



MANITOU SPRINGS
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 4, 2015 7:00 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

A Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, February 4, 2015 in Council Chambers at 606 Manitou Avenue. Chair Anne Hyde called the meeting to order at 6:59 p.m. The following were in attendance:

PRESENT: Commissioner ANN NICHOLS
Commissioner MOLLY WINGATE
Vice Chair CYLINDA WALKER
Commissioner NEALE MINCH
Chairperson ANNE HYDE

ABSENT: Commissioner TAMMILA WRIGHT (excused)

STAFF: Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner
Sherri Crowley, Planning Technician

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ITEM 1. January 7, 2015

MOTION:

Commissioner Wingate moved to approve the minutes as presented.

SECOND:

Commissioner Walker seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0. Chairperson Hyde abstained as she was not present at the January meeting.

III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

There was no Council Action to report.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no Unfinished Business to discuss.

At this time, the Commissioners introduced themselves to the audience and Chairperson Hyde reviewed the meeting procedures and asked if any Commissioner had ex parte contacts or conflicts of interest to declare. Hearing none, the meeting continued.

V. NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 2. MCAC 1501 - Material Change of Appearance Certification (new Garage Structure) - 213 Mesa Avenue - Kurt Meredith, Applicant.

Senior Planner Michelle Anthony presented the staff report dated January 30, 2015.

Commissioner Wingate suggested because the house had divided light windows, the applicant may wish to mirror those on the garage. Ms. Anthony replied the applicant could address, however either divided light or single light windows would be appropriate as garages could be simpler than the main structure, but there would be nothing wrong with matching the windows to the house.

Chairperson Hyde asked if there were any further questions. Hearing none, the applicant as invited to the podium.

Kurt Meredith, 213 Mesa Avenue, stated he would be happy to answer any questions, however because it was only a garage with a studio, there was not much to present. Mr. Meredith said in regard to the windows, they could be matched however they were actually leftover from when the addition to the house was built. He asked Commissioner Wingate to clarify what she was asking. Commissioner Wingate explained what she meant by divided light windows. Mr. Meredith replied yes, the gable window would be divided light to match the house.

Jeanne Steele, 213 Mesa Avenue, stated they loved the house and the historical nature of it. She noted it was originally a 1913 home and the addition won an award from the HPC. She and Mr. Meredith felt they should keep the garage in the same spirit of the house.

Chairperson Hyde asked if there were anyone in the audience would like to comment.

Walter Clavier, 153 Capitol Hill Avenue, stated he supported the proposed construction.

There being no further audience comments, Chairperson Hyde closed the public hearing.

MOTION:

Commissioner Wingate moved to approve MCAC 1501 for construction of a new, single car garage with a second-floor living level at 213 Mesa Avenue as requested with the understanding the garage door design will conform to the photograph as presented by the Applicant at the meeting and the gable window will feature divided lights to match the house. Commissioner Wingate found the overall proposal is consistent with the purpose of the Historic Preservation Regulations by encouraging private ownership and use of properties within the District.

SECOND:

Commissioner Nichols seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 5-0.

ITEM 3. MCAC 1502 - Material Change of Appearance Certification (Demolition Residential) - Initial Meeting) - 903 High Road - Ryan Lloyd of Echo Architecture on behalf of Jeff and Sara Reindeau, Applicant.

Senior Planner Michelle Anthony presented the staff report dated January 30, 2015.

Commissioner Wingate asked Staff to verify that in order to approve a demolition, a new construction must also be approved. Ms. Anthony replied that was correct.

Commissioner Wingate asked if the garage was a separate issue. Ms. Anthony replied it was unclear whether the garage was to be considered at this time, or would be applied for separately and recommended this be clarified with the Applicant.

Commissioner Wingate further asked if the renderings of the rehabilitation option for the cottage were required. Ms. Anthony replied this was not required.

Commissioner Nichols asked Staff if a historic inventory form would be useful. Ms. Anthony stated the Commission could decide that a historic inventory form would not be required, adding it would have limited usefulness. She noted the current process will document the existing building and it appeared there was not disagreement between the City and the Applicant that the building was a contributing structure.

Commissioner Nichols stated she felt this was a step which could be eliminated and adequate information had been provided. She saw no point in requesting further documentation.

Commissioner Walker asked about the cottages encroachment on the adjacent property. Ms. Anthony said it was likely that the property next door may have also been in the same ownership and people built based on where they thought property lines were or ignored these boundaries when they owned several lots. She further clarified that new construction would be expected to meet setbacks.

There was discussion among the commissioners as to when a site visit could be scheduled. The commissioners agreed to perform a site visit on Tuesday, February 17, 2015 at 4:30PM.

Chairperson Hyde asked if there were further questions for Staff, hearing none, they applicant was invited to the podium.

Ryan Lloyd, Echo Architecture, stated the owners live in Washington and hoped to retire in Manitou Springs. Mr. Lloyd agreed with staff's findings adding in regard to primary verses secondary structure, he felt the building didn't fit either description. It is not a secondary structure; it was built as a cottage for residential however in his opinion, it was not built for long-term use. Mr. Lloyd noted there was no foundation and the building appeared to have never been winterized or even weatherized. The existing siding under the green asphalt shingles was butted and gapped and daylight could be seen between boards. He assumed it was a summer cottage built for short term occupation. Mr. Lloyd also stated, as far as the renderings on the rehab of the existing cottage, if this was to be done, it would look virtually identical to what was being proposed, adding he tried to match the roof pitch, window locations and shingle siding of the existing building. He stated one of the main reasons for requesting demolition and rebuilding rather than rehabilitating the existing building was the setback issues. His concern would be once the building was lifted up and a foundation was installed, there would be a lot of disturbance on the neighbor's property. According to code, rehabbing the cottage would be a change of occupancy and he was concerned with complying with building code as there would be a lot of work necessary to meet code.

The building does not meet energy code; there was only framing at the door and window openings so there is no place to insulate. Also, the ceiling height was quite low and not to code, which is also an issue for the owner.

Commissioner Minch asked if the neighbor was okay with the present location of the cottage or if there any litigation pending. Mr. Lloyd stated according to his client, there had not been any problems however they did mention the neighbor was not too friendly and they did not communicate very often.

Commissioner Minch asked regarding the rehabilitation verses rebuilding cost estimates, would the functionality be the same. Mr. Lloyd replied the construction prices are true estimates however the value was approximated. Because of the ceiling height issue, he estimated somewhat below average value for the remodel. Mr. Lloyd added the width of the existing cottage also limits things like the bathroom and closet would be tighter than and not as spacious as the new building would allow.

Ms. Anthony asked if the width and the ceiling height on the existing structure, if rehabilitated, would still be smaller and lower. Mr. Lloyd replied yes.

Ms. Anthony stated that because this was not a public hearing, it would be up to Chairperson Hyde if she would hear any public comment. Chairperson Hyde suggested public comment may be better heard next time when a decision would actually be made.

Walter Clavier asked if he could make a comment because he had looked at the property. Chairperson Hyde agreed.

Walter Clavier, 153 Capitol Hill Avenue, stated he went and looked at the cottage and asked the applicant if he were to rehabilitate the cottage, what would be left. Mr. Lloyd replied there would be nothing left that could be seen on the outside.

Mr. Lloyd asked Staff to review the steps in the process. Ms. Anthony replied at the formal hearing, the Commission would go through each of the items in the demolition criteria and review the replacement structure against the Design Guidelines. The Commissioners would then make a recommendation to City Council regarding the demolition and either approve or deny the actual replacement structure design. The demolition would then go to Council for final determination.

Commissioner Wingate wanted to clarify drawing A5 and the visibility of the construction. Ms Anthony stated this was on a corner and would be seen somewhat from Tio Road. Mr. Lloyd stated the reason there is no significant visual difference is because they want the new construction to mimic the cottage, and used the breezeway to visually link the two structures.

Ms. Anthony noted the western side of the breezeway could not be seen from either High or Tio Roads, so it would not be reviewed.

Mr. Lloyd mentioned the owners had decided they would request the MCAC for the new garage after the demolition request was finalized since, if the demolition was not approved, they would not continue with the garage.

Commissioner Minch verified the Commissioners all agreed a statement regarding the architectural and historical significance was not necessary. Ms. Anthony noted there was such a statement in the application, which she concurred with.

MOTION:

Commissioner Nichols moved to set the public hearing for March 4, 2015.

SECOND:

Commissioner Minch seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 5-0.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Anthony introduced Steven Snyder, a Crystal Hills resident and retired consulting archeologist.

Mr. Snyder noted he had worked on Fort Carson for many years and previously worked with Colorado Springs regarding compliance with National Historic Preservation Act. He was interested in the impact of federal or state funds being used in Manitou Springs that could potentially impact cultural resources.

Commissioner Wingate asked, during new construction in Manitou Springs if archeological resources were discovered, was the contractor required to stop. Ms. Anthony replied, the work is supposed to halt to allow consultation and evaluation. She further continued that many times the assumption is the land area has been disturbed so there may be less likelihood of encountering resources. However, when Federal funds are used there is a set of guidelines to adhere to and without someone like Mr. Snyder observing, contractors won't always recognize a potential resource. Ms. Anthony suggested Mr. Snyder should contact the new Flood Recovery Manager, Shelly Cobau, as she was in charge of the City's federally funded projects and needed to be apprised of the potential for archeological disturbance.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, Vice Chair Walker adjourned the meeting at 8:05pm.

Minutes submitted by Sherri Crowley