



MANITOU SPRINGS
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, August 7, 2013, 7:00 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

A Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, August 7, 2013 in Council Chambers at 606 Manitou Avenue. Chairperson Wright called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. The following were in attendance:

PRESENT: Commissioner ANN NICHOLS
Commissioner ANNE HYDE
Chairperson TAMMILA WRIGHT
Commissioner NEALE MINCH

ABSENT: Commissioner MOLLY WINGATE (excused)
Commissioner HILLARY MANNION
Commissioner CYLINDA WALKER (excused)

STAFF: Dan Folke, Planning Director
Michelle Anthony, Planner

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ITEM 1. July 3, 2013

MOTION:

Commissioner Hyde moved to approve the July Minutes as presented.

SECOND:

Commissioner Nichols seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the minutes.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0

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 1309 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (Addition and Exterior Alteration) – 1 Fairmont Avenue – Carrie and Mike Garmen, Applicants.

Staff noted for the audience that this item had been withdrawn.

ITEM 3. MCAC 1308 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (2nd Floor Addition and Exterior Alterations) - 56 Park Avenue – Peter Wolfe for The Maté Factor, LLC, Applicant.

Planner Michelle Anthony presented the Staff Report dated August 2, 2013.

Chairperson Wright asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Minch asked if the shaded area was large enough for 800 sf. Ms Anthony stated the 2001 addition was approximately 800 sf.

Commissioner Nichols asked if it was certain the proposed addition would trigger the 50% Floodplain rule. Ms. Anthony stated that it's not just the addition but all the improvements that are part of a project.

Director Folke explained the regulation requiring buildings to be brought into compliance with current floodplain regulations if the value of work being done is over 50% of the value of the property. Mr. Folke noted that for Certified Local Governments, contributing historic structures were exempt from this rule.

Patricia Parrish, of Opus Planning at 308 Clarksley Road, stated she was representing the applicant and reminded the Historic Preservation Commission its responsibility was to not only make sure of the preservation of historic elements but to also to further economic viability and not stifle it. Ms. Parrish continued that the Yellow Deli was not a franchise, but individually owned, maintained and operated - they just happen to have some architecture elements which are in common. So that particular statement in the Staff Report was incorrect. She stated the Applicant wanted to use the lighter color that was originally on the building. As far as the placement of the second floor addition, Ms. Parrish noted that had not been brought up previously so she asked that the Commission discuss that issue to make sure it was not just a subjective opinion. Ms. Parrish stated she did not believe placing the addition somewhere else was going to have much less of an impact on the building elevations. In regard to the arched openings, item number three (3) under the recommended staff conditions, she asked the Commission to discuss that further because it was a design on Santa Fe type buildings and although this was not Santa Fe, this is the closest they could come up with. In regard to the requirement for canvas awnings, Ms. Parrish stated that she wanted to encourage the Commission to consider the fact that canvas will rot and awnings also help with utility costs.

Ms. Parrish remarked that, as we noted during the site visit, the chimney would not be as visible as people thought it would be. Ms. Parrish stated she disagreed with the statement in Dr. Shriver's letter regarding the visibility of the chimney from the west as the property is covered with trees on that side. She felt the most impact would probably be from across the street at Soda Springs Park or as you are walking up Park Avenue. However, the addition would be no more visible than the rusty old A/C unit now on the roof. The applicant has shown the benefit of getting that old equipment off the roof which is the reason the placement of the second floor addition was important to accommodate the equipment so it would not be visible any longer from Park Avenue. Ms. Parrish asked the Commission to go through the recommended conditions of approval and ask them "Is this just subjective opinion or is this really going to impact the historic value of this building" and "In general is this a good thing for Manitou?" She stated she believed most people, if they were surveyed on the street, would say it's an improvement to what's there now and would help with economic viability, which is ultimately a sustainability issue for Manitou and something that is good for its future.

Scott Harvey, Project Designer, addressed the question about the size of the footprint of the building, noting the 2001 addition was about 790 sf. The owner wanted stairs for workers and stairs for patrons and confining the proposed addition to over the footprint of the 2001 ground floor addition might require the stairs to be shared between workers and patrons. Mr. Harvey continued, in regard to the parapet, the building is fairly inconsistent - the east side has two steps in the parapet yet the south and the west sides have three steps. This was just one of the inconsistencies they wanted to resolve and also correcting this provided the benefit of having one more course of block which would help camouflage the railing. Mr. Harvey stated they were trying to solve two problems at once.

Planning Director Folke verified with Mr. Harvey they are changing the parapet and the design proposed alterations to the height of the building. Mr. Harvey confirmed they were proposing to make the south side equal in height, so it was their desire to change the parapet.

Mr. Harvey addressed the awnings, stating he hoped the Commission would allow removal of some of the awnings because those on the east side of the building were not consistent with those on the south side. Mr. Harvey pointed out that the proposal went to great lengths to minimize the appearance of the mechanical equipment, even to the point of putting geothermal tubing underneath the facility. He stated they were striving to make the exhaust fan and air conditioners as low noise as possible. Mr. Harvey asked if the Commissioners had any questions for him.

Commissioner Hyde asked about divided light windows on the east side. Mr. Harvey stated the owner wanted to install divided light windows on around the new doorway on the east side of the building and pointed out that there were divided light windows on the north side of the building. They were not proposing changes to the west side windows.

Commissioner Hyde noted the previous month the Commission had advised a drawing should be provided if divided light windows were proposed. Therefore she understood they wanted divided lights on the windows and doors on the east side and that the elevation drawing would be amended to show this. Mr. Harvey apologized for missing that request and confirmed they did want the divided light windows and he would provide an updated elevation drawing.

Peter Wolfe, 966 Manitou Avenue, stated the windows on the west side of the building are original with the metal dividers as on the back of the row of shops over the creek in the 900 block of Manitou Avenue. He noticed these because he had new windows made for the back of the Mate Factor building and they matched the number of lights to the original windows from 1945 and also wanted to match the original, divided windows on this building.

Ms. Anthony clarified the windows being discussed were on either side and in the new entry door on the east side of the building, not the store front windows or the windows around each of the corner at the front of the building. Mr. Harvey confirmed no changes were proposed to the storefront windows or the ones immediately around the front corners of the building and the divided lights were only proposed for the new east side door and window units.

Commissioner Hyde referred to the Staff Recommendation for a darker color if it were to remain. Mr. Harvey stated he did not think there would be a problem with that, although he noted when you look at Manitou Avenue, it sort of stopped after Soda Springs Park and a lighter color would create a continuity of the commercial district and make people think that was more beyond Soda Springs Park. He stated they wanted to keep the color in the yellow spectrum. He stated he thought a lighter color advanced the community and the business more. Mr. Harvey stated that they could change the scale of the chimney and remove a lot of the mass as shown - perhaps coming up to the mantel level with the width as shown and then narrowing it down to something like 24" square, similar to the story poles that were put up.

Commissioner Wright asked Mr. Harvey what he thought of the awnings. Mr. Harvey said historically the City doesn't really have a set pattern for awnings and it wasn't known when the original awnings on this building were built. In terms of the character and where they wanted to go - the building has been problematic in terms of its past, and we want to create a cohesive future ascetic for the building. The proposed awnings fit the structure. Mr. Harvey stated they could find something more Spanish in style but he thought that would be less historical. He noted they wanted to evolve the building historically and into something that would hopefully be a pride of the community for a long time

Commissioner Minch asked if the choice of material was a mandate or was there the ability to be flexible. Ms Anthony explained there are different types of material and the canvas was a kind of generic term for fabric awning materials. She stated the Guidelines are not codes and there is the ability for the Commission to interpret in relation to specific conditions. However, Staff provided the Secretary of the Interior's standards interpretation in regard to awnings in the commercial core and to interpret them differently outside of the commercial core would be consistent with the Secretary's Standards.

Chairperson Wright opened the meeting for public comment.

Keri Lutz and Lon Lutze, 53 Grande Avenue, stated in general they had no issues and felt the proposal might be an improvement. The Lutzes stated they would rather look at a stucco wall than a silver roof and HVAC equipment. Mr. Lutze suggested the appearance of the stair going up the side and to the back would be improved by using a solid stucco railing rather than wood.

Mr. Harvey noted the area under the stairs would be dedicated to a grease trap and bicycle parking, so a solid stucco wall would not work for those uses.

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

Commissioner Nichols suggested the Commission discuss the location of the second floor. What she heard Mr. Harvey say was there were design/function considerations internally for why it was designed and located as proposed. Ms. Nichols stated during the site visit it did not appear that the addition was going to be as visible as she might have thought, so she had no strong feelings either way.

Commissioner Minch stated he went to the site the day before and didn't think the addition looked like it was going to be too big. He also remarked he had no strong feelings regarding it.

Commissioner Hyde stated she agreed. Eight feet didn't make much difference to the overall plan.

Commissioner Nichols stated she had no preference one way or the other regarding the parapets.

Chairperson Wright agreed with the Staff Recommendation regarding leaving the parapets as they are.

Commissioner Minch brought up the issue of square versus arched openings on the second floor addition.

Commissioner Nichols noted she didn't think the arches materially detracted from the building; however the Commission needed to keep in mind the contributing nature of the building had to be maintained to get away from the floodplain issue. So the question would be if the three arches on the west and one on the south detract from the historic character of the original, stucco, commercial building.

Commissioner Minch stated the issue didn't seem to be that there were openings, but that these were visually different than the rest of the building and he felt it would be more compatible with the original structure if at least the windows were not arched.

Chairperson Wright stated sometimes it was not desirable for the addition to perfectly mimic the original building and she felt the arches softened and broke up the second floor mass.

Commissioner Nichols mentioned she felt the windows on the west had very low visibility and she was content to leave them as proposed.

Chairperson Wright stated she supported the awnings being fabric and matching the commercial core.

Commissioner Nichols stated the awnings as shown were attractive but when you walked downtown, everything was canvas. She remarked she thought the Applicant could do a very nice custom job and still have canvas and they would look perfect. Historically awnings were not metal, they were canvas and Commissioner Nichols suggested the Commission insist on canvas.

Commissioner Minch stated he was also convinced, after hearing this discussion, that the awnings should be a canvas material.

Chairperson Wright asked if there was any discussion regarding the proposed railings around the rooftop dining area.

Commissioner Nichols stated she felt the Staff recommendation was correct in regard to the color and the use of diminutive posts.

Chairperson Wright asked the Commission for discussion regarding the fireplace chimney.

Commissioner Nichols stated she supported the changes that had been offered, which would narrow the chimney and make it a more compatible color. She noted what made it stand out in the elevations was that the building was dark and chimney was light in color. She felt as long as the building and chimney were more compatible in color; she had no particular problem with the location

Commissioner Minch stated the mass was huge and better as proposed than as part of the second floor.

Commissioner Wright asks if everyone agreed with staff on having an alternative low profile fire feature.

Commissioner Nichols stated staff basically suggested a fire pit and she believed the consensus was that with the changes offered by the applicant to reduce the width of the chimney to so it would be closer in size and height to what was mocked-up on the site and in a darker, more compatible, color were acceptable.

Commissioner Minch asked for a recap of the decisions made during this discussion. The Commission and Staff reviewed what would be the conditions of approval based on the previous discussion.

MOTION:

Commissioner Nichols moved to approve MCAC 1308 for construction of a partial second floor, development of rooftop seating, and exterior alterations to the existing building at 56 Park Avenue with the following conditions:

- 1) There shall be no change to the existing height or design of the parapet on the original structure.
- 2) All awnings on the lower or upper floors shall be canvas, either movable or fixed, and of a traditional design similar to the awning currently on the front façade of the building.

3) Roof top railings shall be as depicted in the application, unless additional setback from the front or east-facing elevation is needed to further mitigate visibility. Railings shall be a dark color and the posts shall be a diminutive as possible.

4) The fireplace/chimney shall be narrowed at the base and will be approximately 24” square and straight above the mantel line and in a darker color that coordinates with the building color.

Commissioner Nichols further recommended the finding that the proposed alterations, as amended by the final conditions of approval, maintain the architectural integrity and contributing status of the simple, original storefront by meeting the purpose and intent of the Historic Preservation Regulations as follows:

- Improving the economic vitality of the historic areas of the community through encouraging and fostering historic rehabilitation of structures.
- Promoting and encouraging private rehabilitation and ownership of historic structures.

SECOND:

Commissioner Minch seconded the motion

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

Mr. Harvey asked if the shape of the awnings as proposed was acceptable as long as they were covered in a canvas awning material. The Commission agreed that the shape was acceptable.

V. NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no Other Business

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, Chairperson Wright adjourned the meeting at 8:18 p.m.