



**MANITOU SPRINGS**  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**  
**Wednesday, July 6, 2011; 7:00 P.M.**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

A Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, July 6, 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  
Commissioner VICKY BUNSEN DOUCETTE  
Vice Chair RANDY HODGES  
Commissioner ANNE HYDE  
Commissioner ANN NICHOLS  
Chairwoman MOLLY WINGATE  
Commissioner TAMMILA WRIGHT

**ABSENT:** None.

**GUESTS:** Alternate Commissioner BARBARA DIAMOND

**STAFF:** Michelle Anthony, City Planner  
Kari Kilroy, Planning Assistant

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**ITEM 1. Minutes from June 1, 2011 Regular Meeting.**

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

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

**DISCUSSION:** There was no discussion.

**VOTE:** Motion passed, 7-0.

**III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION**

**ORD. No. 1111,** An Ordinance Amending Chapter 17.04 Historic Preservation and Chapter 2.52 Historic Preservation Commission passed on 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading during City Council's meeting on June 21, 2011.

**IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None.

**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 1107 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (Addition of Porch) – 53 Grand Avenue – Lon & Kim Lutze, Applicants.**

**DISCUSSION REGARDING REQUEST AND PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Michelle Anthony (City Planner) presented Staff Report MCAC1107 dated 06/29/11. Staff recommended approval with two conditions and the finding that the building was not an architecturally significant structure and not a uniquely historic building.

The Commission had no questions for Staff so Chairwoman Wingate invited the Applicant to the podium.

Lon & Kim Lutze (Applicants), 53 Grand Avenue, approached the podium. Mr. Lutze pointed out that there was an existing 4' eave so the proposed 10'x20' porch would only stick out an additional 6'. He also added that the columns would be 10' apart, not 20' as in the drawing. Mr. Lutze finished by saying that the structure used to be a six-family dwelling and they were trying to make it appear more like a single-family home.

Chairwoman Wingate asked for an update on the roof material. Mr. Lutze showed a sample of the proposed composite shingle with the proposed color.

Mr. Lutze briefly discussed possible rock styles saying that they were open to alternatives. Ms. Anthony added that she had asked the Applicants to choose one with a color, not just gray.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Doucette commented that it seemed like a nice project and the other Commissioners agreed.

Commissioner Case thought that it was a compatible use of the non-contributing guidelines.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Hyde moved to approve MCAC 1107 for the addition of a porch at 53 Grand Avenue with the following conditions:

- 1) Staff to approve the final manufactured stone color and profile prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
- 2) Roofing to be either a three-tab or Architectural-style composition shingle in a darker, Earth-tone color.

Commissioner Hyde further moved that the motion to approve was based on the finding that if the structure was architecturally-significant and unique to the subdistrict then the Commission would be reluctant to recommend an alteration that emphasized a style that didn't really exist

on the property; however, it was not a unique, historic building and the proposal provided an important “missing” element to the existing structure that enhanced its compatibility and was more consistent with the character of the surrounding area. Therefore, the Commission approved the proposed front porch with the finding that the request was consistent with the purpose of the Historic Preservation regulations to promote compatible architectural design of infill structures.

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

**DISCUSSION:** None.

**VOTE:** Motion passed, 7-0.

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

**ITEM 3. MCAC 1108 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (New Single Family Home) – 5 Keithley Place – Jay & Elaine Pretzer, Applicants.**

**DISCUSSION REGARDING REQUEST AND PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Michelle Anthony (City Planner) presented Staff Report MCAC1108 dated 06/29/11. Staff recommended approval with the finding that the request was consistent with the purpose of the Historic Preservation regulations to promote compatible architectural design of (current) infill structures.

Commissioner Case confirmed with Ms. Anthony that the Commission was to consider only the view of the home from the public right-of-way and that it was Staff’s recommendation that they consider only the north and west elevations. Ms. Anthony further explained that to see the east elevation one would have to be on the neighbor’s property and that the south could maybe be viewed if looking through the properties off of Spur Road but Staff would not consider that a bona fide condition of the regulations. She added that even from Keithley Road there was not a strong connection.

Chairwoman Wingate asked what the square footage of the new home would be. Per Ms. Anthony’s request, the Applicant answered from the audience that it would be under 2,400 square feet.

In answer to Chairwoman Wingate’s next question, Ms. Anthony explained that the Applicants were not given a checklist because the checklists were not being given out at the time that they submitted their application.

Chairwoman Wingate then asked Ms. Anthony to address the stucco highlights. Ms. Anthony explained that stucco would not be appropriate if they were doing an addition to a historic cabin but given the lack of visibility and the fact that they were constructing a new home and that the stucco would give it a contemporary touch, Staff felt that the stucco was appropriate.

There were no further questions for Staff so Chairwoman Wingate invited the Applicants to the podium.

Jay Pretzer, 308 Santa Fe Place, introduced his wife, Elaine, and said that Ms. Anthony had summarized the request very well so they did not have a lot to add. He explained that the home would truly be a customized home and he wanted to clarify that he thought that they had seen the option to use stucco in the Historic Design Guidelines. Mrs. Pretzer then showed a sample of the siding that they were going to use while Mr. Pretzer discussed the details and patterns.

Commissioner Case asked about the Applicants' mention in their application of the house being a "passive solar rancher" and wondered if they intended to install solar panels. Mr. Pretzer said that they might possibly consider it down the road but for now the house was designed as south-facing.

Commissioner Case then asked why they were using metal balusters on the west deck. Mr. Pretzer explained that they liked the narrowness in that it enhanced their view from that deck and said that there would also be some wrought iron work in that area of the home. Commissioner Case confirmed with Mr. Pretzer that there would be a wooden cap.

Commissioner Wright wished that there was an alternative to the stucco but said that she understood that it would not be very visible.

Commissioner Wright then confirmed with the Applicants that the siding would be a light color and not painted.

Mrs. Pretzer showed samples of the proposed metal roof color and Mr. Pretzer showed samples of the asphalt shingles and the stone.

Chairwoman Wingate opened the hearing for public comment.

Edward Koback, 3 Keithley Place, said that they would be building on the lot directly behind his house and that they were somewhere in the middle of the Historic District. He loved the plans but mentioned that when he built his house five years ago the Commission was very strict about windows and had required wood and divided lites, which he was happy to comply with. He was concerned about the stucco in that it might hinder the sale of his home in the future and he would like to see conformity. Mr. Koback also mentioned that his neighbors had gone out of their way to conform to the Guidelines.

Nancy Keithley Galles Ballard, 15 Keithley Place, said that nowhere in the neighborhood had she observed stucco. She went on to say that her home was built in 1954 and had been remodeled in 2002 and she had to comply to the Guidelines to the letter when she remodeled, including a green roof and said that the homes had to have log exterior. Ms. Ballard objected to the blue roof saying that it was more Cape Cod than it was their neighborhood.

Douglas Keithley Edmundson, 7 Keithley Road, said that there was no consideration in the Guidelines for stucco. Regarding the proposed house he said that he saw odd sizes, two different roof materials and that it was totally not congruent to any houses in the area. Mr. Edmundson finished by saying that there was no stone veneer above the rim joists in the area.

Linda Blauvelt, 19 Keithley Road, said that she had the same concerns as everybody else. When they built their home they had to put in divided windows and they cost a lot but they had to do it.

She said that the proposed windows were bad, the blue was bad and she disapproved of all the stucco. Mrs. Blauvelt finished by saying that there was a lot of talk about no one's going to see it but you will see it.

Betty Armstrong, 14 Keithley Road, said that her home was built in 1946 and had a living growth on the roof. During her comments, it became clear that Ms. Armstrong thought that the photograph showing the proposed roof color was also a picture of the proposed house. Chairwoman Wingate and the Applicants tried to explain that it was not a picture of the proposal.

Seeing and hearing no further comment, Chairwoman Wingate closed the hearing to the public.

Mr. Pretzer asked to speak again and Chairwoman Wingate invited him to the podium.

Mr. and Mrs. Pretzer said that if stucco was objected they could use log siding instead.

Discussion ensued between Mr. Pretzer and Chairwoman Wingate regarding where the stucco was proposed.

Mr. Pretzer then discussed the windows and their choice not to do grids.

Mrs. Pretzer said that she grew up in Manitou and that she envisioned the blue roof color blending in with the purple/blue mountains and the sky. She didn't want it to stick out and reiterated that she thought that it would blend in saying that she was just trying to do something a little different from all the green roofs.

Commissioner Case wondered if Staff had required a citizen participation plan. Ms. Anthony said no.

Commissioner Case referred to the old version of the Historic Design Guidelines saying that maybe they were a bit heavy-handed in trying to make a new structure blend in with the existing buildings but that the stucco trim and the windows on the north elevation bothered him.

Chairwoman Wingate pointed out that there was a dynamic balance between blending in and not looking old. The Guidelines were pretty specific but they were still "guidelines" and the job of the Commission was to make sure that the proposal fit within them. Regarding the windows she said that it was modern construction and modern windows were consistent and she liked consistency. They couldn't suddenly say that they had to put divided lites in if there was nothing on the record. Chairwoman Wingate didn't particularly care about the roof color saying that blue, green, and brown were all earth tones. She finished by reiterating that the house was not trying to appear old.

When Commissioner Case asked Chairwoman Wingate what she thought about the stucco, Chairwoman Wingate replied that she didn't like the stucco but had heard that the Applicants were willing to work on that aspect.

Commissioner Hyde felt that the place where the stucco stuck out was around the windows.

Vice Chair Hodges said that the Guidelines say log cabin style exclusively and that there was no mention of stucco so he couldn't agree to that. He also said that the Guidelines addressed roof scale and texture, not color, and he felt that the metal didn't fit.

Chairwoman Wingate and Commissioner Nichols commented that there were several other metal roofs and Ms. Anthony confirmed that there were several and added that the Log Cabin subdistrict was the only subdistrict where metal roofs were allowed.

Regarding Commissioner Doucette's question about the stone veneer, Ms. Anthony said that it was used pretty significantly on foundations, chimneys, and porch columns. Ms. Anthony added that one could say that stone was second only to log regarding materials in that subdistrict.

Commissioner Wright appreciated the neighbors coming and mentioned that she lives below the area so she would see it. She also said that she knew that the intention of the Log Cabin subdistrict was that they wanted to see earth tones, not sky tones. Commissioner Wright finished by wondering why someone would move into a specific district and then want to do something different.

Commissioner Case wondered if cedar shingles were used in the subdistrict. Ms. Anthony said some use in gable ends. She added that cedar shingles wouldn't be seen on an historic cabin but that the Applicants were doing a contemporary twist.

Ms. Anthony acknowledged that the Design Guidelines had changed and that they had much less detail and fewer guidelines for new construction, for example, not mentioning things like windows. She said that she and the Applicants had discussed using divided lite windows but that the Guidelines didn't require using divided lites. Ms. Anthony then discussed the Blauvelts' cabin at 19 Keithley Road, which had been approved to use contemporary stone on one façade.

Commissioner Doucette thought that the blue color was an earth tone.

Commissioner Nichols reminded the Commission that the Applicants were willing to replace the stucco on the north elevation around the windows and thought that, with that change and possibly reducing the stucco on the west side, it would be a compatible structure. She reiterated that there were no regulations for windows or for roof color and agreed with Commissioner Doucette that the blue would blend in nicely.

Chairwoman Wingate confirmed with the Applicants that they were comfortable with the changes and Mrs. Pretzer suggested possibly using cedar trim to replace the stucco thereby matching the front entry.

Ms. Anthony explained that they could bring the siding down to within 6" of the grade and mentioned that when there was minimal foundation showing, it was acceptable to use stucco instead of bare concrete.

Mr. Pretzer said that they could bring the log siding down, depending upon how it graded out.

Chairwoman Wingate asked about the west elevation and the Applicants said that they would use siding. Ms. Anthony showed the Commission a sketch of what she thought the Applicants were

proposing. The Applicants confirmed that Ms. Anthony's sketch was accurate and the Commissioners agreed that they liked the changes.

In answer to Chairwoman Wingate's question if there were any other issues, Commissioner Wright said the roof and Vice Chair Hodges said that the blue metal bothered him.

Commissioner Nichols reiterated that there were actually a lot of metal roofs up there.

Discussion ensued.

**MOTION:**

Chairwoman Wingate moved to approve MCAC 1108 for the construction of a new single family home at 5 Keithley Place with the following conditions:

- 1) The Applicants will work with Staff to replace as much stucco on the building as is possible.
- 2) Minimal use of stucco is allowed to cover bare foundation exposure.

Chairwoman Wingate further moved that the motion to approve was based on the finding that the proposal maintained the character of the area while allowing for a contemporary log cabin and that the request was consistent with the purpose of the Historic Preservation regulations to promote compatible architectural design of (current) infill structures.

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

**DISCUSSION:** None.

**VOTE:** Motion passed, 6-1 (Commissioner Wright cast the opposing vote).

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

**ITEM 4. Update on Canon/Park Avenue Bridge Project**

Ms. Anthony discussed the load testing and passed out photographs. The conclusion of the tests was that both bridges would need to be saddled. In answer to Commission questions, Ms. Anthony explained what saddling entailed. She also mentioned that the bridges were not the worst but that they were the most used and got the heaviest traffic; they were also on the National Registry.

**ITEM 5. Discussion of September Workshop**

Ms. Anthony and Commissioner Doucette were working on it.

**ITEM 6. 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

Regarding public education, Chairwoman Wingate told the Commission that she, Ms. Anthony, and Commissioner Doucette had met with Councilwoman Aimee Cox regarding financial incentives for property improvement. Chairwoman Wingate asked the Commission to email her addresses and pictures of any properties they thought could use incentives and why. Ms. Anthony mentioned that the program would probably end up being multi-pronged and long-range.

**ITEM 7. Other**

Ms. Anthony mentioned that she had run into Dave Meese and reported that he was cancer-free. He had thanked the Commission again for his honor award, saying that he was very touched and was disappointed that he couldn't go to the presentation.

Vice Chair Hodges wondered if the MCAC application addresses could be conveyed to the Commission before the Staff Reports were done so that he would have time to drive by the properties before the meetings. The others agreed with his request. Discussion ensued. It was agreed that Ms. Kilroy would email the draft agendas to the Commission once they were finalized by the Planners.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business before the Commission, Chairwoman Wingate adjourned the meeting at 8:49 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Kari Kilroy*