



**MANITOU SPRINGS  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
Wednesday, February 7, 2018**



**I. CALL TO ORDER and APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, February 7, 2018, 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:

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Chair ANN NICHOLS Vice Chair LISETTE CASEY Commissioner ROBERT JACKSON Commissioner NEALE MINCH Commissioner TAMMILA WRIGHT Alternate Commissioner ROGER ARMSTRONG
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Commissioner SAMANTHA BELDING (excused)
<b>STAFF:</b>	Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner Dylan Becker, Planner I
<b>GUESTS:</b>	Bob Todd, City Council Liaison

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**ITEM 1.** January 3, 2018

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Armstrong moved to approve the January 3, 2018 Regular Meeting Minutes of the Historic Preservation Commission as presented.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Minch seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 4-0. Vice Chair Casey and Commissioner Wright abstained as they were not present for the January 3, 2018 Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.

**III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION**

Bob Todd, City Council Liaison to the Historic Preservation Commission introduced himself as the new liaison.

*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 1801 – Material Change of Appearance (Exterior Remodel) – 33 Cherokee Road – Robert and Laura Lewis, Applicants**

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, presented the Staff Report dated February 2, 2018. A handout providing comments made by the Applicants to the Staff Report was also handed out to the Commissioners at the dais along with examples and depictions of their proposals for doors and windows.

Commissioner Minch inquired if the houses adjacent to the property were contributing, non-contributing, contributing intrusive, or contributing altered. Ms. Anthony responded the house directly behind this house was non-contributing and there had also been a fairly recent renovation at a property on Elk Path nearby which had gone through the Historic Preservation Commission. Ms. Anthony stated the Elk Path property also had stucco on a portion of the structure which had been in place prior to 1950 and the Commission had also instructed the Applicant to keep and maintain the siding around the garage on the property which was similar to this request. Ms. Anthony stated there were many eclectic buildings in this area and some properties had more historic integrity than others. Ms. Anthony also stated there were some apartments on Elk Path which were stucco, but the complex was in a more 1920's southwestern architectural style.

Ms. Anthony stated Staff felt the window selections and maintaining the siding was important in giving a structure the historic Manitou Springs appearance.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if the pink stucco property across the street was a newer structure. Ms. Anthony responded she hadn't looked up the date on that particular property, but thought it to be a newer structure.

Vice Chair Casey inquired how the garage across the street, which was stucco, was allowed to occur and how it tied into this request. Ms. Anthony responded this was actually located at the Applicant's current residence and the property had been renovated at one point when the house was also largely stucco which, at the time, was permitted.

Commissioner Wright inquired, regarding the three (3) little windows above the garage on the west side elevation drawing, if the windows were going to replace an already existing larger, single window. Ms. Anthony stated the current window was located more in the corner and the proposed windows would be more centered on the upper façade. Commissioner Wright inquired why this change was necessary. Ms. Anthony stated the applicants had addressed this in the supplemental information they had provided and Staff was recommending it was preferable to have double hung windows there as this would be more consistent with the overall window designs and would help take up more space to cut up the mass of this side of the building. Ms. Anthony commented she understood the Applicants desire to not lose any wall area in the interior living room, and suggested there could be something installed which was larger than the three (3) small windows proposed, but smaller than the standard double hung windows and would also be consistent with the divided-lite window on the recessed area located on the front elevation drawing. Ms. Anthony stated she felt this would help maintain interior wall space while also maintaining a more uniform

and semi-historic appearance to the building. Commissioner Wright commented she felt Ms. Anthony's suggestion was a good balance between contemporary and historic.

Ms. Anthony commented there was also a new residential home on the west end of Manitou Avenue under the purview of the Historic Preservation Commission which was recently prohibited from using the same small windows proposed in this request and did not feel it would be appropriate for the Commission to allow them.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if there was an elevation drawing depicting the new entry. Ms. Anthony responded she did not think there was, but perhaps the Applicants could explain further or there were changes to be proposed.

Commissioner Minch commented the pictures of the rock wall taken from a distance appeared fairly uniform, however, up close, it appeared as if two (2) walls had been merged into one (1) as he had noticed as he drove by the property earlier that day. Commissioner Minch stated he had a difficult time focusing on the house because the wall looked so horrible and inquired how prevalent the mismatched patch shown in the close up images of the wall provided by Staff were to wall as a whole. Ms. Anthony responded it was probably consistent with the majority or entirety of the wall and stated having the wall repointed would be of huge benefit to its appearance. Ms. Anthony stated she did not feel it would be much of a detriment to cover the wall entirely because it was not comprised of the historic Manitou Greenstone.

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

Laura Lewis, 220 Elk Path, inquired if the Historical Society was run by Ms. Anthony or the people sitting at the dais. Chairwoman Nichols responded this was the Historic Preservation Commission and the Commissioners were sitting at the dais and Ms. Anthony was a Staff member of the Planning Department. Commissioner Minch commented the Historic Preservation Commission was a quasi-judicial entity comprised of Manitou Springs residents who had volunteered to serve the community and were selected based on their expertise in related fields. Chairwoman Nichols stated the Historic Preservation Commission was an advisory commission to City Council, although not every decision required further approval from City Council on a majority of the matters before them.

Ms. Lewis inquired if the Commission could provide her with an example or explanation to provide some clarification, as she thought Ms. Anthony had just stated stuccoing the exterior of the building was not approved. Chairwoman Nichols responded this was Staff's recommendation, but the Commission made the final decision. Commissioner Armstrong stated the Commission would listen to what the Applicant had to say and would discuss the proposal amongst themselves and render a final decision on the request. Ms. Lewis acknowledged she understood the procedure and inquired if the recommendations in the Staff Report had come from Ms. Anthony. Ms. Anthony responded the recommendations in the Staff Report had come from her. Ms. Lewis stated Ms. Anthony had some good recommendations and especially wanted to incorporate the idea for a porch between the eastern and western portions of the house.

Ms. Lewis stated she had grown up in Manitou Springs and had attended Manitou Springs High School. Ms. Lewis stated she lived across the street from the house at 33 Cherokee Road and could not bear to look at it any longer, which was why she had purchased the property. Ms. Lewis stated she felt the current appearance of the house was like a large square block with a crown on top. Ms. Lewis stated trying to get away from the square appearance of the building was difficult, but felt her proposal to utilize stonework on

the lower half of the façade and stucco on the upper half would be instrumental in changing its appearance. Ms. Lewis stated also using stucco on the rock wall out front, along with the lower stonework and upper stuccowork on the building, helped break up the blocky appearance of the front façade.

Ms. Lewis stated if the Commission was not willing to approve stucco for the rock wall, she would like to use stonework. Ms. Lewis stated it would have to be fake stone because otherwise it was too much and too much of anything was a not a good thing in her opinion.

Ms. Lewis stated the window on the left side of the front façade of the building shown on the front elevation drawing, which was the bedroom window, she had proposed the larger custom window with the small arch window above it to break up the square-ness of the building. Ms. Lewis stated she did not feel the arched or rounded window was a contemporary feature and could be seen in homes throughout the west side of Manitou Springs and further stated she did not feel any of the proposals she was making were necessarily contemporary.

Ms. Lewis stated she liked Ms. Anthony's recommendation to use a multi-lite window in the kitchen as this would lend to a more cabin-like or country appearance. Commissioner Minch inquired which window Ms. Lewis was referring to. Ms. Anthony responded Ms. Lewis was referring to the window in the recessed portion of the front of the building in which a large slider was proposed.

Ms. Lewis stated, in reference to the three small sliders above the garage on the west side of the building, she would rather have no windows as opposed to the double hung windows recommended in the Staff Report. Ms. Lewis stated she would be amenable to using smaller divided-lite windows as suggested by Ms. Anthony.

Ms. Lewis stated, after discussing the matter with her husband, should the Commission decide not to approve the stucco on the building facade, they intended to leave the existing clapboard siding on the house.

Ms. Lewis stated she was in support of Staff's recommendation for a full porch. Chairwoman Nichols inquired if there was an elevation drawing for the porch area. Ms. Lewis responded she thought they had submitted one showing the porch proposal, but it was possible the architect was unable to send it in time for this night's meeting. Ms. Anthony stated she had not received anything at this point in time.

Chairwoman Nichols stated she felt the main issue for Ms. Lewis seemed to be the stucco versus the clapboard siding. Ms. Lewis responded she felt the building looked ridiculous as it currently sat and the proposal to use stucco and stonework on the building and wall were intended to break up the blocky appearance of the structures. Ms. Lewis also stated stucco was lower maintenance to keep up compared to repairing and maintaining the existing clapboard siding and she would also like to go with stonework on the wall should the Commission also deny the use of stucco there.

Ms. Lewis stated she loved Manitou Springs and its uniqueness and commented she felt like the City was beginning to look like double hung windows and clapboard everywhere. Ms. Lewis urged the Commission to allow the request to give Manitou Springs more uniqueness as she felt it was unfavorable for everything in town to look the same. Ms. Lewis stated she would respect whatever decision was rendered, but she'd at least like her request to be considered.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired the condition of the existing clapboard siding. Ms. Lewis responded it was not great, but they would sand and paint them if needed and commented she did not feel the clapboard siding would match well with the proposed stonework.

Commissioner Wright inquired if the Applicant was amenable to the recommendation to replace the wood clapboard siding with new siding and commented the property was in a cottage style historic sub-district which made the stucco a big hurdle in making the property more compatible with the district. Ms. Lewis responded there was a stucco house across the street from her, as well as down the street from her on either end, and other location in the neighborhood and inquired what the Commission would recommend other than the use of stucco.

Commissioner Wright commented there was clapboard siding available which was smooth and more easily maintained. Ms. Lewis responded she had no intention of replacing the clapboard siding. Chairwoman Nichols stated there were other alternatives to the clapboard siding.

Commissioner Wright stated she would like to see the rock wall covered and inquired if Ms. Lewis was opposed to using stucco on the wall. Ms. Lewis responded she was agreeable with this and commented if she were to use stone, it sure would take a lot of it.

Commissioner Armstrong inquired if the Applicant intended to live in the house. Ms. Lewis responded her intention was to use the house as a month-to-month rental for travelling nurses which would already be furnished for their use and lodging.

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

Commissioner Minch stated Ms. Anthony had discussed the small sliding windows, which had not been approved for use in a recent Material Change of Appearance on the west end of the city, and his recollection was it was a single window in which the Commission had required the Applicant install a double hung at the location instead. Ms. Anthony responded it was a long, narrow window in the bathroom.

Vice Chair Casey inquired if the dimensions for the three (3) small windows were known. Ms. Lewis stated the windows were approximately twelve to fifteen inches (12 - 15 in.) in height.

Ms. Anthony suggested the Applicant could use a multi-lite, six-pane window, as opposed to the nine-pane, which would make the window larger than the small sliders, but smaller than a standard double hung window. Ms. Anthony stated it would also help to cut some of the mass of this side of the building and block what needed to be blocked while maintaining a wonderful view. Vice Chair Casey commented she felt this would fit the big wall while still allowing for a smaller window. Commissioner Minch commented the current window was thirty-six inches (36 in.) in height and felt something in the range of twenty-four inches (24 in.) was appropriate. Ms. Anthony stated, similar in appearance to the nine-pane window on the recessed portion of the front façade, this six-pane window would replace the three small sliding windows on the west elevation above the garage and would help maintain window consistency throughout the building. Chairwoman Nichols stated she felt this was a good compromise because the Applicant was still able to block the view of the neighbor's house while breaking up the mass of the wall.

Commissioner Minch stated he understood the comment regarding attempting to use the materials and colors to break up the appearance, but felt the color aspect of the proposal could be replicated by keeping the clapboard siding and allowing the rock wall to be stucco in front. Ms. Anthony commented the siding could be painted any color to match what was needed. Commissioner Minch stated putting stucco on the rock wall may be beneficial and helpful in achieving the overall visual goals of the Applicants.

Chairwoman Nichols commented she was concerned about using stone on the rock wall because it would make the property appear to have too much stone. Commissioner Minch stated he felt it would be a shame to lose the existing siding. Chairwoman Nichols stated the siding was one of the few original looking elements on the house, even though she did not feel the house currently fit the cottage look. Vice Chair Casey stated, with the stucco wall, the house could be painted to match, which would visually achieve the goals of the Applicants. Commissioner Minch stated this was the point he was trying to make.

Commissioner Minch stated the proposed stonework on the building was amenable to the Commission as presented. Chairwoman Nichols commented she was in agreement and the stonework would be instrumental in breaking up the wall on this side of the addition.

Commissioner Wright stated she would like the Applicants to have the choice to stucco the wall or to use stonework, as she was concerned once the stonework was placed on the building, it may have a different appearance than expected and wanted to ensure some flexibility in the event the Applicants felt the wall would look better as stone in conjunction with the stonework on the house. Ms. Anthony responded she felt this was reasonable and also suggested the Commission also allow the Applicants to choose between maintaining and refurbishing the existing clapboard siding or to replace it with a composite siding. Commissioner Minch stated he felt it was a good idea to allow the Applicants some degrees of freedom and flexibility because, as the project went along, there were likely to be changing perceptions regarding the property's appearance.

Vice Chair Casey stated she felt raising the flat roof would help to reduce the box-like shape of the structure and questioned the need for the half-arched window on the front facade. Chairwoman Nichols stated she was not bothered by the proposal for the half-arch window. Ms. Anthony stated as long as the Commission's decision did not render the property any more intrusive or less compatible with the district, the final decision was acceptable. Commissioner Minch stated he felt it helped keep the property about where it was currently in terms of its contribution to the district. Vice Chair Casey commented she felt the half-arched window may be less prevalent in appearance with the clapboard siding. Ms. Anthony responded the building would have texture with the clapboard siding which could not be achieved using stucco.

Commissioner Minch stated, from his point of view, the wall should either be stucco or stone, the half-arch window was ok, but the siding on the upper level of the house should either be replaced or repaired and maintained.

Ms. Anthony stated she had noticed, on the cut sheets provided by the Applicants, the north-facing double hung windows on the east and west side of the front facade appeared to have a nailing flange which meant the window sat flush with the plane of the wall, as opposed to being centered in the wall. Ms. Anthony stated the window style was fine, but having the window flush with the plane of the wall was not acceptable. Ms. Lewis inquired if the Commission preferred the windows to be recessed as opposed to flush. Ms. Anthony responded regular windows were typically recessed within the framing about half way which was why most windows had a window sill both inside and outside. Ms. Anthony stated often times with a nailing

flange, there was no window sill. Ms. Lewis stated she would be more aware of this when selecting and installing the windows.

Commissioner Minch inquired if the nailing flange only pertained to these double hung windows on the front façade or if there were others. Ms. Anthony responded she only noticed the nailing flange on these windows, but she just wanted to ensure none of the windows were installed in this manner. Ms. Anthony stated the Commission should note that all windows needed to be placed within the wall openings to match the traditional windows and not at the surface. Ms. Anthony stated it also needed to be noted Staff needed to review and approve the windows prior to installation.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Minch moved to approve MCAC 1801 at 33 Cherokee Road to allow exterior modifications of the existing building with the following conditions:

1. The approval is as outlined in the application and the accompanying materials dated January 11, 2018, unless changed by the following conditions.
2. Stuccoing of the building exterior is not approved. Siding and Trim shall be in either wood or a composite material (not vinyl) that matches the profile and reveal of the current siding/trim and provides for a smooth surface to be painted in a color choice of the property owner.
3. The railing around the roof deck, and on an entry porch should one be added to the plan, shall be of a traditional design with simple square balusters centered between hand and foot-rails. Railings shall be finished in an opaque stain or paint in a color choice of the property owner.
4. Windows shall consist of either vertically-oriented 1/1 double-hung units, and/or multi-lite sliding units with exterior grids as described in the Staff Report. The windows located on the west side of the building exterior above the garage shall consist of modified divided-lite window panes with a minimum of two (2) panes in height. All windows shall be center mounted in the window opening in a traditional manner with accompanying window sills. All windows shall be administratively reviewed and approved by Staff prior to installation.
5. The existing rubble and stone retaining wall at the street edge of the property shall either be retained and repointed to match the color and material used for the manufactured stone to be applied to the building foundation or stucco, depending on the Applicants' preference. A sample mortar/stucco color shall be provided for Staff review and approval prior to installation.
6. The Applicant shall provide an elevation drawing of the east façade depicting the incorporation of the new porch and the new entry for Staff review and approval prior to the beginning of construction.

And the finding the proposal, under the conditions, is consistent with the purpose of the Historic Preservation Regulations by encouraging and fostering private rehabilitation and ownership (use) of historic properties.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Wright seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 6-0.

Ms. Lewis inquired what happened next. Ms. Anthony gave explicit instructions regarding the planning review process for the City and Pikes Peak Regional Building Department.

Commissioner Minch informed the Applicants of the appeal process to City Council should they disagree with what the Commission had decided. Ms. Anthony stated the appeal needed to be filed within ten (10) days of the final decision rendered by the Historic Preservation Commission.

## **VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no Other Business to discuss.

### **NON-AGENDA ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:**

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if Ms. Anthony would address the current issues with the Park Avenue Bridge. Ms. Anthony responded the bridge was supposed to have been finished on the Friday prior to this meeting, and extensive modelling had been done showing that even low rise vehicles were able to cross the bridge without issue. Ms. Anthony stated, however, once the bridge was completed, it was apparent there was an issue.

Ms. Anthony stated there had also been extensive surveying done to prepare the as-built plans after construction and upon reviewing the survey data, it was determined the ledges, in which the asphalt would abut, were installed six inches (6 in.) too low due to a miscalculation by the contractor. Ms. Anthony stated the engineers had looked into the matter and think they may have a relatively simple fix for the problem.

Ms. Anthony stated there were certain coverage requirements for the rebar used to support the bridge and the engineers believed there was enough there to be able to saw cut a new ledge where the asphalt came to it and soften the curve in the bridge. Ms. Anthony stated this should bring everything at or near where it should have been and the engineers were currently working on the plans for this fix.

Ms. Anthony stated it was the responsibility of the contractor to complete the fix and the City would not be paying for the redesign or repair work to be completed.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if the bridge deck would be raised any higher than it currently sat, as this was a concern for her. Ms. Anthony responded there had been a proposal to add an extra two inches (2 in.) to the bridge deck to flatten it out, however, this would bring the deck level two inches (2 in.) closer to the bottom of the benches, which she felt was absolutely unnecessary and did not recommend due to the higher cost and general appearance of the finished product.

Commissioner Wright inquired if there was going to be lights on the bridge, as she had seen some wiring hanging out of the bridge. Ms. Anthony responded there would not be lights on the actual bridge itself and what Commissioner Wright was seeing was wiring for a thermal coupling to check the temperature of the concrete.

Commissioner Armstrong inquired if these complications with the Park Avenue Bridge would postpone or delay the Canon Avenue Bridge Project. Ms. Anthony responded it already had and Councilman Todd had suggested mobilizing anything the City was able to for the project such as excavating the bridge, confirming the conditions, installing the bridge foundation, and completing the utilities undergrounding. Ms. Anthony

stated Councilman Todd further suggested the City could then back fill where needed and take a three month hiatus over the summer. Ms. Anthony stated this would allow businesses to remain open during the busy season with minimal disruption and for there to only be a month's worth of further work to complete the bridge in the fall and still meet the grant deadlines which were specific for the completion of both bridges. Ms. Anthony stated another option would be to try to file for a scope change, but there was no guarantee it would be approved.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Historic Preservation Commission, Chairwoman Nichols adjourned the meeting at 7:26 p.m.

*Minutes Prepared by: Dylan Becker, Planner I*