



MANITOU SPRINGS
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, January 6, 2016

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, January 6, 2016, in Council Chambers at 606 Manitou Avenue. Chair Minch called the meeting to order at 6:03 pm. The following Commissioners attended:

PRESENT: Chair NEALE MINCH
Vice Chair ANN NICHOLS
Commissioner MOLLY WINGATE (Arrived at 6:12pm)
Commissioner LISETTE CASEY
Commissioner BOBBY JACKSON

ABSENT: Commissioner TAMMILA WRIGHT (Excused)

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

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ITEM 1. December 2, 2015

Chair Minch noted on Item 6 of the Minutes, there were brochures at the Chamber so no further action would be necessary.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Nichols moved to approve the December 2, 2015 minutes with Chair Minch's clarification.

SECOND:

Chair Minch seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed 2-0. Commissioner Casey and Commissioner Jackson abstained as they were not present for the meeting.

III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

There was no council action to discuss.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

At this time, Chair Minch explained the public hearing procedures to the audience and asked if any Commissioners had ex parte communications or conflicts of interest to declare. Hearing none, the meeting continued.

ITEM 2. MCAC 1527 - Material Change of Appearance Certification (Rehabilitation and Addition) - 2 Fountain Place – Douglass K. Edmundson of Restoration & Rejuvenation Construction, LLC, on behalf of Diane Fitzkee Applicant.

Senior Planner Michelle Anthony presented the staff report dated December 31, 2015.

Chair Minch asked staff about the area of excavation between the house and the parking area and asked if that was where the extension would be located. Ms. Anthony confirmed this was the area of construction.

Chair Minch, hearing no further questions for staff, invited the applicant to the podium.

Douglass K. Edmundson, 7 Keithley Road, stated he received new information as he entered the meeting regarding a potential easement to the east of the property that might alleviate the setback variance and/or help with enhancement of the building design. Mr. Edmundson said he would bring in an enhanced site plan with surveying and the proposed building footprint to the Staff. He further related that, from what he could tell, the bathroom was likely a free-standing building at one time and the original building probably did not have an internal toilet - most likely an outhouse. There were two floor levels inside the house; one wall area of Manitou greenstone mortared together and the rest of the building was built on a foundation of railroad ties. Mr. Edmundson said he was trying to be sensitive in the Architectural plans for the addition, which would complement the original building. He noted the drawing made the house look very tall, however the height of the building was just 24'. Mr. Edmundson stated, although staff recommended alternate drawing #2, his client preferred the roofline in alternate drawing #1 as they did not want a flat roof. Alternate #1 was better because of the decreased pitch and had the character of buildings in the area. The original proposal was what they preferred, however if staff recommended alternate #1 with the pitched gable, that would not be a problem. Everything else was in line in regard to the mass and scale and the materials would be the same as the existing house. Mr. Edmundson said they would use in-kind windows taking the western window and make that into three, separate, smaller windows. He stated the poured concrete parking area was actually still in place, it was simply buried by the excavated dirt. The hole that had been dug at the back of the house was what generated the entire request. The back part of the building had rotted through. The building was no longer inhabitable and no central heat, no insulation, and he was sure most of the wiring was substandard. He noted he preferred everything to be state-of-the art, such as high end 90% appliances. He intended to use a 90% or better efficiency boiler and in-floor radiant heat. Everything would be insulated, re-wired, and brought up to current standards. The intention was to make this an economical to operate, viable building. In regard to the eastern doorway, Mr. Edmundson, said there is an existing stone paver patio in that area which is very nice and the door would provide access to.

Commissioner Wingate asked Mr. Edmundson about the idea of putting a roof or porch cover over that door. Mr. Edmundson replied that would be up to the owner, saying it could be done if it was their preference. Commissioner Wingate agreed adding it may compliment the front patio and break up some of the space.

Commissioner Wingate asked about the interior changed suggested by staff so to see if something could be done to further lower the roof. Mr. Edmondson replied everything on the inside was drawn at the standard 8' ceiling height. They went with the 6/1 rather than a steeper pitch and he did not feel much could be gained beyond what was proposed.

Commissioner Wingate asked if where the existing roof would attached to the addition, would that create a trench. Mr. Edmondson replied yes, there would be drainage issues in that area that would have to be dealt with. One of the problems the building had was there was no perimeter drain and this would be part of the planned improvements. Currently the plan was to cut the floors out and pour new footings for the entire building and install a perimeter drain.

Ms. Anthony said if you look at some of the elevations, you could see where a gable would be built between the roofs so there would not be area catching water.

Chair Minch asked about the pole in the photos provided. Mr. Edmondson said that pole is 25' or a foot above where the top of the roofline would be.

Chair Minch asked if 3' were taken off from that line, it would probably be at the bottom of the red circle in the photo. Mr. Edmondson said the elevations drawn were really unfair to the perspective you get from the road, unless you drove by in a double-decker bus.

Chair Minch asked if there were any further questions for the applicant. Hearing none, the meeting was opened for public comment. Hearing none, the Public Hearing was closed.

Commissioner Nichols felt given the way the building was situated, sitting next to a large residence on the east and the next closest house to the south being quite a bit higher, alternative #1 would work fine. She was not a fan of the flat roof, adding in this location she would not like to see a flat roof at all. Commissioner Nichols said alternate #1 was acceptable and retained the character of the cottage, which she felt was important.

Chair Minch clarified the 5' east side setback variance could be approved so the applicant would not have to come back.

MOTION:

Commissioner Wingate moved to approve MCAC 1527 at 2 Fountain Place to allow reconstruction of a portion of the existing building to include a second floor living level with the following conditions:

- 1) The proposed plan as shown on the drawing labeled Alternative #1 is approved. Any changes to this plan resulting from setback or zoning code issues subsequent to this approval will require reconsideration by the Historic Preservation Commission.
- 2) The horizontal window shown on the Right Side Elevation shall be broken into 3 smaller windows and a revised drawing shall be provided prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
- 3) A new site plan shall be provided to staff showing the approved 5' setback.
- 4) The approval is specific the situation and property.

Commissioner Wingate found the proposal was consistent with the purpose of the Historic Preservation Regulations by encouraging and fostering private rehabilitation and ownership (use) of historic properties.

SECOND:

Vice Chair Nichols seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 5-0.

Commissioner Wingate added her personal thanks for choosing not to demolish the cottage. Ms. Fitzkee thanked Mr. Edmondson for showing her how not demolishing the cottage would be possible.

V. NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 3. MCAC 1525 - Material Change of Appearance Certification (Demolition and New Construction - Initial Meeting)- 27 & 29 Delaware Road - Rod Wiebe, Night Hawk Design on behalf of Sandra Bigg and Christina Parker, Applicant.

Senior Planner Michelle Anthony stated the applicant was changing consultants and therefore would like to postpone to the next meeting

MOTION:

Vice Chair Nichols moved to postpone MCAC 1525 to the February meeting.

SECOND:

Commissioner Wingate seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 5-0.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

ITEM 4. Discussion Regarding Preservation Incentives

Senior Planner Michelle Anthony reviewed the background of this project, noting City Council put a moratorium in place regarding the issuance of incentives and asked the Commission to look at updating and revising that section of the code. She noted processes for requesting and granting the incentives needed to be put in place as there currently were none. The Commission had held one work session in November where some direction had been given; however Staff had not yet been able to prepare a draft ordinance or any of the associated work. She had recommended to the Planning Director that a consultant be retained and he had agreed to this. Ms. Anthony informed the Commission that she would keep them updated on the progress with this effort.

Chair Minch asked how much was in the budget for the \$500 maintenance grants. Ms. Anthony replied \$6,000.00 which was doubled from last year. Chair Minch asked if there should be some advertisement in the bulletin. Ms. Anthony said yes, that could be done.

Commissioner Wingate asked if there was money in the budget for the subdistrict signs. Ms. Anthony replied she would speak with the Planning Director to find out that information and let her know.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, Chairperson Minch adjourned the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Sherri L. Johnson, Planning Technician