



**MANITOU SPRINGS
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 27, 2017**

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, September 27, 2017, in Council Chambers at 606 Manitou Avenue. Chairwoman Nichols declared a quorum present and called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm. The following Commissioners attended:

PRESENT: Chair ANN NICHOLS
Vice Chair LISETTE CASEY
Commissioner ROBERT JACKSON
Commissioner SAMANTHA BELDING

ABSENT: Commissioner NEALE MINCH (excused)
Commissioner TAMMILA WRIGHT (excused)
Commissioner DEBORAH MOORE (excused)

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

GUESTS: None

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ITEM 1. September 6, 2017

MOTION:

Vice Chair Casey moved to approve the September Regular Meeting Minutes of the Historic Preservation Commission as presented.

SECOND:

Commissioner Jackson seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

ITEM 2. Brook Street Bridge Preferred Rehabilitation Alternative. This item was scheduled to be heard on September 19, 2017 and was approved as recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission by a vote of 7-0.

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

ITEM 2. MCAC 1709 – Material Change of Appearance (Addition to Existing Residence) – 11 Delaware Road – Ken and Mary Cowdery, Applicants

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, presented the Staff Report dated September 1, 2017.

Commissioner Belding inquired if the current design of the chimney was going to be investigated prior to construction of the addition to ensure its structural stability or if there was a game plan should the chimney be damaged. Ms. Anthony responded she would let the applicants answer the question.

Hearing no further questions for Staff, Chairwoman Nichols invited the Applicants to the podium.

Ken and Mary Cowdery, 11 Delaware Road, stated they would like to answer as many questions as possible and, in regard to the chimney, they were going to try to convert the fireplace to gas and would likely not need to extend the structure. Mr. Cowdery stated he was working with Ray's Chimney to help make those types of decisions.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if the chimney and gas fireplace would be incorporated with the addition. Mr. Cowdery responded the chimney exterior would be a rock wall in one of the bedrooms.

Mr. Cowdery showed an image to the Commission depicting the railing and stated it would be made of two-by-two (2" x 2") wood balusters and painted to match the trim. He commented the grade would be a bit above what was depicted in the plans and there was no way to see the foundation next to the house because the wood extended to the ground and popped out an inch or two on the side to match the existing structure; so there was no exposed foundation at all.

Mrs. Cowdery stated she liked the stone look for the foundation and if there was any foundation showing, she would prefer to use stone to cover it. Mr. Cowdery again noted he did not think the foundation would be visible at all.

Mr. Cowdery displayed an architectural image of the proposed windows and stated the current windows on the house were a mix of styles, sizes, and aesthetics, which he would like to make more uniform in appearance. He commented there was a gap on one side of the existing bank of windows which caused an asymmetrical appearance, and felt symmetry would help maintain the historic appearance of the cottage. Mr. Cowdery further commented if he moved the door on the same elevation to the side it would look worse than not having it there at all.

Mrs. Cowdery stated a door next to the fireplace was the best location. Mr. Cowdery stated he would like to keep the plan as presented and commented the windows in the document he handed out were a more accurate representation than what was shown in the drawing at the time of submittal.

Mr. Cowdery stated rafter tails would also be installed and the clapboard would have the same dimensions and texture as the rest of the house. He noted there would be no exposed concrete anywhere and the mortar color for the retaining wall located by the parking area would be colored per the City's required mix. Mr. Cowdery stated the exterior lighting would be very similar to the one on the garage next to the door.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if the proposed windows would match exactly the existing windows. Mr. Cowdery responded, of the windows which were available, the six (6) pane and nine (9) pane windows were much harder to find and where it looked like there were only four (4) windows, there were actually eight (8) windows because each was a slider. Mrs. Cowdery commented it was four (4) windows, but each window had two sashes.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if they intended to replace all of the windows and asked what the windows were made of. Mrs. Cowdery responded there were three (3) different vendors and they had yet to decide on which one to use, but each were vinyl.

Ms. Anthony stated the main issues with the proposal were the replacement of the windows and the removal of the original door. It was her recommendation not to allow removal of the existing fenestration on the front of the house. Ms. Anthony stated noted there were options to window replacement, such as restoring the windows or placing storm windows over them. She also expressed concern with removing the front door as this would have a major visual impact on the architecture of the building.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired what would happen to the stairway that went up to the doorway. Mr. Cowdery responded it would not change and there were four (4) steps which went up to the garage which could also service the house.

Ms. Anthony commented there appeared to be a flat area in front of the house, like a patio. Mr. Cowdery stated there was not really a porch on the house as the original porch was enclosed and incorporated into the house.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if people simply went up the stairs and onto the porch. Mr. Cowdery responded it was more of a patio or flat area with a single step up into the house.

Chairwoman Nichols asked for clarification if the windows in the front would all be replaced with new windows. Mr. Cowdery responded the current windows leaked very badly due to their age and he doubted he could find anyone willing to repair them.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if the current windows could open. Mr. Cowdery stated some of the windows opened, but they opened up directly into the house. Ms. Anthony commented the windows in her office opened very similarly. Mr. Cowdery stated, of the six (6) windows on the north side of the house, only two (2) were able to open as the others were either nailed or sealed shut.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if the proposed windows would slide, as opposed to opening into the house. Mr. Cowdery responded the new windows would slide and they had looked for something as close as they could find to match the existing windows. Mrs. Cowdery commented they tried to match the size and function of the original windows.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if the applicants had considered refurbishing the existing windows at all. Mr. Cowdery responded he was unsure his carpenter had the necessary skills for that specific work. Mrs. Cowdery commented the existing windows had really been abused and there was even evidence a dog had chewed them. Mr. Cowdery responded he could research the matter further.

Ms. Anthony stated her recommendation was, at the very least, the Applicants investigate refurbishing the windows and also stated there would need to be more documentation should the Commission allow the windows to be replaced. The windows were the primary architectural feature on the building and there were companies which refurbished windows in much worse shape than the ones on this cottage. Ms. Anthony stated if the Applicants were to replace the windows, they would need to find windows which actually replicated size, dimension, and number of lights as the original windows. From Staff's standpoint, this was a serious change to the building which needed to be better documented.

Chairwoman Nichols stated the Applicants would need to supply some photographic documentation regarding the current state of the existing windows and to explore, at the very least, talking to someone who refurbishes windows to determine how difficult it would be to do so.

Mrs. Cowdery commented the house around the corner from them had put in cathedral windows which were brand new and nothing like the old cottage windows which existed previously. Mr. Cowdery stated they were at least trying to maintain symmetry and felt the appearance from the front would still maintain the appearance of historic Manitou Springs. Mrs. Cowdery stated it was a little cottage and refurbishing the windows would be an expense they may not be able to afford. Ms. Anthony stated repairing windows could potentially be cheaper than replacing them and offered to let the Cowderys use some of her books which showed how to repair the windows themselves, should they want to explore this option.

Vice Chair Casey inquired if retaining the doorway and changing it into a window was something the Applicants were interested in doing. Mr. Cowdery responded if they were required to keep the front door in its present location, it would be non-functioning. Mrs. Cowdery commented, aesthetically from the inside, the door would need to be covered in some way.

Chairwoman Nichols commented if it was not going to be a door, it should be filled with the windows as recommended by Ms. Anthony which match the other existing windows or all new windows with better documentation of what the windows would look like. Mr. Cowdery commented when they had shopped for windows, they discovered there were not any nine (9) pane windows in standard sizes, which was the reason the plans showed the windows as such, and even custom sizes did not come in nine (9) panes either. Mr. Cowdery also stated the windows on the house were equally divided in nine (9) pane and six (6) pane windows and the widths of the windows were inconsistent such as the four (4) windows in front that actually touched one another.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if Ms. Anthony was comfortable handling the window alterations administratively or if she would like the Applicants to come back before the Commission. Ms. Anthony responded she would rather the Applicants come before the Commission again and there needed to be more information so the Commission could render a decision.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if timing was an issue for the applicants. Mr. Cowdery stated they would like to get the foundation going, but the windows could wait. Ms. Anthony stated the Commission could approve the request with everything, except for the windows, which would be brought back to the Commission for approval.

Vice Chair Casey inquired if the Commission wanted the windows on the addition to match the other windows. Mr. Cowdery responded the windows on the addition would match the windows on the older structure if they were permitted to replace the existing windows.

Chairwoman Nichols stated the Commission would make a decision before the Applicants reached that point because the Applicants would be coming back in front of the Commission at a later date with better documentation of the status of the windows and a better visual of the replacement windows. Chairwoman Nichols stated, for now, the Commission could approve the request subject to the additional exploration of the window refurbishment and whether or not the door will stay in place. Mr. Cowdery responded he would research getting the windows refurbished.

Commissioner Belding inquired if it would be worth exploring a superficial façade to make the outward aesthetic appear like a functioning door, as opposed to actually retaining the door. Ms. Anthony responded the important part was the trim, the feature did not necessarily need to look like the door was still in place, but retain the opening with trim around it with some sort of infill, like a window above, and solid below, so it followed the line of other windows. Commissioner Belding commented the Applicants could make it look like a door on the outside, but more like a window from the inside. Ms. Anthony stated the Applicants could do something where the trim was left as is, but install a window in the upper portion of the opening with a continuation of the siding in the lower part of the opening, only broken by the existing trim. Chairwoman Nichols commented she had something similar at her family cabin where a doorway was converted into a window in the upper portion of the opening and infilled in the lower section. Mr. Cowdery responded he felt the idea would work just fine. Ms. Anthony commented the idea was actually fairly common to show there had been a change while maintaining the historic feature and appearance of the building. Chairwoman Nichols stated this would be another item the Commission requested the Applicants look further into.

Mrs. Cowdery inquired if metal roofs were approved in the Historic Districts. Chairwoman Nichols responded it was a rather controversial topic and there had been a few metal roofs approved on log cabins, but not for cottages. Ms. Anthony commented there was an option called stone coating on metal which had the appearance of shingles. Mr. Cowdery commented he thought the owner of the property at the top of Elk Path had this on their roof. Ms. Anthony stated sometimes there was a discount on insurance for using hail resistant shingles, as well.

Hearing no further comment from, or questions for, the Applicants, Chairwoman Nichols opened the Public Hearing for comment. Hearing none, Chairwoman Nichols closed the Public Hearing.

Vice Chair Casey inquired if the Commission was going to approve the request subject to further exploration into the door and windows. Ms. Anthony stated she thought it would be good to go through the conditions and any that had been answered by the applicants could be removed.

Vice Chair Casey inquired if there would be a new walkway leading up to the door. Mr. Cowdery responded there would not be.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Casey moved to approve MCAC 1709 at 11 Delaware Road to allow construction of an addition to the existing home with the following conditions:

- 1) Specifications on the new windows in the north and west elevations of the addition shall be provided for review by the Historic Preservation Commission and approval prior to issuance of the Building Permit for the new construction.
- 2) Further review of the removal and infill of the original front door is necessary. The Applicants shall discuss with the Commission leaving the door in place, or the option of infilling it with a window in the same dimensions and location as the current doorway. Should the Commission approved the window infill alternative, this may either be administratively reviewed and approved, or require further Commission action.
- 3) Any areas of exposed concrete, including foundation walls over 6" above grade, visible to the street shall be integrally-colored per the City's selected mortar mix, or clad in stone.

Vice Chair Casey also offered the finding the proposal is consistent with the purpose of the Historic Preservation Regulations by encouraging and fostering private rehabilitation and ownership (use) of historic properties.

SECOND:

Commissioner Jackson seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

ITEM 3. MCAC 1710 – Material Change of Appearance (Window Replacement – After-the-Fact) – 337 Pilot Knob Avenue, Unit 1 – Blair Babcock, Applicant

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, presented the Staff Report dated September 1, 2017, noting the windows in question were not the primary features facing the street and, although it would have been nice to retain the original windows where possible, these windows did not look out of place for the district.

Vice Chair Casey inquired if the size of the windows was the same more or less. Ms. Anthony stated they were.

Hearing no further questions for Staff, Chairwoman Nichols invited the Applicant to the podium.

Blair Babcock, 339 Pilot Knob Avenue, stated he would be sure to follow the process in the future and the windows in question were replaced due to their deterioration. Mr. Babcock stated the original windows were old single glazed windows.

Hearing no further comment from, or questions for, the Applicant, Chairwoman Nichols opened the Public Hearing for comment. Hearing none, Chairwoman Nichols closed the Public Hearing.

Chairwoman Nichols stated the application was straight forward and inquired if any Commissioner wanted to make a motion.

MOTION:

Commissioner Belding moved to approve MCAC 1710 at 337 Pilot Knob Avenue, Unit #1 for replacement of the windows on the street facing and west facades, as currently executed, and with the condition the City assess the additional fees for after-the-fact permitting.

SECOND:

Commissioner Jackson seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

V. NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 4. MCAC 1711 – Material Change of Appearance (New Construction) – 722 Manitou Avenue – Faruk Sahin, Applicant

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, presented the Staff Report dated September 21, 2017.

Vice Chair Casey inquired, regarding the visibility of the loft, if Staff was more concerned with its visibility from the street or, for example, from the nearby Congregational Church. Ms. Anthony responded Staff was concerned with its visibility from the street in front of the building and, it needed to be demonstrated if it could be seen when standing across the street. However, as one moved in distance from the property, that mitigated some visibility issues. Ms. Anthony stated Staff was more concerned with what was visible when one was closer to the property from Manitou Avenue.

Vice Chair Casey inquired, regarding the floodplain, if there was need for fill in order to make the elevations more compatible. Ms. Anthony responded it could make things difficult because of ADA compliance, which often avoided having a step into a building and could require a ramp be put in place. She noted a few years ago, before the City had updated its floodplain maps, the base flood elevation through town was three to four feet (3-4 ft.) higher and a number of years ago, someone had looked at building on this property. That developer discovered to install an ADA-compliant ramp, it would extend halfway back into the site which made development difficult and infeasible. Ms. Anthony commented Mr. Sahin may need to add a ramp of some sort and recess the entryway in order to access the required floor level, but hopefully all that would be required was something minimal. She felt this was an important issue because it would affect the design.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if it was unusual for a preliminary approval to be given considering there were significant questions regarding the building design. Ms. Anthony responded the Applicant had requested review of a Concept Plan for the property on the next Planning Commission Agenda, so the Applicants were early in their planning stages and giving them input from the Historic Preservation Commission prior to further development of their plans would help them finalize their design and specifications. Ms. Anthony commented with something of this magnitude, it was not a bad idea for them to check in at this early stages.

Chairwoman Nichols stated this was the first time in a number of years there had been any construction in the Downtown Zone.

Commissioner Belding inquired, if the retaining wall needed to be reconstructed, how would it tie into the adjacent properties and their retaining walls. Ms. Anthony responded the Applicant and his family actually owned the adjacent retaining walls, but their engineer and architect would need to look at that and determine whether there was need for a physical tie-in for stability.

Hearing no further questions for Staff, Chairwoman Nichols invited the Applicant to the podium.

Faruk Sahin, 724 Manitou Avenue, stated he had lived in Manitou Springs for the last six years (6 yrs.).

Bill Beard, 7 W. Caramillo St., Colorado Springs, was introduced as the Architect on the project and stated he had officially retired and only worked on what he called fun projects. He stated the footprint of the building was one-thousand square feet (1,000 ft²) with two (2) floors for commercial use and one (1) floor for residential use. In order to get the level of detail needed for full approval, it would take a lot of money, time, and he was not comfortable proceeding without knowing they had a path which was feasible to accomplish. Mr. Beard stated the stairways would take up one-hundred to one-hundred and fifty feet (100 - 150 ft²) each and there was an exacerbating problem with the adjacent building to the east which required maintaining an entry into it at twelve feet (12 ft.) above the grade. Mr. Beard stated, regarding the stairways, they still had to maintain control between commercial and residential levels and had looked at several options in order to do so. He noted the design pushed the limits by adding the loft space and felt it helped the residential portion of the building come alive. Mr. Beard said he thought the loft would not be visible from anywhere other than the library lawn and the parking lot on the back side of the property. The basement, which was not allowed to be utilized for anything other than storage, actually made floorplanning easier for him as it improved the vertical circulation of the building and would allow more usable room on the commercial levels. In regard to the floodplain issue, he had an Improvement Location Certificate which showed no vertical elevation bench marks, which meant they would need to have a survey done. Mr. Beard stated he thought the finished floor level was at six-thousand three-hundred and twenty-two feet (6,322 ft.) in elevation and the base floodplain level was at six-thousand three-hundred and eighteen feet (6,318 ft.) in elevation. Although the calculation for the finished floor level may be off by a foot or two, he felt it was to their advantage to build at curb level because ADA regulations for ramps would be a huge obstacle to overcome. Mr. Beard stated there were two entrances, one commercial and one residential, which could be offset from the sidewalk by six to eight inches (6"– 8") and still properly work at grade. He indicated residential entry would be controlled differently and separately from the commercial entry mechanisms. Mr. Beard stated there would not be security devices on the exterior of the building, but there would be alarm systems installed. He indicated he was pushing the envelope in terms of usable commercial space and was currently in the five-hundred and fifty to six-hundred square foot (550 – 600 ft²) range of usable space per floor. The main restaurant level had an auxiliary coffee bar in the back and, if done correctly, there

would be no need for an elevator, which would maximize the usable space. Mr. Beard commented it was a difficult task to accommodate two staircases and leave enough square footage to make the usable space viable. As an architect, his first responsibility was managing the owners' functional issues, followed by the community's contextual issues and, with such a small square footage, managing the two was quite complicated. He indicated he was concerned about the budget and looking at a simple back to the building, which would be two toned stucco. The front side of the building would be clad in a subtle and less expensive type of manufactured stone with a smooth appearance and would also be mortared, similar to a real stone wall; the pilasters would be in the same color as the rest of the front, but would stick out about six inches (6 in.). Mr. Beard also stated the stonework came up to the spring line and stuck out just enough to create a shadow line just past the pilasters and there would also be a simple cornice with some sort of central element. Mr. Beard stated whether the element was stepped or sloped, would be up to the Applicant - he preferred the sloped option. Mr. Beard commented anytime there was a ninety degree (90°) turn, there was potential for water intrusion and he preferred something with smooth joints. When using metal coping, there was little room for error and it should be installed only by a professional. Mr. Beard stated, in regard to mechanical equipment, his preference was to put it in the basement but, in this building the water heaters would be located inside and the air handlers would likely be located on the roof. If the loft concept was approved, they would use it as a screen to block the air handlers from view but they did not have mechanical engineers yet, or a completed survey, to determine the vertical chases. The loft itself was a secondary objective to the building's performance, but to the person living in it, it would be something great. It would require a spiral staircase, in order to avoid any vertical stairway issues, and the loft would be a single room, like a studio. Mr. Beard stated the loft would have the potential for a half bath and the roof would be sloped away from the front of the building for drainage purposes. The loft would be relatively inexpensive to construct, but he thought, given the tight budget, the money might be better spent on the rest of the building and, with the basement not an option, his hope was it would provide more space in the interior to work with since it would be utilized as storage. Mr. Beard commented the doors and windows would be made of steel or aluminum and medium to heavy duty grade, as was atypical for commercial buildings. What mattered most to him was the color of the building and he was looking at using steel/wrought iron railings for the balcony guardrails, of which, the requirements were forty-two inches (42 in.) in the commercial spaces and thirty-six inches (36 in.) in the residential spaces. Mr. Beard also stated he was looking at making the building as adaptable to other uses as possible. He stated his design philosophy was to be understated and, in regard to the stonework, he envisioned the stone in two medium tones and the two-tone stucco color would be based on the stone color choices. The trim colors would be based on the stone and stucco choices. Mr. Beard commented commercial windows usually had a baked enamel finish and were hardly ever painted in the field any more, unless done with special colors the manufacturer did not carry. Mr. Beard also stated he preferred to use the manufacturer provided colors. The front elevation and lighting were the next things he would work on and, if the basement was lost, he needed to figure out how to rework the west-side stairway. He indicated he was thinking of installing a downcast light at the entrance of the restaurant and the door would also be recessed slightly. The awning over the residential portion needed lighting and two (2) small up-lights would be used at the top of the structure.

Ms. Anthony stated one thing she noticed was, even though the buildings on either side had been heavily altered, there was still a sense of some of the features, such as the pediment. The cornice on the building left of the subject site had the same kind of angles as one of the options. Mr. Beard commented the building a couple of doors west was a little overdone; the cornice on that structure was too large. Mr. Beard stated the four-story building across the street was one of the more interesting, simple buildings in town and was considerably taller than the proposed building. The building to the east was three feet lower than the proposed building. He was not trying to match adjacent buildings in terms of height.

Ms. Anthony responded there were buildings across the street which were also only one story tall and there was a lot of up and down as far as the rhythm of the streetscape.

Hearing no further comment from, or questions for, the Applicant, Chairwoman Nichols opened the Public Hearing for comment. Hearing none, Chairwoman Nichols closed the Public Hearing.

Chairwoman Nichols stated the project was obviously in the preliminary stages and inquired if any of the Commissioners thought something along these lines would be a fitting addition to the block, as she did.

Commissioner Jackson agreed with Chairwoman Nichols.

Commissioner Belding stated she felt the building would be an improvement to the area.

Ms. Anthony commented she felt the issues which had been brought up during the meeting were things which could be addressed and she did not see anything, at this point, which was an application stopper.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if the application for this request going to the Planning Commission was a Concept Plan. Ms. Anthony responded the Applicants were requesting a conceptual review and there would likely be variances needed during the more formal project approval.

Chairwoman Nichols commented she felt this was a good first step and provided a good idea of the possibilities for what could go in at the location and on some of the preliminary issues with the building.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Casey moved to approve MCAC 1711 for construction of a new building at 722 Manitou Avenue, as presented, with the requirement that additional information and final draft plans on the items as noted in the Staff Report and responding to any additional comments or requests made by the Historic Preservation Commission be provided for final review and approval. Vice Chair Casey stated the preliminary approval was based on the finding the concept of the new building would be consistent with the Historic Preservation Regulations by improving the economic vitality of the historic areas of the community through encouraging and fostering compatible architectural design.

SECOND:

Commissioner Belding seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

ITEM 5. MCAC 1712 – Material Change of Appearance (Modification of Retaining Wall to Install Parking) – 901 Prospect Place – Jay Rohrer, Applicant

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, presented the Staff Report dated September 22, 2017, and stated Staff had received no comment regarding the request until the day of the meeting. She presented a letter received from a neighbor.

Commissioner Belding inquired how the extra load from run-off would be evaluated over time. Ms. Anthony responded Public Services would need to look into that further because, with driveways like this around the City, there were often issues with tracking or erosion and often it was not the water which was a problem but the sediments or whatever was being carried by the water. Ms. Anthony commented Plan Manitou stated a preference for avoiding impervious surfaces, but the City's regulations required paving of new driveways. Ms. Anthony also commented Staff needed to work with Public Services to determine the best course of action for small areas like this.

Hearing no further questions for Staff, Chairwoman Nichols invited the Applicant to the podium.

Jay Rohrer, 208 Ruxton Avenue, stated there would be about a nine percent (9%) slope on the wing walls, but he was hoping for less; a lot of the historic stone walls in Manitou Springs had a double layer, which would help to stretch the usable stone so there should be enough to complete the project without gaps. Mr. Rohrer also stated the trick was to not get too specific this early in the game because he was fairly confident a gas line existed somewhere in the vicinity of the proposed work, which could prove incredibly costly to move. So he might not be able to go through with the project if there were too many obstacles to overcome and it became too expensive. He commented, in regard to the permeable surface issue, he was hopeful he could find an amenable solution as he was interested in mitigating the permeable surface issue and stated he was looking for a good stone mason to do the work, as he was having difficulty finding someone. Ms. Anthony stated she could provide Mr. Rohrer with some options.

Hearing no further comment from, or questions for, the Applicant, Chairwoman Nichols opened the Public Hearing for comment. Hearing none, Chairwoman Nichols closed the Public Hearing.

Chairwoman Nichols stated, in regard to the letter from the neighbor, the wall was not located on City property.

Commissioner Belding stated she thought the letter was not only inaccurate, but used too strong of language.

Ms. Anthony stated Mr. Rohrer would need to show Staff where his property line was, but the City did allow retaining walls to go into the City right-of-way if accepted by Public Services.

Chairwoman Nichols stated Pawnee went past her property and her wall jogged a good two feet (2 ft.) into the right-of-way. Ms. Anthony responded Staff referred to these type of situations as private improvements on public property.

Chairwoman Nichols commented she was aware of many of these types of driveways on Pawnee because, given the lack of parking in town, it was a common practice. Ms. Anthony stated she would like to see some funding set aside out of the parking program which would help homeowners develop off-street parking in much of the congested areas because, even though there would be a loss to some of the on-street parking, it would help free up some of the congestion on the street.

Vice Chair Casey inquired if the Commission was going to further address the letter. Chairwoman Nichols stated, from her perspective, the compelling thing to her was it may be highly important to provide off-street parking and, if done correctly, it could actually be a big improvement. Ms. Anthony stated this did not need to be addressed in the motion, but it will be noted the matter was taken into consideration.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Casey moved to approve MCAC 1712 at 901 Prospect Place for modification of the existing, historic retaining wall to provide for a parking area on the property with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall provide plans for Staff review and approval which detail:
 - a) How much of the retaining walls on each side of the parking area will be clad reusing the greenstone removed from the existing wall.
 - b) The material for any area of retaining wall around the parking area that is not to be clad in the re-used greenstone. The treatment of this area may be concrete colored per the City's approved mix, or if it is ½ or less of the length of the parking, landscape timbers or other landscape material as approved by Staff.
 - c) The treatment of the transition between the existing stone wall and the new retaining walls.
2. Any concrete paving shall be colored per the City's approved color mix.

And the finding, with the above recommendations, that the proposal will be consistent with the purpose of the Historic Preservation Regulations by encouraging and fostering private rehabilitation and ownership (use) of historic properties.

SECOND:

Commissioner Belding seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no Other Business to discuss.

NON-AGENDA ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Belding stated, regarding the development of the open lot at 722 Manitou Avenue, the City should collaborate with the property owner to figure out a better way to engage the community about the project and noted the site had the potential for some great archaeology. Ms. Anthony stated the City's jail used to be housed on the property and she had heard rumors the jail cells were simply filled in, intact. In the course of the development of the property it was possible the owner might discover things subsurface.

Commissioner Belding stated she felt it would be great to outreach to the community and schools to try to involve Manitou Youth in history and archaeology.

Ms. Anthony also noted the development would be required to hold at least one community/neighborhood meeting as part of the Major Development application. She felt it would be a good idea to add the property to the historic plaque program in town.

Vice Chair Casey inquired if the building housing Manitou Springs Real Estate was also the site of the original post office. Ms. Anthony responded it was, in fact, the old post office and she was hoping Rachel Buller would donate anything related to the old post office to the Heritage Center, as they were amassing quite the postal collection of artifacts.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, Chairwoman Nichols adjourned the meeting at 8:04 p.m.

Minutes Prepared by: Dylan Becker, Planner I