



**MANITOU SPRINGS
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, August 3, 2011; 7:00 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

A Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, August 3, 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: None.

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

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ITEM 1. Minutes from July 6, 2011 Regular Meeting.

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

SECOND: Commissioner Case seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: There was no discussion.

VOTE: Motion passed, 7-0.

III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

AP 1101 – Appeal of Historic Preservation Commission Approval of MCAC 1108 (5 Keithley Place) – Douglass Edmundson, Nancy Galles, Bruce & Linda Blauvelt, Ed & Jan Kobach, and Betty Armstrong, Appellants has been scheduled for a hearing before City Council on August 16 @ 7:00 p.m. Discussion ensued regarding the procedure. Per Chairwoman Wingate’s question, Ms. Anthony clarified that the “Planning Commission” referred to in the Appellants’ letter was really the HPC. Discussion continued. Ms. Anthony suggested that the Commission’s particular concerns could be addressed to the City Attorney before the Council hearing. Chairwoman Wingate indicated that she would do that.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

V. NEW BUSINESS

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

ITEM 2. MCAC 1109 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (Remove Windows) – 11 Washington Avenue – Tom Bryant (Bryant Construction and Fine Carpentry) on behalf of Brigitte & Alex Klaib, Applicant.

DISCUSSION REGARDING REQUEST AND PUBLIC COMMENT:

Michelle Anthony (City Planner) presented Staff Report MCAC1109 dated 07/29/11. Staff recommended denial of the request because it was inconsistent with the purpose of the Historic Preservation regulations to foster historic rehabilitation of existing structures.

Commissioner Case asked Ms. Anthony if applicants were required to sit down with Staff and discuss the checklist as part of the application procedure. Ms. Anthony replied that it was not a requirement at this time. She suggested that Staff could discuss the desires of the Commission regarding the checklist. Ms. Anthony also pointed out that the Applicant's submission was so close to the meeting date (after the deadline) that Staff would not have had time to go over the checklist with them anyway.

Discussion ensued regarding the checklist.

The Commission had no further questions for Ms. Anthony so Chairwoman Wingate invited the Applicant to the podium.

Tom Bryant (Applicant), 101 Fairview Avenue, introduced himself as the home owners' general contractor. He first addressed Staff's concern about the siding saying that any replacement siding (to cover the removed window(s)) would be similar to what was already on the house; he felt that cedar "shakes" and cedar "shingles" were the same thing. Mr. Bryant went on to discuss the history of the cantilevered porch addition and mentioned that there was a problem with the floor plan and the bearing walls because of a long ago renovation--he surmised in the 40s/50s--when the porches were closed in and then a 2nd renovation when a bunch of interior walls were removed. Based on the window pattern all around the façade with 16" between each, Mr. Bryant felt that the windows they wished to remove were added at a later date. He then described how they had been painted and caulked so much that they couldn't be opened, even with a crowbar. It would be difficult to restore, would be in the bathroom, and looked into the neighbor's house only 15' away so Mr. Bryant felt that removing at least one of the windows would be only a minor change on a beautiful house. He added that there was also a tree there and that the windows were set back on the side of the house. Mr. Bryant said that the owners were putting some major money into the house by completely replacing the plumbing and correcting other renovation work that had been done with no permits. He finished by saying that if the Commission allowed the removal of the window they would make it match.

Commissioner Doucette commented that she still did not understand what the Applicant felt could not be done on the interior if the window stayed. Mr. Bryant explained that he had originally encouraged the owners to not remove any windows and they had agreed. However, as they got in there and started doing the work the homeowners thought that it didn't look right and thought that it would look better to make the whole space a shower. One of the windows would be in the shower and was only 18" from the floor so that was why they were requesting removal of the window.

Chairwoman Wingate asked Mr. Bryant if the gain of removing the window was more shower. Mr. Bryant replied yes and added that they would also be losing a spot that didn't make sense.

Commissioner Case asked if the windows to be removed had ropes and weights. Mr. Bryant replied yes.

Commissioner Nichols wondered why there couldn't be a window in the shower. Mr. Bryant explained that it would be damaged by the water since it was so low to the floor.

Discussion ensued between Ms. Anthony and Mr. Bryant regarding rearranging the bathroom so that the shower would be in a different location.

Commissioner Case wondered if there had been discussion about losing natural light if the windows were removed. Mr. Bryant replied that there would be tons of natural light because the entire upstairs was windows. Commissioner Case countered that if both windows in the bathroom were removed then there would be no natural light in the bathroom. Mr. Bryant conceded that that was true but said that then they wouldn't be looking at the neighbors so the owners wouldn't mind the loss of the light.

Chairwoman Wingate asked if they had planned for ventilation. Mr. Bryant replied yes and explained that the bathroom would be to code and that they would install an exhaust fan.

Based on previous discussion regarding the installation of glass block, Commissioner Wright commented that she had glass block in her shower on an exterior wall and that she did not recommend it (because it was cold).

Commissioner Wright asked if the Commission could do a site visit because she was having trouble envisioning alternatives to removing the windows. Chairwoman Wingate pointed out that the Commission's purview was to allow or not allow the removing of the window(s); they did not have to redesign the project by providing alternatives.

Per a question from Commissioner Doucette, Ms. Anthony said that replacing the window with glass block or recessing it as a solid wall would be considered six of one or half a dozen of the other as far as Staff was concerned.

Mr. Bryant mentioned that there were several different types of really nice tempered glass and Ms. Anthony pointed out the window in Council Chambers behind him, suggesting, as well, that there were a lot of options.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Doucette commented that losing windows that were visible to the public was an incremental change that would eventually impair the architectural integrity of a neighborhood. She felt that a lot of things could be done and she wouldn't have a problem with using different materials or Ms. Anthony's idea of a recessed "wall" saying that she didn't care what the Applicant did on the interior but that they had some responsibility to the neighborhood and to the community to maintain the ambience and integrity.

Commissioner Case agreed with Commissioner Doucette's comments and pointed out that the Commission was dealing with the Guidelines so they couldn't stretch them to allow removing the windows, particularly getting rid of only one window which would leave the elevation looking lopsided.

Commissioner Nichols agreed with the previous comments adding that she was very sensitive to balancing maintaining historic integrity with functionality but she was having a hard time coming to grips with the idea that requiring the windows to stay would impair the functionality for the owners. She felt that they could achieve functionality in whatever way they felt appropriate but that the Commission could not allow the change of historic character just for convenience.

Chairwoman Wingate added that the bump-out was now an integral part of what the building was and though she appreciated Mr. Bryant's argument of finding weird things she was not swayed by it. Though she found it difficult to say "no", all the windows in that regular pattern were what it was and even though the window in question was on the side it was still really visible from the street so she concurred with Staff's findings.

Vice Chair Hodges commented that 11 Washington was listed as one of the notable addresses in its subdistrict and added that windows were one of the most important attributes to a structure. He began reading from the Design Guidelines to further his point: 4.1 (an alteration to an historic building shall ensure that the original architectural character and style of the structure is maintained), 4.5 (mass and scale), 4.13 (windows shall be preserved and sealing a window is inappropriate), and 4.15 (avoid removing or altering any significant architectural detail). Vice Chair Hodges finished by stating that the Guidelines stated time and again that the Commission could not approve removing the window(s).

MOTION:

Commissioner Case moved to respectfully deny MCAC 1109 to remove windows at 11 Washington Avenue because the request did not conform to the intent, spirit or letter of the Historic Design Guidelines, specifically regarding 4.1 (Architectural Character), 4.13 (Historic Windows) and 4.15 (Architectural Details).

SECOND:

Vice Chair Hodges seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Doucette wondered about discussing some alternatives but it was quickly decided that it was not in the Commission's purview.

Regarding Guideline 4.13, Commissioner Hyde wondered what “materials” entailed and if the Commission needed to be specific about which materials were allowed. Ms. Anthony said that the Applicant did not have a proposal to do some other treatment; the Commission was just ruling on the request to remove windows and saying that they could not. She also pointed out that glass was glass; it was changeable and replaceable.

VOTE: Motion passed, 7-0.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

ITEM 3. Discussion Regarding Public Education

- a. Energy Efficiency Workshop**
- b. Information to Property Owners**
- c. Information to Contractors**

Ms. Anthony referred to her memo addressing these items which was in the Commission’s packets and discussion ensued.

ITEM 4. 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**

Chairwoman Wingate confirmed with Ms. Anthony that these items were being kept on the agenda and would be addressed in turn.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business before the Commission, Chairwoman Wingate adjourned the meeting at 8:13 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Kari Kilroy