



MANITOU SPRINGS
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, November 7, 2012, 7:00 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

A Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, November 7, 2012 in Council Chambers @ 606 Manitou Avenue. Chairperson Wright called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. The following were in attendance:

PRESENT: Commissioner ANN NICHOLS
Commissioner MOLLY WINGATE
Commissioner HILLARY MANNION
Chairperson TAMMILA WRIGHT
Commissioner CHARLES CASE

ABSENT: Commissioner ANNE HYDE (excused)

STAFF: Dan Folke, Planning Director
Michelle Anthony, Planner
Marquitrice Wright, Planning Technician

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ITEM 1. October 3, 2012

MOTION:

Commissioner Nichols moved to approve the October minutes as presented.

SECOND:

Commissioner Wingate seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 5-0.

III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

There was no Council action to report.

Chairperson Wright explained the public hearing procedures to the audience and asked if any of the Commissioners had ex parte communications or conflicts of interest to declare. Hearing none, the meeting continued.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

ITEM 2. MCAC 1207– Material Change of Appearance (Demolition & New Construction – Public Hearing) – 946 Midland Avenue – Joanne Pearring on behalf of Jenelle, Jeffrey and Judith Pearring, Applicant

Ms. Anthony presented the staff report.

Commissioner Wingate asked whether using a different subdistrict description would make a difference which design standards to apply. She also inquired as to whether the 2008 sale of the property included all three proposed lots. Ms. Anthony answered the design standards did not vary greatly between subdistricts and the 2008 purchase included all the lots.

Commissioner Case asked for clarification on whether the exterior of the structure consisted of aluminum or vinyl siding and if siding was removed, the structure might be contributing but what style. Ms. Anthony stated the structure had features consistent with the Manitou Cottage.

Commissioner Nichols stated whether rehabilitation is economically feasible had not yet been demonstrated and was subject to further discussion.

Joanne Pearring, 109 Pawnee Avenue, stated she was present when Tim Stroh came to inspect the structure and he did not go into the crawl space. Ms. Pearring stated the estimate of \$61,000 by JFP Construction was based on the foundation inspection by the structural engineer and a conversation between Mr. Pearring and the Engineer. Mrs. Pearring stated she was trying to get another cost estimate done. She also noted she had requested the Appraiser provide a value of the property based on Mr. Stroh's proposed renovations. Ms. Pearring stated the Pikes Peak Regional Building Department would require a total renovation to bring the property up to code if a certain percentage of renovations were exceeded and that meant changes to all the door heights, stairs, etc. She stated over \$8,000 in repairs had been done since the property was purchased to make it safe and more livable; however it would be too expensive to do full renovations. Ms. Pearring also expressed concern about the lack of off street parking on the property.

Commissioner Case asked if the property was purchased with the intent to demolish the existing house. Mrs. Pearring stated that the property was purchased as three buildable lots and they didn't have an inspection because they didn't intend to keep the house.

Mrs. Pearring further stated that they supported saving historic structures – she and her family had worked to save the Sunnyside Hotel and had done extensive work on their house on Pawnee Avenue. She noted that the houses on Pawnee were once identical.

Chairperson Wright opened the floor for public comment.

Cylinda Walker, 26 Waltham Avenue, inquired as to how the property was listed on the MLS prior to the Applicant's purchase – was it listed as just lots, or lots with a house. She questioned whether this might have misled the purchaser.

Commissioner Nichols stated it was important the Commission know what its goal was in regard to the item prior to opening the floor for public comment. She felt more information was needed and was

reluctant for there to be public comment without knowing what direction the Commission was going. Commissioner Nichols acknowledged the applicant provided economic feasibility information; however a review of the information by an independent third party was necessary.

Discussion ensued regarding what Staff hoped would be accomplished specific to the demolition. Mr. Folke asked the Commission give the applicant direction on whether the structure meets the criteria for demolition and give some initial input on design. He stated Staff wanted to keep the demolition and final design together for review. Mr. Folke noted he had emails from prior to when the property was purchased where he advised the applicant the property consisted of two lots with a house on one lot, and a partial lot.

Commissioner Wingate stated she supported keeping the demolition and design reviews together. She believed the applicant's evaluation and the City's review were from different perspectives - the City reviewed the request from a rehabilitation standpoint and the Applicant was analyzing the economic feasibility based on reconstruction. She also stated the economic feasibility was incomplete and did not factor in tax credits, or potential sale or rental of the house. Commissioner Wingate stated she would like more information on what extent a rehab triggered a full renovation to bring the building up to code.

Commissioner Case noted that the cost of demolition was also not accounted for. He stated perhaps the Commission needed to look at the standard for noncontributing structures and what was needed to change that status. He would hold contributing structures to a different standard than noncontributing structures.

Commissioner Nichols stated that the economic feasibility study would be required whether the structure was contributing or not. She also stated that a third party should be hired to evaluate the applicant's economic feasibility report and provide an independent review of whether the structure is economically feasible to rehabilitate.

Chairperson Wright opened the floor for public comment. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Pearring stated that Mr. Stroh's report was based on information he put into a formula on his computer and wasn't specific to the house and didn't include a lot of things that would be required.

Mr. Folke clarified that, in regard to the demolition, the Commission was requesting:

- a third party review the economic feasibility information
- information from the Pikes Peak Regional Building on what extent a renovation would trigger bringing the building up to code be provided
- the cost of demolition
- the benefit of State Tax Credits

The Commission continued the meeting in order to provide feedback on the proposed designs.

Commissioner Nichols stated the Commission needed a streetscape rendering in order to determine whether the mass and scale of the proposed buildings were comparable to other homes in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Wingate stated the three elevations presented by the Applicant were different from what was provided to the Commission previously. The proposed structures looked identical to her and she encouraged greater variation in their designs. Commissioner Wingate also agreed an elevation drawing of all three homes that included the two most adjacent houses would be helpful

Commissioner Case stated the proposed structures would have a large impact on the neighborhood because of their size and the homes looked more like those from a subdivision. He suggested variation in setbacks to help minimize the overall mass and scale of three, large homes placed in a row.

Ms. Pearing stated Staff had also suggested ways to change the designs that would minimize impacts and asked for more feedback. Ms Anthony and Commissioner Case provided some ideas, such as differing rooflines, varying setbacks, having a single story at the street, etc. Ms. Anthony noted the Commission normally takes into account limitations on a property and the surrounding development when applying the Design Guidelines.

Commissioner Nichols asked if Staff thought it would be feasible for the additional information to be provided by the next meeting. Staff responded that this would not be known until a consultant was located.

MOTION:

Commissioner Wingate moved to postpone MCAC 1207 to the December 5th Regular Meeting.

SECOND:

Commissioner Nichols seconded.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 5-0.

V. NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 3. MCAC 1210– Material Change of Appearance (New Construction) – 944 Midland Avenue – Joanne Pearing on behalf of Jenelle, Jeffrey and Judith Pearing, Applicant

ITEM 4. MCAC 1211– Material Change of Appearance (New Construction) – 948 Midland Avenue – Joanne Pearing on behalf of Jenelle, Jeffrey and Judith Pearing, Applicant

MOTION:

Commissioner Nichols moved to postpone MCAC 1211 to the December 5th Historic Preservation meeting.

SECOND:

Commissioner Wingate seconded.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 5-0.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

ITEM 5. Discussion Regarding Establishing Criteria for Preservation Incentives

Staff commented that there are currently no criteria for determining eligibility for the various incentives outlined in Section 17.04.060 of the Historic Preservation Regulations. The Commission agreed that this should be done and further discussion should occur at the annual retreat.

Mr. Folke stated that he was able to put \$3000 in the Planning budget towards funding for a loan/grant program.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, Chairperson Wright adjourned the meeting at 8:28 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Marquitrice Wright