



**MANITOU SPRINGS  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
April 4, 2018**



**I. CALL TO ORDER and ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

The Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, April 4, 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:

**PRESENT:** Chair ANN NICHOLS  
Vice Chair LISETTE CASEY  
Commissioner ROBERT JACKSON  
Commissioner NEALE MINCH  
Commissioner TAMMILA WRIGHT  
Commissioner SAMANTHA BELDING

**ABSENT:** Commissioner JOY PORTER (excused)

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

**GUESTS:** Bob Todd, City Council Liaison

**ITEM 1.** Election of Chair

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Minch moved to elect Ann Nichols to serve as Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Casey seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion Passed, 6-0.

**ITEM 2.** Election of Vice Chair

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Jackson moved to elect Lisette Casey to serve as Vice Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Belding seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion Passed, 6-0.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**ITEM 3.** February 7, 2018

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Minch moved to approve the February 7, 2018 Regular Meeting Minutes of the Historic Preservation Commission, as presented.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Wright seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion Passed, 5-0. Commissioner Belding abstained as she was not present for the February 7, 2018 Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.

**III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION**

**ITEM 4. AP 1801** – Material Change of Appearance (Exterior Remodel) – 33 Cherokee Road – Robert and Laura Lewis, Applicants. The Applicants have filed an appeal of the HPC approval at the February 7, 2018 regular meeting. City Council was scheduled to hear the appeal at their April 3, 2018 Regular Meeting.

**ITEM 5.** 218 Ruxton Avenue – Our Lady of Perpetual Help – Chuck Smith, Presenter

Ms. Anthony stated Mr. Smith did not appear to be present, but he wanted to thank the Historic Preservation Commission for their help in keeping Our Lady of Perpetual Help a contributing historic property and thought Mr. Smith may arrive at some point during the meeting to give an update on the property.

*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 6. MCAC 1802** – Material Change of Appearance (Window Replacement) – 114 Canon Avenue – Andrew Odlin, Applicant **INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT REQUESTED**

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, stated MCAC 1802 needed to be postponed indefinitely because the Applicant had decided to refurbish the windows on the property, as opposed to out-right replacing them, as the Commissioners would see in the next agenda item. Ms. Anthony stated Staff had recommended the Applicant apply for the Maintenance Mini-Grant for \$500.00 to help in the window refurbishment.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Minch moved to indefinitely postpone MCAC 1802 for window replacements at 114 Canon Avenue.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Wright seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion Passed, 6-0.

**ITEM 7. MCAC 1803 – Maintenance Mini-Grant Request (Window Refurbishment) – 114 Canon Avenue – Andrew Odlin, Applicant**

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, presented the City Memorandum dated March 29, 2018.

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

Andrew Odlin, 114 Canon Avenue, stated he was fixing the building up and felt window refurbishment was the best way to go in terms of keeping the property's historic appearance and integrity.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired who had been contracted to perform the window refurbishment. Mr. Odlin responded he had enlisted Doug Edmundson of Restoration & Rejuvenation to perform the refurbishment, although an absolute deal had not yet been finalized.

Commissioner Minch inquired if the window refurbishments only pertained to the four (4) upper level windows. Mr. Odlin responded there was also a bedroom window which was obscured from view by the apothecary's roof in addition to the four (4) windows mentioned. Ms. Anthony commented she was in support of Mr. Odlin refurbishing the additional window.

Mr. Odlin stated he had mentioned in his application the use of sea foam green paint on the upper windows but felt it would be best to match the color used on the street level windows and inquired if this was amenable to the Commission. Ms. Anthony responded the Commission did not regulate or have purview over paint color unless an Applicant was attempting to paint something which had not been previously painted such as stone or masonry work.

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

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Minch moved to approve MCAC 1803 for a Maintenance Mini-Grant Request at 114 Canon Avenue.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Belding seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion Passed, 6-0.

Commissioner Minch inquired if Mr. Odlin would mind submitting a letter to the Pikes Peak Bulletin explaining the process he had just gone through with the Historic Preservation Commission and mentioning the Maintenance Mini-Grant to get more publicity regarding the grant. Commissioner Minch stated this was the first grant request the Commission had seen in a while and thought it would be a good idea to help spread the word that the grant was an option for residents in the Historic Districts. Commissioner Belding commented she felt it would be impactful to also mention how much easier the process to refurbish historic windows was in comparison to out-right replacing them. Mr. Odlin stated he was willing to do so.

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

**ITEM 8.** Review and Recommendation of Rehabilitation Plans for the Spring Street Bridge – Sara Hartley, City of Manitou Springs Hazard Mitigation and Resiliency Manager

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, presented the City Memorandum dated April 3, 2018.

Sara Hartley, Hazard Mitigation and Resiliency Director, stated the report presented to the Commission was put together by one of the City's on-call engineers and there had been a lot of behind the scenes work done to reach this point.

Ms. Hartley stated the Spring Street Bridge had failed between May and June of 2015 and the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) had given the City forty-six (46) days following the disaster to find damage points, which was the longest disaster in FEMA's history in terms of spanning days. Ms. Hartley stated it was determined during this process the culvert crossing at the Spring Street Bridge had failed and the bridge was immediately closed. The City then purchased and installed a temporary bridge which was the structure which was currently in place.

Ms. Hartley stated, initially, FEMA was not going to give the City any money because the bridge was under private ownership and was within the bounds of an existing conservation easement. Ms. Hartley stated since then, there had been several revisions to what FEMA would fund regarding the project and it was ultimately determined that FEMA would fund the temporary bridge, the removal of the failed culvert crossing beneath the bridge, and the funding to turn the temporary bridge into a permanent structure.

Ms. Hartley stated the issue, however, was once the culvert crossing was removed, more slope within the channel would be exposed, and that slope, without vegetation, was susceptible to erosion. Ms. Hartley stated

the City had also asked FEMA for funds to perform some slope stabilization but was denied the request based on the fact the work would be considered an improvement and because the City was not eligible for mitigation funding.

Ms. Hartley stated this request had been in front of City Council on a few occasions and City Council had given the direction that two (2) options be presented. Ms. Hartley stated the first option was to turn the temporary bridge into a permanent structure which fit in with the surrounding historic district and the second option was to build a new structure which could convey a 100-year flood event and also fit in with the historic district.

Ms. Hartley stated earlier in the week her team had a meeting with the surrounding property owners and they were not very thrilled by the two options as presented. Ms. Hartley stated the neighborhood strongly desired to see an arch bridge which better mimicked the standard arches found in the City's other historic bridges.

Ms. Hartley handed out a rough, un-engineered representation of the bridge based on the neighborhood's vision for the bridge and discussions from the neighborhood meeting to the Commissioners at the dais and stated her main concern was whether the creek flow would be restricted too much to convey the 100-year flood event. Ms. Hartley stated if the bridge was too restrictive to convey the 100-year flood event, FEMA would require the City to go through a lengthy Map Revision and Letter of Map Revision process.

Ms. Hartley stated her hope was that by raising the arch of the bridge, this would allow enough space to convey the 100-year flood event which would result in raising the road bed, but felt this would still be acceptable as she thought the City could use the slope, at grade, to lessen its appearance. Ms. Hartley stated she was currently working to do some modelling for the proposed bridge to confirm whether or not the proposal would be able to convey the 100-year flood event and, if it did not meet the requirements, City Council would then need to decide whether or not to go through the FEMA Letter of Map Revision process.

Ms. Hartley stated she had been in contact with the Palmer Land Trust, who owns the conservation easement which the bridge lies upon, and they did not see any issues regarding the easement and the two proposals presented for the construction of the bridge.

Commissioner Minch stated Figure 4 on page 7 and Figure 8 on page 12 of the report appeared to be the same figure, depicting the same arch, but with different descriptions. Ms. Hartley responded modifying the bridge to become a permanent structure would require an arch because when a stone façade was added to the bridge it would otherwise compromise the load bearing capabilities and rating of the steel bridge beneath it and the arches allowed the façade to be anchored to a foundation or subsystem which was independent of the temporary bridge, as opposed to anchoring it to the bridge itself. Ms. Hartley stated in order to turn the temporary bridge into a permanent structure, there would need to be an arch of some sort to help support the stone façade.

Commissioner Minch inquired if this was all captured by the \$375,000 estimate for Option One. Ms. Hartley responded it was.

Commissioner Minch inquired if Figure 8 on page 12 represented Option Two for a completely new bridge at an estimated cost of \$800,000. Ms. Hartley responded this was correct and, for a new structure, there was also the option to construct a bridge without an arch as shown in Figure 7 on page 11. Commissioner Minch

commented he felt, given the neighborhood's sentiments regarding the bridge's appearance, the bridge option depicted in Figure 7 was likely unacceptable to the surrounding residents. Ms. Hartley responded this was likely accurate. Commissioner Minch stated he just wanted to make sure he had the options, costs, and appearances correct.

Ms. Hartley stated she wanted to point out the cost estimates were very conservative because pinpointing costs in a bridge rehabilitation project was difficult to accurately assess.

Commissioner Minch inquired if Figure 2 on page 2 was a representation of the existing bridge, as it currently existed. Ms. Hartley responded it was.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if the current configuration of the Brook Street Bridge was able to convey the 100-year flood event. Ms. Hartley responded it was nowhere near capable of being able to do so and was only capable of conveying around seven-hundred and fifty cubic feet per second (750 cf/s), whereas the 100-year flood event was around three-thousand cubic feet per second (3,000 cf/s).

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if there was an option to maintain the existing condition of the bridge and wondered how this had not run afoul of FEMA since it was not capable of conveying the 100-year flood event. Ms. Hartley responded the original bridge was constructed prior to the FEMA National Flood Insurance Program which meant the structure was grandfathered in, as is, and only once there was any change to a facility, such as a total failure and rebuild (including temporary bridges), did the requirements for the 100-year event kick in. Ms. Hartley stated if the bridge did not meet the FEMA requirements when completed, the City would then be required to go through a Letter of Map Revision process, at which point FEMA may determine whether or not they would accept the structure.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if the Brook Street Bridge was able to convey the 100-year flood event and wondered how the recent rehabilitation of the bridge had not triggered a Letter of Map Revision process. Ms. Hartley responded none of the historic bridges on Ruxton Creek were able to convey the 100-year flood event and since the bridge was repaired and rehabilitated, as opposed to constructing a new bridge, it was still considered grandfathered in. Ms. Hartley commented it was only when the bridge was replaced that it would trigger the 100-year flood event conveyance requirement.

Ms. Hartley stated the original project worksheet FEMA had written suggested the City remove the two (2) drainage culverts, repair the interiors, and reinsert the culverts, however, if the City were to remove those culverts, the entire structure would fail and collapse in on itself. Ms. Hartley stated she had told FEMA the City would perform the work as FEMA had suggested, but wanted to know what the contingency plan was should the structure fail during rehabilitation and who would be responsible for funding the project in that event. Ms. Hartley commented it was at this point that FEMA decided to re-evaluate the situation.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if it was possible to perform a rehabilitation of Spring Street Bridge as opposed to replacing it and asked if there was an option to do so. Ms. Hartley responded, at this time, there was nothing feasible the City could do.

Commissioner Wright inquired if the wing walls would have a veneer. Ms. Hartley responded they would and commented when the project was engineered, the City would include this in the request and budget. Ms. Hartley stated the engineers would be required to have several discussions with the Historic

Preservation Commission and community meetings to ensure the proper stone was selected and that the bridge was aesthetically compatible with other historic bridges in town.

Commissioner Belding inquired if the City of Manitou Springs had adopted the same flood control master plan as the City of Colorado Springs or if the City of Manitou Springs had its own plan in place. Ms. Hartley responded the City of Manitou Springs was under the purview of the Pikes Peak Regional Building Department and FEMA had been responsible for mapping the entire county. Ms. Hartley stated, however, the City had redone a section of Fountain Creek in 2011 because the City suspected the flow calculations were incorrect and a Letter of Map Revision was performed through FEMA based on the findings.

Commissioner Belding inquired if the discussions for a more barrel arch design occurred after the official report was prepared. Ms. Hartley responded this was correct and the alternative design depicting the barrel arch design which was presented along with the report depicted Staff's recommendation in support of the residents' request for a more aesthetically traditional bridge which would better match other historic bridges in the City.

Commissioner Belding inquired if the City had anything in place to ensure consistency between the historic bridges, specifically in terms of their arch. Ms. Hartley responded it had been recommended the City identify a repair option for the future which fit all of the bridges, but there was nothing in place as of yet.

Commissioner Minch inquired if design Option Two, which was more expensive than Option One, had a longer life span and asked what the real benefit of Option Two over Option One was. Ms. Hartley responded there were obvious concerns about Option One because a steel girder bridge would require more maintenance over time, which would raise costs, but, if maintained properly, could achieve the same lifespan as a concrete girder design. Ms. Hartley stated the steel girder bridge design also had a wood decking which would need to be replaced more frequently than an asphalt or concrete driving surface.

Ms. Hartley explained there were additional concerns with the steel girder design because, if the bridge was clad in stone, there would be gaps in which there was potential for water intrusion which could corrode, weaken, and significantly lessen the lifespan of the bridge and the damage, should there be a Staff shortage or no one to maintain the bridge, also had the potential to go unnoticed as the corrosion would not be visible from the outside.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired the cost of the temporary steel bridge which was currently in place. Ms. Hartley responded the temporary bridge cost the City around \$100,000.

Commissioner Minch inquired if there was a difference in time to perform the work between the two options presented. Ms. Hartley responded the City was almost three years (3 yrs.) into the project already with the temporary bridge, but the surrounding residents were willing to be patient for the bridge to be done right and to their preferences. Ms. Hartley stated FEMA had provided funding to date in the amount of \$178,000, of which \$101,000 was spent on the temporary bridge. Ms. Hartley stated this left around \$77,000 of remaining funds, of which, seventy-five percent (75%) was available for the remainder of the project. Ms. Hartley stated if those funds were not used by the end of December 2018, the City risked losing the money because FEMA disaster declarations did not stay open indefinitely. Ms. Hartley stated she had spoken with Mayor Jaray regarding the matter and he was not in favor of a funding deadline forcing and pushing the City to make a decision on how to proceed.

Commissioner Minch inquired if there was a significant difference in project duration between the two options. Ms. Hartley responded she did not think there was a dramatic difference between the two options in terms of timing because the concrete forms were pre-cast.

Commissioner Belding inquired if it was possible to file for an extension with FEMA regarding funding. Ms. Hartley responded the City had already asked for an extension, as the project was supposed to be completed in 2017, and the State had the authority to grant the first extension, which they did. Ms. Hartley stated any further extension would require approval from Washington D. C., which was unlikely, but the City would ask anyway as the worst they could do was deny the request.

Ms. Anthony inquired if the flat bridge option met the 100-year flood conveyance requirement for FEMA. Ms. Hartley responded it would and would love for the engineers to perform some modelling on the representation she had created, which incorporated the neighbors' requests, and raising the deck until it was a near certainty the bridge would be able to convey the 100-year flood event. Ms. Hartley stated this design would essentially push in the sides to form a full barrel arch and would raise the deck to achieve conveyance of the 100-year flood event. Ms. Hartley commented that from this point, the City could then determine whether or not it wanted to go through the Letter of Map Revision process with FEMA.

Hearing no further questions for Staff, Chairwoman Nichols opened the Public Hearing for public comment.

Bill Koerner, 205 Ruxton Avenue, thanked Ms. Hartley for working with the residents regarding this project and presented a set of photographs of the Spring Street Bridge and other historic bridges around the City. Mr. Koerner stated the original bridge which had failed was a historic bridge likely built around the turn of the century.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if the Springs Street Bridge was included in the City's historic bridge assessment. Ms. Anthony responded it was not included in the assessment.

Mr. Koerner stated he was supportive of this process and urged the Commission to move forward with the modified design for Option Two.

Mr. Koerner inquired if the modified design for Option Two included the rock facing and everything else. Ms. Hartley responded the modified bridge design would have stone underwork, end caps and seating, and would incorporate all of the details which aesthetically make Manitou's bridges so unique.

Mr. Koerner stated he was interested in working with the City on an easement and was excited for the project to be moving forward.

Commissioner Minch, using the depictions for Option One and Option Two, stated the bridge design which could convey the 100-year flood event was likely somewhere in the middle between the two options in terms of design and would essentially squish the arch depicted in Option Two into a more barrel arch form. Mr. Koerner responded he felt comfortable with Ms. Hartley's computer modelling to "squish" the bridge to determine the appropriate design and termed the model the "Squish-Squish Model".

Mr. Koerner stated he was also concerned about maintaining the riparian habitat on both sides of the creek and stated when the temporary bridge had been installed the City had cut down a cottonwood tree which was on his property. Mr. Koerner stated the logs leftover from this were still sitting on his property waiting



to be removed two years later. Mr. Koerner stated he did not like the idea of cutting down trees and if any absolutely needed to come down, they should be removed in a timely manner.

Deborah Felton, 347 Spring Street, stated she strongly agreed with Mr. Koerner and she was his neighbor on Spring Street. Ms. Felton stated she hoped the Commission would consider the natural habitat when reaching a decision and mentioned the beautiful cottonwood trees which were still in or near the creek bank. Ms. Felton stated there was a mistake made when the temporary bridge was installed and one of Mr. Koerner's cottonwood trees was removed despite the agreement the City would not remove it. Ms. Felton stated she did not want to see something like this occur again.

Ms. Felton also requested the City salvage and re-use the remaining stone from the original historic bridge on the new bridge as a means of saving money and contributing to the historic nature and integrity of the area.

Chairwoman Nichols inquired what stone type was used in the construction of the original historic bridge. Ms. Hartley responded the remaining lower portion of the bridge appeared to be Manitou Greenstone and the City was already salvaging and collecting Manitou Greenstone and other historic materials from other historic structures which had been repaired or removed through the years for use in projects just like this one. Ms. Hartley stated the salvaged stone could also be used to obtain a matching manufactured stone should the City need it. Ms. Felton responded she would like to see, at the very least, the salvaged stone used on the bridges capstones. Ms. Anthony commented the City could look into how much stone was available and then allocate it towards specific components of the bridge because mixing the real thing with manufactured stone often times did not appear aesthetically pleasing and felt the only way to make it work would be to separate out certain components which would be clad in one or the other.

Billy West, 328 Spring Street, stated he would like to see the bridge done in a historic style and for the riparian habitat of Ruxton Creek to be maintained and preserved. Mr. West stated Ruxton Creek was the only creek which originated in Manitou and the location near the Spring Street Bridge was the only spot on the creek within city limits in which one was able to get in and enjoy it. Mr. West stated he would like to see some end caps on the bridge and seating so visitors and residents hiking the Intemann Trail could have a place to rest, take their shoes off, and go for a wade in the creek.

Maia West, 328 Spring Street, stated as the future heir to her family's property she felt the outcome of these discussions regarding the Spring Street Bridge would have a larger and longer lasting impact on her. Ms. West stated she wanted the bridge to reflect the natural beauty of the surrounding area and wanted the bridge to have a historic appearance which was compatible in character with the rest of Manitou's historic structures.

Ms. Felton stated when the previous Mayor, Mayor Snyder, initially installed the temporary bridge, he had assured the neighborhood the structure was very reusable and sellable. Ms. Hartley commented when the culvert crossing had initially failed, the City looked into renting a temporary bridge from the Colorado Department of Transportation, and the cost was somewhere in the neighborhood of \$3000.00/week and the City could certainly sell or rent the bridge for a good price. Ms. Hartley commented the bridge could also be reused in an area like the Schryver Park Pedestrian Bridge.

Ms. Hartley stated FEMA had told her if the temporary bridge stayed in place for a minimum period of five years (5 yrs.), the City would receive the full amount of funding and any time less than five years (5 yrs.)

would lessen the funding due to a depreciation value. Ms. Hartley stated she felt the additional funding was rather minor and did not have a large impact on the outcome for the bridge or the City.

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

Chairwoman Nichols inquired if the Commission needed to make a recommendation to City Council. Ms. Anthony stated she felt it was a good idea to express support for whatever the Commission wanted to support and noting a more definitive plan and recommendation would follow. Ms. Hartley commented from her standpoint, and to add to Ms. Anthony's suggestion, her department was also looking for a recommendation in support of, and in partnership with, the residents' request to modify Option Two for a permanent bridge with a more historic Manitou Springs arch.

Commissioner Belding inquired if stream stabilization or anything like it could be performed using the FEMA funds when the bridge was replaced. Ms. Hartley responded although this would be included in the permanent design, there would be no FEMA funding for this aspect of the project and the intent was to perform some slope and channel stabilization.

Commissioner Minch stated the Commission needed to make a recommendation in support of proceeding with modelling to determine how much of an arch may be established and support for the end state of the bridge to appear historic with the riparian habitat preserved. Chairwoman Nichols commented she felt it was important for the Commission to also weigh in on the appearance of the bridge from a historical perspective. Commissioner Minch commented he agreed.

Commissioner Belding commented it would be useful to compare the designs of the Brook Street Bridge and other historic bridges to obtain a better and more uniform understanding of the bridge designs. Chairwoman Nichols stated the Brook Street Bridge was one of the City's few true stone arch bridges and recommended the Commissioners go to the site to see the uncovered arch while it was exposed. Commissioner Wright commented the concrete deck had already been poured and the arch was no longer exposed. Ms. Anthony commented there was a photo of the exposed arch in the Pikes Peak Bulletin. Commissioner Minch commented he was surprised how sharply the arch came down and into the ground.

Commissioner Wright inquired if Ruxton Creek had a similar water flow near the Brook Street Bridge as it did with the Spring Street Bridge. Ms. Anthony responded it was the same creek and the Spring Street Bridge was just farther up the creek.

Chairwoman Nichols stated since the Spring Street Bridge was a new construction, it triggered further requirements than the Brook Street Bridge which was only repaired and commented the Brook Street Bridge actually had a fairly narrow opening. Ms. Hartley commented the channel for the Brook Street Bridge was also a manmade channel, whereas the Spring Street Bridge channel was more natural and felt the Spring Street Bridge would look beautiful amidst the preserved natural habitat.

Commissioner Minch stated the Commission was in support of the modelling to assess the bridge arch because it was more consistent with the other bridges in town and was in support of maintaining the natural beauty of the habitat surrounding the bridge. Chairwoman Nichols stated the Commission also supported a compatible historic design for an arch bridge which worked with FEMA's 100-year flood event conveyance requirement and incorporated the design features seen on other historic bridges in town, like the Brook Street Bridge. Ms. Hartley also requested the recommendation mention the bridge structure would be new.

Bob Todd, City Council Liaison, stated, given the loss in revenue to the City due to the closing of the Manitou & Pikes Peak Cog Railway, it may be appropriate to include in the motion the Commission felt it was worth taking the risk of losing the FEMA funding to ensure the bridge was done correctly and acknowledge there was a premium to this bridge. Mr. Todd stated he felt this would help get the request through City Council more smoothly.

Commissioner Minch stated there was also an unknown cost associated with Option One which may help to close the gap between it and the cost of Option Two and the possibility for re-use of the existing temporary bridge for other projects were also good reasons to send to City Council as well.

Chairwoman Nichols stated she felt the main interest of the Commission was maintaining a historic appearance for the new bridge rather than saving money on the cost. Ms. Hartley stated her department would continue to search and apply for grant funding throughout this process.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Minch moved to forward a recommendation to City Council recognizing that Option Two for a new bridge structure was more costly than Option One and the Historic Preservation Commission was in support of modifying the design of Option Two to incorporate a more barrel arch structure to be consistent with the other bridges in the historic districts. The Commission is supportive of the modelling to assess the arch to be more consistent with other bridges and including enhanced features found on other bridges such as pillars, seats, and capstones, as well as, the salvage and use of existing stone where possible. The Commission is also supportive of maintaining the creek setting in this area and preserving the beauty of the natural habitat.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Wright seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion Passed, 6-0.

**NON-AGENDA ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:**

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, stated, usually, the Commission would discuss Historic Preservation Month and the Historic Preservation Awards during this meeting, but due to the current financial concerns of the City, Staff had been given the directive to only perform essential functions/services and, unfortunately, the awards were not considered an essential function/service. Ms. Anthony stated the Commission would not be able to hold the award ceremony this year and any awards would be postponed until next year or until the financial situation and standing of the City changed. Ms. Anthony stated should the financial situation change, the awards could potentially be held later this year, but it was likely they would be added to next year's ceremony, assuming the City was in better shape. Chairwoman Nichols commented things could change, but felt it made sense to do a combined ceremony for this year and next year.

Commissioner Minch inquired if the City had ever identified anyone to develop a web-based application regarding the historic walking tour. Commissioner Casey stated the Commission had discussed the matter at their annual retreat last year, but did not think anything had moved forward beyond that point. Commissioner Casey commented she was, however, still willing to write the e-book for the walking tour if people would get the information to her. Chairwoman Nichols stated she knew the Mineral Springs Foundation had also discussed something similar for the mineral springs tour and had also heard suggestions these two groups should join forces.

Sara Hartley, Hazard Mitigation and Resiliency Director, stated she had an announcement regarding Saturday, April 21, 2018 for the Great American Clean-Up to help the City clean up and clear out some of the City's parks and waterways. Ms. Hartley stated she would be setting up in Memorial Park at 8:00 that morning and the clean-up would occur from 9:00 a.m. and 12:00 p.m. Ms. Hartley commented any volunteers were appreciated and she looked forward to people coming out and having some fun.

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Historic Preservation Commission, Chairwoman Nichols adjourned the meeting at 7:09 p.m.

*Minutes Prepared by: Dylan Becker, Planner I*