



**MANITOU SPRINGS
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, December 6, 2017**



I. CALL TO ORDER and APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, December 6, 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 Commissioner ROBERT JACKSON Commissioner NEALE MINCH Commissioner TAMMILA WRIGHT Commissioner SAMANTHA BELDING
ABSENT:	Vice Chair LISETTE CASEY (excused)
STAFF:	Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner Dylan Becker, Planner I
GUESTS:	None

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ITEM 1. September 27, 2017

MOTION:

Commissioner Jackson moved to approve the September 27, 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes of the Historic Preservation Commission as presented.

SECOND:

Commissioner Belding seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 3-0. Commissioner Wright and Commissioner Minch abstained as they were not present for the September 27, 2017 Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.

III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

There was no Notice of Council Action to discuss.

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 2. MCAC 1713 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (Alteration to Roof for Second Floor Area) – 918 Prospect Place – Maria Masone, Applicant

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

Chairwoman Nichols stated she had gone to visit the property and noted there was only one door at the entrance of the property, as opposed to two, as the Staff Report had stated. Ms. Anthony responded she thought there were two entrances because the photos she had obtained showed two doors instead of the single door and window combo which currently existed at the location.

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

Tom Murphy, 918 Prospect Place, introduced himself as the husband of the Applicant.

Maria Masone, 918 Prospect Place, stated she was thankful for Ms. Anthony's efforts through the process and commented there was already an existing skylight in the roof. Ms. Masone stated when Geoquest had done her initial plans, they had informed her she could get more space by turning the roof another direction, but she felt it too drastically altered the historic appearance and authenticity of the home. Ms. Masone stated she had Geoquest redraw the plans to appear as structurally similar to the original structure as possible.

Ms. Anthony inquired the location of the skylight on the roof. Ms. Masone responded it was located on the north side of the roof on the side of the structure not seen from the street. Ms. Anthony stated if the Applicants wanted to install a new skylight, it could be administratively approved, because it was not visible from the street.

Ms. Masone stated she would also like to remodel the front porch once they had more living space and had already purchased some posts without the bannisters at a garage sale. Ms. Anthony stated a restoration project to restore a feature like this might be eligible for the maintenance mini-grant and commented the Applicants may want to consider waiting until Dylan Becker, Planner I, went to the El Paso County Assessor's Office to retrieve the old photographs from the property record cards as they may show the how the porch looked during the 1950s. Ms. Anthony also commented the Applicants may want to look around the neighborhood as well because, often times, the porches in the neighborhood used a square baluster with the turned porch posts, which were much less expensive.

Ms. Masone stated she had heard from the Summit Ministries their house was not always located where it was currently and was originally located on the opposite corner of the street, but there was no actual proof this was verifiably true. Chairwoman Nichols stated she had lived in Manitou Springs all of her life and the house had been located in the same place as long as she had lived in the town. Chairwoman Nichols expressed doubt there was any truth to the claim although she believed it was a truly lovely house.

Commissioner Minch held up one of the images from the Staff Report and inquired if the area being raised was the area he had circled. Ms. Masone responded Commissioner Minch was correct. Commissioner

Minch inquired if there was a chimney located there. Mr. Murphy responded there was a chimney on the far backside and he had wondered if it needed to be removed, but his wife liked the historic brickwork and wanted to keep the feature. Commissioner Minch inquired if the chimney would possibly just need to be raised. Ms. Masone responded it was a non-functioning chimney and therefore it did not really matter whether it was raised or not. Ms. Anthony commented she had a non-functioning chimney in her home which she kept because it was original and had wrought iron brackets. Commissioner Minch inquired if the three-foot raise in the roof would essentially swallow and eliminate the chimney or if the Applicants intended to make it visible by raising it. Chairwoman Nichols stated the architectural drawings showed the chimney still visible. Ms. Anthony stated, ultimately, if the chimney needed to be removed, it would not affect the approval, but she understood why its visibility would want to be maintained as she certainly would want it to be so on her home.

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.

Commissioner Wright commented the request was straight forward. Chairwoman Nichols commented, as Ms. Anthony had pointed out, the alteration would make very little change to the home's appearance.

MOTION:

Commissioner Minch moved to approve MCAC 1713 for the construction of new roof area as depicted on the elevation drawings dated August 22, 2017, by Geoquest, LLC, at 918 Prospect Place with the following findings:

- Is consistent with the Commission's purpose to promote the educational, cultural, economic, and general welfare of the public through the protection and enhancement of this historic structure and instill and foster civic pride in the legacy and achievements of the past.
- Improves economic vitality of this area of the historic district through encouraging and fostering the historic rehabilitation of the structure.
- Promotes compatible architectural design for the alterations to this structure.
- Promotes and encourages the private rehabilitation of this historic structure.

SECOND:

Commissioner Belding seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 5-0.

ITEM 3. MCAC 1714 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (New Construction) – 722 Manitou Avenue – Todd Liming of behalf of Faruk Sahin, Applicant

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, handed out and presented the City Memorandum dated December 5, 2017 to the Commissioners at the dais. Ms. Anthony stated the Applicant was requesting postponement of the request because the architect was unable to attend the meeting and they were anticipating small changes

to the design. Ms. Anthony also stated the Applicant and the architect would like to meet with Staff to discuss exterior materials prior to meeting with the Historic Preservation Commission.

Commissioner Minch inquired if Staff had any idea when the actual construction would begin. Ms. Anthony responded Mr. Sahin needed to complete construction prior to the potential parking garage which might be constructed at the Wichita Parking Lot because the construction crew would need the area to stage and get materials across the creek.

MOTION:

Commissioner Belding moved to postpone MCAC 1714 until the January Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.

SECOND:

Commissioner Wright seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 5-0.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

ITEM 4. Information Regarding State Tax Credit Application Fees

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, presented the City Memorandum dated November 30, 2017. Ms. Anthony stated one of the differences between the 1990 and 2014 legislation was under the 1990 legislation, kitchen and bathroom remodels were permitted as part of a larger construction project, but under the 2014 legislation they were not permitted at all. Ms. Anthony commented if someone wanted to perform a kitchen or bathroom remodel, they may want to do it under the 1990 legislation. Ms. Anthony also stated she had learned, as part of the 1990 legislation, there was a cap on the review fees the City could charge for a project, however, there was no cap on fees under the 2014 legislation. Ms. Anthony stated, after looking at the current fee schedule, she realized the fees only reflected one type of application, not two, and under the 1990 legislation the cap on fees was seven-hundred and fifty dollars (\$750.00). Ms. Anthony commented the City was at nearly one-thousand one-hundred dollars (\$1100.00) for the most expensive application and stated under the 1990 program she had shuffled some of the fees around to ensure everything made sense and there was not just one-hundred dollars (\$100.00) between the second and third tiers. Ms. Anthony stated, under the 2014 program, the City was only supposed to charge an initial application fee, so she basically made those act like the first and second part application fees under the 1990 program. Ms. Anthony commented the result was the City would receive slightly less money in fees, but at least they would be in compliance with the regulations.

Commissioner Minch inquired if the remodel on Washington Avenue included a kitchen. Ms. Anthony stated the remodel did include the kitchen and the tax credit fell under the 1990 legislation which allowed kitchens and bathrooms to be remodeled as part of a larger construction project.

Commissioner Belding inquired if the 2014 program did not allow kitchens and bathrooms to be remodeled using the Historic Tax Credits because people were abusing the allowance under the 1990 program. Ms. Anthony responded she thought this was the case because the 1990 program did not have any limits, but from a policy standpoint, the State had told the City if someone wanted to perform a bathroom or kitchen remodel, the City should not approve the request because it would not meet their scrutiny. Ms. Anthony stated when the 2014 regulations were written, the State excluded kitchens and bathrooms because people were abusing it. Commissioner Belding commented bathrooms and kitchens did not typically have the historic integrity of a building because they had often been heavily modified through many years and owners. Ms. Anthony commented she agreed with Commissioner Belding and commented it did not seem right to make someone who bought a property with a wood burning kitchen stove to keep it instead of upgrading. Ms. Anthony stated if an Applicant was doing some overall general heating or electrical work which included the kitchen or bathroom, it would be approved under building safety upgrades and serviceability. Commissioner Belding inquired if this applied to both the 1990 and 2014 programs. Ms. Anthony confirmed they would apply to both programs so long as the request did not include appliances and fixtures.

ITEM 5. Discussion regarding Historic Landscapes and Trees

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, presented the Preservation Briefs pertaining to Historic Structures.

Commissioner Minch inquired what standards the brief was referring to. Ms. Anthony responded the standards were the Secretary of the Interior's standards regarding cultural landscapes. Chairwoman Nichols also responded the standards pertained to the protection, restoration, and rehabilitation thereof. Ms. Anthony commented when the Commission looked at guidelines they were mostly concerned with rehabilitation standards and the brief offered several novel ideas which showed how far into the details the Commission could get regarding landscapes.

Chairwoman Nichols commented the brief seemed to largely be focused around cultural landscapes and inquired if the City even had any. Ms. Anthony responded the City had some cultural landscapes and there were definitely significant features on some properties such as historic walls or significant trees. Ms. Anthony commented the Rockledge property had terracing which could be considered a feature, although she was fairly certain there was no historic vegetation still in place. Commissioner Minch commented he did not think there was much historic vegetation left on the property, if at all.

Ms. Anthony stated when the Cliff House went under restoration, they had installed a small fountain with a pond in the court yard because there were historic photographs showing one there and reiterated while the City did not have sweeping mansions with historic gardens and landscapes, there were still aspects and small areas of significant rock outcroppings the City did have and the Commission should also determine how far they were willing to extend their reach in regard to private property or if the Commission just wanted the regulations to pertain to public property, parks, and landscapes.

Commissioner Minch inquired if someone was applying for a state or federal tax credit, were they obligated to comply with the Secretary of the Interior's standards. Ms. Anthony responded tax credits only applied to built environments and not landscapes.

Commissioner Belding inquired if the Commission was only discussing vegetation in terms of a cultural landscape, because cultural landscapes encompassed much more than just vegetation. Commissioner

Belding stated cultural landscapes had the potential to be complimentary to the City's Historic Districts and how the districts interweaved through design and the vernacular landscape. Chairwoman Nichols responded she felt cultural landscapes covered much more than just vegetation, as the City had many historic walls and terracing which were aspects of cultural landscapes. Ms. Anthony commented there were already guidelines regarding those aspects and a little bit regarding vegetation, as in the Log Cabin Historic District, but the City was looking to go a little further. Ms. Anthony used an example of the trees on Canon Avenue removed earlier in the year and how those could have been viewed as an aspect of historic landscapes.

Ms. Anthony also stated there was a large historic tree on the Craftwood property which had also been removed. Commissioner Minch stated the Craftwood had lost a tree to either lightning or wind, but could not remember which. Ms. Anthony responded she did recall it was blown over by the wind and commented most people did not realize how shallow the roots of evergreen trees were.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if the focus of the discussion and changes to the regulations were adding and beefing up definitions and guidelines to help the City implement the updates. Ms. Anthony responded the City had received some money to perform code and guideline updates and when the City put an RFP together, they would be looking at updating the guidelines to add vegetative or cultural landscape/feature guidelines. Ms. Anthony stated the City would also be looking at updates to the guidelines regarding natural hazards and strengthening the guidelines regarding windows.

Commissioner Minch inquired how fences played into the discussion of historic landscapes. Ms. Anthony responded fences could be considered a landscape feature. Commissioner Minch inquired how adding a fence to a historic landscape would be considered. Ms. Anthony stated she was unsure at this point because the Commission had not yet really looked into the matter deeply enough, but it could be the sort of thing where the guidelines are more clear on the desire for shorter fencing in front and larger fences in the back. Ms. Anthony stated fences were usually administratively approved in Historic Districts, but felt the guidelines should be clearer on the topic as fences had a great potential to impact the streetscape.

Ms. Anthony stated the new Pikes Peak Regional Building Department Code will be adopted at the end of 2017 or early 2018 which put a restriction on wooden roofs and the only way to get a wooden roof approved was to use wood shingles which had a fire retardant applied to them. Ms. Anthony commented given the expensive nature of fire retardant wood shingles, it was unlikely they would be widely used.

Ms. Anthony stated, in regard to the new code and other wooden materials and houses, not placing a wooden fence directly up to a residential structure was a good thing and she knew from experience. Ms. Anthony commented her neighbor's house had burned down and what had ignited their house was their wooden fence which went right up to the house. Ms. Anthony further commented the neighbors now had a small section of chain link fence which went up to the house while the rest was constructed out of wood. Ms. Anthony stated the Commission may look at allowing these types of fences in the Historic Districts or providing some guidance in that regard and certain colors, such as green chain link fence, were somewhat camouflaged against the background and less visible.

Commissioner Minch inquired if there would be an age limit regarding trees where trees of a certain age were considered historic or significant. Ms. Anthony responded age, size, diameter, and history would all be relevant factors and also trees which were unusual for certain locations yet still thriving due to our unique micro-climate.

Chairwoman Nichols stated Colorado Springs had a significant tree program, as did many other communities, which had criteria to determine exactly what a significant tree was and felt the Commission needed to look over those criteria to help shape their own.

Chairwoman Nichols also stated the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board had thought they were getting a forestry and parks person, but it was ultimately turned down by the City Council and her guess was the cultural landscapes and significant tree discussion would remain in the Historic Preservation Commission for the time being. Commissioner Minch stated he felt this was better because the Historic Preservation Commission was quasi-judicial and had more effective processes. Ms. Anthony stated the Commission should also include the Open Space Advisory Committee and the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board because they actually had forestry stuff under their purview. Ms. Anthony also stated the Commission could use the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board to advise them much like they did for City Council.

Commissioner Belding stated she had done some research on cultural landscapes and discovered there were cultural landscape reports which really fleshed out the details of what was missing from the City's design standards and guidelines. Commissioner Belding stated the City should compile all of its historic property data into a cultural landscape report to determine where the gaps in policy and regulations were. Ms. Anthony stated it was similar to doing historic structure assessments, surveys, and inventories and using those to determine their context and building the guidelines out of that. Ms. Anthony stated, depending on which way the Commission felt they wanted to go, whether they determined they wanted to have some guidance on private property or whether the guidelines pertained mostly to public property, the Commission could do a survey of all of the parks and major streets for trees to identify where features were located to help inform the Commission regarding the gaps in the guidelines.

Ms. Anthony stated a big thing was the cemetery and there had been discussion outside of the Historic Preservation Commission about forming a cemetery preservation group or committee. Ms. Anthony commented the cemetery was a prime example of a cultural landscape and the City currently had no regulations or policies regarding the preservation of its features and felt the cemetery would require its own set of regulations and guidelines. Commissioner Wright commented the stone work which was done in the cemetery a few weeks prior was amazing to watch and thought the work was very well done.

Commissioner Minch stated he felt there needed to be something in the guidelines regarding private properties even if the guidelines were very loose. Ms. Anthony commented the Commission could put in loose guidelines for private properties which were advisory and recommended as opposed to hardline regulations.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if there was enough money to complete the type of inventory Ms. Anthony was referring to. Ms. Anthony responded the City would probably need to find a source of money to perform the surveys and inventories, but perhaps the City could get some landscape graduate students to perform the work under an internship as a means to reduce costs.

Commissioner Belding commented trying to engage the community in documenting these things, especially in regard to their own property, would also help the community feel more like they were a part of the process as well. Ms. Anthony responded she thought it was a good idea and as the City began doing more historic building inventories, there was need for a section which incorporated vegetation and landscapes. Commissioner Wright commented this would also be beneficial when insurance companies came after homeowners for not clearing the land for one-hundred feet (100 ft.) surrounding a structure if they were in

a historic district with significant cultural landscapes or vegetation. Ms. Anthony stated the Fire Department was working on a community wildfire protection plan and the City was looking at only needing to clear out a space of five feet (5 ft.) since the City's lots were not large enough to require a larger clearing.

Chairwoman Nichols commented this would be a big project for next year and would be a significant undertaking. Ms. Anthony commented the guidelines, as they sat, were almost ten years old at this point and felt it was time to give them a refresher and reorganization.

NON-AGENDA ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Commissioner Minch inquired if there was any money to incorporate historic landscapes and vegetation into the historic walking tour web application, as he had heard recent discussion pertaining to this potentially occurring. Ms. Anthony responded she thought there was some money in the 2018 budget which was for consulting services not specified for a specific project which would likely be able to pay for the application to be made.

Commissioner Minch stated, in regard to the wayfinding and signage project, the historic walking tour application came up as well and felt this should also be included to create a richer and more informative experience for users. Commissioner Minch also stated he would like the application to be able to locate where the user was in proximity to historic locations. Commissioner Minch stated he would also like to see the mineral springs incorporated into the application as well.

Commissioner Minch stated he had recently had some concrete work done which was textured and when it came to coloring the concrete he discovered there was a price difference between certain shades. Commissioner Minch commented he felt it was enlightening to understand part of the cost was due to specific coloring and there was also a minimum quantity most concrete places required to be ordered. Ms. Anthony commented there was also a cleanout fee for the truck. Commissioner Minch stated he just wanted to share his experience with the colored concrete requirement.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, Chairwoman Nichols adjourned the meeting at 7:02 p.m.

Minutes Prepared by: Dylan Becker, Planner I