwards commented he felt the concrete staining was not a public health hazard or risk and did not feel there was any reason the homeowners could not move in. Ms. Anthony responded there was another action regarding the height of the house which was up for a variance request with the Planning Commission in August and did not think the Planning Director would allow the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy until the variance request had been resolved. Ms. Anthony stated if allowed to issue a conditional Certificate of Occupancy, Staff would gladly do so, but she had received an indication from the Planning Director he would not issue a Certificate of Occupancy until the Planning issues had been resolved.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if the Commission was amending MCAC 1708 or if they should deny the request. Ms. Anthony stated she felt the Commission could approve MCAC 1708 with the revised proposal for the windows and noting the concrete must be stained to meet City color as closely as possible with test patches or examples provided to Staff. Ms. Anthony also stated the Commission needed to make the finding it promoted compatible architectural design as called for in the Historic District regulations.

Commissioner Minch stated expecting Pikes Peak Regional Building Department to know about the intricate processes of the City's Local Historic District requirements under the guidelines was asking too much of them and he would therefore like to add a third item to the revision which was a notification to the builder and applicants reminding them of the conditions of their approval or for Staff and the Commission to do so to ensure there were no questions regarding the requirements. Ms. Anthony stated Staff generally issued a letter of approval to the applicants which stated the conditions of their approval and either the meeting minutes or a reference to the conditions on the Property Improvement Permit which was also used to release the Pikes Peak Regional Building Department's permit. Chairwoman Nichols stated it was good Staff did this, but did not feel the action was needed for inclusion in the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Casey inquired if the Commission needed to specify the windows were required for each floor. Commissioner Minch stated they would specify this and mention both closets as well.

MOTION:

Commissioner Minch moved to approve MCAC 1708 with the finding the proposal promotes compatible architectural design as called for in the Historic District regulations with the following revisions:

1. The Applicant shall choose one of two options in regard to the windows facing outward onto Ute Trail and on the Right Side Elevation Plans with the understanding compliant windows must be installed:
 - a. Remove and replace the four foot (4 ft.) sliding bathroom windows in the first and second floor bathrooms with two foot by three foot (2 ft. x 3 ft.) one-over-one (1/1) double or single

hung windows in style and operation installed in either shingles or pairs as called for in the original proposal of MCAC 1613 or;

- b. Install one (1) two foot by three foot (2 ft. x 3 ft.) one-over-one (1/1) double or single hung window in each of the walk-in closets on the first and second floor.
2. Concrete staining shall be required on all sidewalks, driveways, patios, etc. to better conform to the Historic District regulations and samples or test patches of the staining shall be provided for the Planning Department's review and approval prior to purchase and installation.

SECOND:

Commissioner Jackson seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 7-0.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

ITEM 6. Discussion Regarding Historic Landscapes and Trees

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, stated Staff was still in the process of researching the topic and would have information for the Commission regarding Historic Landscapes and Trees at their next Regular Meeting.

Commissioner Minch commented he had seen several references to Colorado Springs in the packet which always made him cringe because they had a much larger budget and felt the Commission should look into smaller historic towns with more limited budgets to see how they had balanced and dealt with the issue of historic landscapes and trees. Chairwoman Nichols commented she had seen on the internet many historic districts in communities which fit that description which had done something in regard to significant trees and historic landscapes which might interest the Commission.

NON-AGENDA ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

Ms. Anthony informed the Commission that Commissioner Patricia McLean had resigned from the Historic Preservation Commission due to scheduling conflicts with the Regular Meeting time.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, Chairwoman Nichols adjourned the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

Minutes Prepared by: Dylan Becker, Planner I