



**MANITOU SPRINGS**  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES**  
**Saturday, September 8, 2012, 10:30 A.M.**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

A Special Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Saturday, September 8, 2012 in Council Chambers @ 606 Manitou Avenue. Chairperson Wright called the meeting to order at 10:32 a.m. The following were in attendance:

**PRESENT:** Commissioner ANNE HYDE  
Commissioner ANN NICHOLS  
Commissioner MOLLY WINGATE  
Commissioner HILLARY MANNION  
Chairperson TAMMILA WRIGHT

**ABSENT:** Commissioner CHARLES CASE (excused)

**STAFF:** Dan Folke, AICP Planning Director  
Michelle Anthony, AICP Planner

**GUESTS:** None

**II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**ITEM 1.** MCAC 1207 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (Demolition and New Construction) – 946 Midland Avenue, Joanne Pearring for Judith, Jeffrey and Jenelle Pearring, Applicants.

Ms. Anthony stated the Commission had performed a site visit earlier that morning and had scheduled the special meeting in order to give Staff and/or the Applicants direction as to additional information needed to complete the application.

Commissioner Nichols indicated the Commission had directed Staff to prepare the Historic Survey and Inventory Form at the September 5<sup>th</sup> meeting in order to determine contributing status of the building. She also asked that Staff provide an overview of the ages and contributing status of the surrounding properties in this area.

Commissioner Wingate noted one of the neighbors had presented some information relating to the surrounding properties and suggested that person might be willing to share this information with Staff.

Commissioner Nichols further stated she felt an independent contractor needed to be hired to evaluate the condition of the structure and the costs for rehabilitation and repair.

Mr. Folke clarified cost for this would be the responsibility of the Applicants. The Commission asked Staff how much the last independent evaluation cost. Ms. Anthony replied she did not recall specifically but felt this would be \$500-\$1000.

The Commission determined it was necessary to take a vote on this direction to Staff.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Nichols moved to direct and authorize Staff to obtain an evaluation of the costs for rehabilitation and repair of the subject structure.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Wingate seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 5-0.

Discussion regarding whether the Applicants needed to address alternatives to demolition, such as repair and adding to the structure ensued. Staff suggested this was something the independent contractor could be asked to address. The Commission determined the Applicants should address this question.

Mr. Folke noted it was up to the Applicants to review the application requirements and submit the information they felt met those. It was up to the Commission to then determine whether what was presented was adequate or not, so the Applicants could choose to submit additional information or not.

Commissioner Nichols suggested the Applicants and the Commission should be provided copies of the return on investment evaluations submitted for the demolitions of the 120 Manitou Avenue, 120 Fairview, and 108 Oklahoma.

Ms. Anthony noted for the Applicants and the Commission's information that only 108 Oklahoma was based, at least in part, on the additional information list that had been developed during that review process. She wanted to make sure the Applicants didn't use one of the other evaluations as a template and then the Commission not feel it adequately addressed the information they were looking for. Staff asked if there was anything else on the additional information list the Commission wanted the Applicants to provide.

Commissioner Nichols stated there was a pertinent section in the adopted Historic Preservation Regulations – 17.04.090 Economic Hardship – that should be looked at and utilized as the basis for the economic feasibility evaluation. She suggested this section contained all the criteria necessary and the City should look at better connecting the Demolition and Economic Hardship sections.

Commissioner Wingate noted she had mentioned to Staff on site that it would be helpful to know how long the building had been in its current configuration. Ms. Anthony stated as much of this information as could be found would be included in the Historic Survey and Inventory Form.

Discussion ensued regarding whether the Applicants and Staff would be able to submit all the information in time for packet preparation and hearing on October 3<sup>rd</sup>. Ms. Anthony stated that she would do her best to complete the research for the Historic Survey and Inventory Form in time for the October meeting. However, she did not know the timing for the independent consultant evaluation.

Commissioner Wingate stated she felt Staff and the Commission were committed to as complete and timely process as possible. If the Commission needed to consider another special meeting because everything could not be accomplished in time for the regular meeting, she would support this and the rest of the Commission was in agreement.

Chairperson Wright asked if the Applicants had any questions.

Todd Liming, Planning Matters, of 438 Prospect in Colorado Springs and representing the Applicants asked if he should focus on the 108 Oklahoma Road evaluation as an example for economic feasibility/return on investment. Commissioner Nichols suggested they should look at all three examples. Staff noted the examples might be helpful, but they still needed to reference the code and make sure they covered the requirements in it.

Chairperson Wright asked if there was any public comment.

Michelle Beckman, 950 Midland Avenue, asked how the neighbors would find out if there was a special meeting. Staff noted the property would be posted for any meetings. However the Commission was not looking at holding a special meeting prior to October 3<sup>rd</sup>. If another meeting was necessary, they might schedule a special meeting at that October hearing, so anyone attending would also know when any further discussion was going to occur.

Ms. Beckman also asked if it was within the Commission's scope to consider the issue of size of the proposed development. Commissioner Wingate referred Ms. Beckman to the Mass and Scale guidelines and stated these related to the size of the proposed structure and would be considered by the HPC.

Hearing no further comment, Chairperson Wright closed the public hearing.

### **III. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Commission, Chairperson Wright adjourned the meeting at 10:55 a.m.

*Minutes submitted by Michelle Anthony*