



**MANITOU SPRINGS  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
Wednesday, May 4, 2011; 7:00 P.M.**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

A Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, May 4, 2011 in Council Chambers @ 606 Manitou Avenue. Chairwoman Wingate called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The following were in attendance:

**PRESENT:** Commissioner CHARLES CASE  
Vice Chair RANDY HODGES  
Commissioner ANNE HYDE  
Commissioner ANN NICHOLS  
Chairwoman MOLLY WINGATE  
Commissioner TAMMILA WRIGHT

**ABSENT:** Commissioner VICKY BUNSEN DOUCETTE (excused)

**GUESTS:** City Administrator JACK BENSON (left after Item #2)

**STAFF:** Dan Folke, Planning Director  
Michelle Anthony, City Planner  
Kari Kilroy, Planning Assistant (arrived @ 7:23 p.m.)

*Jack Benson (City Administrator) introduced himself and told the Commission a little about his background. Chairwoman Wingate thanked Mr. Benson for attending and encouraged him to stay for the meeting. Mr. Folke mentioned that it was Mr. Benson's 3<sup>rd</sup> day on the job (and 3<sup>rd</sup> night at City Hall).*

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**ITEM 1. Minutes from April 6, 2011 Regular Meeting.**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Nichols moved to approve the minutes as presented.

**SECOND:** Commissioner Hyde seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:** None.

**VOTE:** Motion passed, 5-0 (Vice Chair Hodges abstained).

**III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION**

Chairwoman Wingate thanked everyone for preparing for and attending the joint worksession with City Council. She felt that it was a productive meeting and Mr. Folke agreed.

#### IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chairwoman Wingate mentioned that it was Preservation Month and hoped that everyone had the date of the ceremony--May 19--on their calendars.

#### V. NEW BUSINESS

*Chairwoman Wingate reviewed the meeting procedures and asked the Commissioners if they had any ex parte contacts or conflicts of interest to declare; there were none.*

**ITEM 2. MCAC 1104 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (Replace Wood Trim with Vinyl) – 203 Pawnee Avenue – Mark Kimball (Nationwide Builders) on behalf of Judi Edman, Applicant.**

##### **DISCUSSION REGARDING REQUEST AND PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Dan Folke (Planning Director) presented Staff Report MCAC1104 dated 04/29/11. Staff recommended approval of the request with four conditions and one finding. Mr. Folke stated that he had found the review very difficult due to trying to find a balance between maintaining materials and trying to restore the home back to a more historic look; ideally he'd like to see both.

Chairwoman Wingate referred to the north-facing dormer peak shingles and wondered if there was any reason to try to preserve the shingles. She then realized that the dormer had been added in 2001 so it was hardly historic. Michelle Anthony (City Planner) confirmed that the shingles were not very traditional.

Chairwoman Wingate asked Mr. Folke if he was suggesting that the window trim for all the windows be the same. Mr. Folke replied yes and added that the trim on the rear was different from the trim on the front.

Chairwoman Wingate wondered how old the aluminum siding was, saying that the siding on her house was 50 years old and it looked similar. Mr. Folke did not know but thought that the Applicant might.

Commissioner Case asked if the owner knew why the windows had been replaced with vinyl and the siding by aluminum. Mr. Folke said that it had been like that when the owner bought the property. Commissioner Case commented that they had probably been replaced before there was an HPC.

Chairwoman Wingate wondered why the owner was replacing the aluminum siding. Mr. Folke said that it was due to hail damage and that the owner felt that the siding had had its life. He added that she also wanted it to be replaced with a maintenance-free product.

Commissioner Hyde said that if we were trying to go back to a more historic look, how did we know what that look was? Mr. Folke acknowledged that it was hard to know and said that he was making a big assumption. He had primarily focused on the window trim and pointed out in a photograph that one could see that the trim had been over the siding.

Mr. Folke mentioned that they would be taking off the aluminum siding.

Chairwoman Wingate said that it appeared that they would also be adding insulation.

***Kari Kilroy (Planning Assistant) arrived @ 7:23 p.m.***

Commissioner Case wondered if the inner “picture frame” of the window trim would remain. Mr. Folke thought that the Applicant would replicate it and suggested that the Applicant could better answer the question.

As there were no more questions for Staff, Chairwoman Wingate invited the Applicant to the podium.

Mark Kimball (Applicant) introduced himself as the owner of Nationwide Builders and said that the [siding] product would not be vinyl but would be the same product that would be used around the windows and described how it could bend. He then mentioned that there were four different types of trim on the west wall alone and that they wanted to bring the house to a more uniform look.

Commissioner Case asked about the limitations of the product and Mr. Kimball replied that they could do pretty close to ½” bends and congregational bends, could control angles, and could get pretty close to a crown molding look; they just couldn’t make it rounded.

Commissioner Case confirmed with Mr. Kimball that the aluminum siding would be removed but that it had not yet been done.

Commissioner Nichols confirmed with Mr. Kimball that they would keep the original look of the front window and that they could/would apply the trim without removing the wood siding.

Commissioner Case confirmed with Mr. Kimball that they would not remove the wood siding. Mr. Kimball added that he assumed that the aluminum had been put over the wood and he felt that it would be a mistake to remove the wood because it might open up a can of worms.

Chairwoman Wingate wondered if they would make any repairs; for example, if rot was found. Mr. Kimball said yes and further explained that typically there was foil under the aluminum and then described the prep work that they would do to make sure that what they were going over was in good shape.

Vice Chair Hodges wondered what the guarantee was and if it would resist hail. Mr. Kimball said that it was maintenance-free, that the guarantee was the lifetime of the current owner and subsequent owner, and that it would resist hail. He added that the guarantee was also that the color would not fade.

Commissioner Case asked what the primary motive of the owner was and Mr. Kimball said that she wanted the siding to be maintenance-free.

Mr. Folke asked Mr. Kimball to explain the available finishes. Mr. Kimball showed samples to the Commission and explained that the siding had a light grain texture (in green) and that the trim would be smoother (in dark green).

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Case said that it was a special house and an outstanding example of Folk Victorian architecture. He also felt that this was an extraordinary opportunity to help preserve its original state. He referred to Design Guidelines 4.15 (*Architectural details, such as trim, combine to establish distinct character and shall be preserved, whenever feasible. Damaged and/or missing detailing shall be replaced and shall match the original detailing*) and 4.18 (*Maintain original materials, textures and finishes on the existing structure*) and said that he was loathe to accept the conclusion that vinyl siding needed to be put on until they had an estimate of how much it would cost to remove the aluminum siding and restore the wood. Commissioner Case added that he did not think that the request met the Design Guidelines in letter or in spirit.

Vice Chair Hodges agreed with Commissioner Case and said that allowing the vinyl siding would be heading towards a Disneyland style.

Commissioner Wright agreed with Vice Chair Hodges and Commissioner Case.

Commissioner Nichols pointed out that the Guidelines don't require restoration and also that we had no idea what was underneath and in what condition it would be. She was struggling with how that would be navigated and also felt that the owner could present an economic hardship argument if required to restore the original wood.

Commissioner Case said that one would hire a restoration contractor--that's what they did and they did it all the time. He also thought that the word "restoration" had been misused in the application and that it should be referred to as "repair".

Commissioner Nichols pointed out that Mr. Folke had made it clear that if a non-historical material was already in place then it was allowed to be replaced without coming before the HPC.

Commissioner Case said that he was amazed that it had been allowed in the past and referred again to Guideline 4.18 about maintaining original materials.

Commissioner Nichols said that it was an unoriginal material now and hadn't been an original material for some time.

Mr. Kimball, from the audience, interjected that aluminum siding had not been made for 40 years.

Chairwoman Wingate suggested, at the risk of adding a fly to the ointment, that the aluminum siding itself may have become historic. She then asked if the question of vinyl siding was open for discussion. Mr. Folke said that it would be helpful for Staff to know if it was ever okay to Staff-approve it and reiterated the history of how the request had come to be before the Commission.

Chairwoman Wingate confirmed with Staff that no permits had yet been issued for the vinyl siding and then suggested that the Commission could postpone the request by asking for more information, such as how much it would cost to repair what was underneath.

Discussion ensued.

Chairwoman Wingate invited the Applicant back to the podium.

Mr. Kimball made the case that it would be quite costly for restoration just because of the amount of nail holes. He also stressed that he was told by Mr. Folke that it would be okay to do vinyl siding; therefore, the siding had already been purchased and the homeowner was expecting vinyl siding. Mr. Kimball said that it would not be a very good mark on the City if they were not allowed to install the siding. He then went on to say that no one knew what condition the wood would be in and that it would be time-consuming to pull off the aluminum siding, get a restoration contractor to make a bid, and then hope that the owner would accept the bid. Meanwhile, the wood would be exposed all that time. Restoring the wood was okay in a perfect world, but not practical. Mr. Kimball finished by reiterating that he was told that he was only there for the trim.

Mr. Folke clarified what he had told the Applicant and said that he did not feel right about going back on what he had allowed; it would be wrong to tell them that they could not replace the siding with vinyl.

Discussion ensued.

Commissioner Case suggested discussing the trim.

Chairwoman Wingate interjected that she had opened the discussion of the vinyl siding because she had confirmed [with Mr. Folke] that it was an open question.

The consensus was to table the topic of vinyl siding for a future agenda and turn the discussion towards the trim.

Commissioner Case said that he agreed with Staff's conclusions.

Chairwoman Wingate and Commissioner Nichols thought that the request would improve the unity of the home and Vice Chair Hodges agreed.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Nichols moved to approve MCAC 1104 to replace existing wood trim, fascia and soffits with a vinyl product at 203 Pawnee with the following conditions:

1. All vinyl siding will be double 4" inch style and all siding and will have a smooth finish; no faux wood grain texture is permitted.
2. Window trim will be smooth and flat, replicating the width and finish of the trim on the front porch windows.

3. The two wood windows on the front porch will be retained, along with all of the porch details including the ceiling, spindles, spandrels and wood fascia below the rain gutters.
4. The wood detail in the front gable will be retained.

Commissioner Nichols further recommended that the approval be based on the finding that the replacement of the trim would not remove the home from a contributing status to the local Historic District, or have a detrimental impact to the District overall.

**SECOND:**

Vice Chair Hodges seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner Hyde suggested that the motion be based on the Design Guidelines and referenced 4.15 and 4.18.

Commissioner Nichols suggested adding language to the finding that the approval was in conformance with Guidelines 4.1, 4.11, 4.15, and 4.18.

Commissioner Case pointed out that the approval was a trade-off; that the coherent look for the entire property was deemed more important than maintaining the wood trim.

Commissioner Nichols and Vice Chair Hodges accepted the amendments to the finding.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 6-0.

*Mr. Benson (City Administrator) left the meeting and Chairwoman Wingate again asked the Commissioners if they had any ex parte contacts or conflicts of interest to declare; there were none.*

**ITEM 3. MCAC 1105 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (Demolition of Existing Porches and New Construction of Porches) – 2 Grand Avenue – John & Joanne Pearring, Applicants.**

**DISCUSSION REGARDING REQUEST AND PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Michelle Anthony (City Planner) presented Staff Report MCAC1105 dated 04/28/11 explaining that although the Applicants were proposing demolition, a full-blown demolition review was not required since the circa 1962 porch addition was not considered historic.

Per Commissioner Case's question, Ms. Anthony said that it was not likely for approval to be granted to construct the new railings at an historic height, rather than to code.

As there were no more questions for Staff, Chairwoman Wingate invited the Applicant to the podium.

John Pearring (Applicant), 109 Pawnee Avenue, addressed Staff's proposed conditions:

- 1) The applicant consider using a shingled parapet "roof" instead of the balcony railing along the eastern edge of the roof deck. – *Mr. Pearring agreed that this would be a nicer look and said that they would adopt the condition.*
- 2) The roof material, either overall or just in the area of the addition, should be wood shingles or a material that provides a similar texture. Wooden shake shingles are not approved. – *Mr. Pearring thought that they would be fine conforming to this condition, but mentioned that they were 2 or 3 years away from roofing and who knew what materials there would be at that time.*
- 3) Specification regarding the proposed stone veneer shall be provided for Staff confirmation that the material matches the coloring and profile/pattern of the historic stonework on the structure. – *Mr. Pearring said that they were a year or more away from this and that they couldn't pick the stone until they knew what would be available, probably next fall, but he was comfortable with providing the selection to Staff for approval.*
- 4) Parking for the property shall be provided in the existing parking lot and the eastern parking lot, if approved by the City. The landscaping and greenstone wall along the eastern side of the lot shall be restored to the extent possible and vegetation shall be incorporated that screens the parking area from view to the extent possible. – *Ms. Anthony changed the condition based on previous discussions with Mr. Pearring. Mr. Pearring said that they were very conscious about using the greenstone, explained how the lower parking lot had been designed, and discussed the construction of the 4' wall with Mr. Folke and Ms. Anthony.*
- 5) Staff shall review proposed lighting for compatible design and to confirm conformance with the City's lighting standards prior to issuance of a Building Permit. – *Mr. Pearring explained that they were looking for restorable lighting fixtures and discussed the difficulty since there were no original fixtures, but indicated that he was comfortable with providing the selection to Staff for approval.*

Mr. Pearring then addressed Staff's questions concerning windows and doors saying that:

- There were only four restorable/repairable windows (he indicated which ones using the photographs in the packet);
- All the doors on the south and east side balconies were repairable and would remain;
- They would keep all the windows on the top of the turret;
- The rest of the windows were double-hung and they intended to replace them;
- The cost was prohibitive to repair the split sashes so they proposed replacing them with Renewal by Anderson true wood double-paned windows.
- There was another half-moon window but they were unsure yet if RBD would require special 1-hour fire glass. If not, they would put in a stained glass window;

Mr. Pearring also mentioned that they were putting in old English radiators.

Chairwoman Wingate wondered if any of the [double-hung] windows were operational. Mr. Pearring said no and that most of them were screwed together because they were broken. He also mentioned that there were no lead weights attached to any of the ropes and that they had had to replace the headers in over half of the windows.

Mr. Pearring then showed the Commission the color matching that had been done by the previous owner, Ken Long.

Discussion ensued regarding the parking areas.

Chairwoman Wingate said that she applauded the Applicants' sensitivity towards preserving the windows. Mr. Pearring said that it was a privilege and honor to be able to restore the building.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Wright said that it was so great and really exciting; Commissioner Case commented that it was wonderful and beautiful.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Wright moved to approve MCAC 1105 for replacement of the nonhistoric addition on the back of 2 Grand Avenue with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant use a shingled parapet "roof" instead of the balcony railing along the eastern edge of the roof deck.
- 2) The roof material, either overall or just in the area of the addition, should be wood shingles or a material that provides a similar texture. Wooden shake shingles are *not* approved.
- 3) Specification regarding the proposed stone veneer shall be provided for Staff confirmation that the material matches the coloring and profile/pattern of the historic stonework on the structure.
- 4) Parking for the property shall be provided in the existing parking lot and the eastern parking lot, if approved by the City. The landscaping and greenstone wall along the eastern side of the lot shall be restored to the extent possible and vegetation shall be incorporated that screens the parking area from view to the extent possible.
- 5) Staff shall review proposed lighting for compatible design and to confirm conformance with the City's lighting standards prior to issuance of a Building Permit.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Case seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

None.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 6-0.

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

**ITEM 4. Review and Recommendation Regarding Ordinance Amending the Historic Preservation Regulations in regard to Public Notice, Neighborhood Meetings, and Appeals Processes.**

Ms. Anthony handed out an email from Commissioner Case with suggested edits.

Discussion ensued and amendments were suggested by the Commission.

**MOTION:** Chairwoman Wingate moved to recommend approval of an Ordinance Amending the Historic Preservation Regulations in regard to Public Notice, Neighborhood Meetings, and Appeals Processes as amended during the May 4, 2011 HPC meeting.

**SECOND:** Commissioner Case seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:** None.

**VOTE:** Motion passed, 6-0.

**ITEM 5. Follow-Up on Board Retreat Items**

- a. **Design Guidelines Updates**
- b. **Demolition Review – Update required information and better define how information is analyzed by City**
- c. **Public Education – Information to Contractors and Property Owners**

Ms. Anthony explained that she had no information yet for these items but that she wanted to keep them on the agendas as standing items so that they would not be forgotten.

-----

Commissioner Hyde returned the discussion to the vinyl siding issue and suggested developing some information to give to applicants regarding vinyl siding versus restoring wood.

Discussion ensued.

Discussion ensued regarding an incentive program.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business before the Commission, Chairwoman Wingate adjourned the meeting at 9:58 p.m.