



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

**I. CALL TO ORDER and ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

The Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, April 6, 2016, in Council Chambers at 606 Manitou Avenue. Vice Chair Nichols called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm. The following Commissioners attended:

**PRESENT:** Vice Chair ANN NICHOLS  
Commissioner DEB MOORE  
Commissioner LISETTE CASEY  
Commissioner ROGER ARMSTRONG

**ABSENT:** Chair NEALE MINCH (Excused)  
Commissioner TAMMILA WRIGHT (Excused)  
Commissioner BOBBY JACKSON (Excused)

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

**GUEST:** Chuck Martin  
Vic Appugliese

**ITEM 1. Nomination and Election of Chair**

Vice Chair Nichols said, she spoke with Chair Minch and he agreed to accept the position of Chair for another year.

**MOTION:**  
Commissioner Armstrong moved to elect Neal Minch as Chair for one more year.

**SECOND:**  
Commissioner Casey seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**  
There was no further discussion

**VOTE:**  
Motion passed 4-0.

**ITEM 2. Nomination and Election of Vice Chair**

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Armstrong moved to elect Ann Nichols as Vice Chair for one more year.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Casey seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no further discussion

**VOTE:**

Motion passed 4-0.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**ITEM 3. January 6, 2016 Minutes**

Senior Planner Michelle Anthony explained the changes she made to the January minutes.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Casey moved to approve the minutes of the January 2016 minutes as presented.

**SECOND:**

Vice Chair Nichols seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed 2 -0. Commissioner Armstrong and Commissioner Moore abstained, as they were not present for the meeting.

**ITEM 4. February 3, 2016 Minutes**

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Casey moved to approve the minutes of the February 3, 2016 minutes as presented.

**SECOND:**

Vice Chair Nichols seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed 2 -0. Commissioner Armstrong and Commissioner Moore abstained, as they were not present for the meeting.

### III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

**ITEM 5.** An Ordinance of the City of Manitou Springs, Colorado, Continuing the Moratorium on Requests for Incentive Awards for Properties within the Historic District. *At their Regular April 5, 2016 meeting, City Council unanimously approved an Ordinance Continuing the Moratorium on second reading.*

Vice Chair Nichols introduced guests from the Historic Preservation Board of Colorado Springs, Mr. Chuck Martin and Mr. Vic Appugliese and invited them to the podium.

Mr. Chuck Martin and Mr. Vic Appugliese said in observance of Preservation Month, The Historic Preservation Alliance of Colorado Springs, the Old North End Neighborhood, and The Historic Preservation Board of Colorado Springs came together to host two events. The first event on May 14, 2016, would be a discussion regarding Historic Preservation Tax Credits for Homeowners. The second event on May 28, 2016, would be a discussion entitled Hidden Treasures of the Historic Mesa Springs Neighborhood. Their purpose was to invite all of the Manitou Springs historic homeowners to the event.

*At this time, Vice Chair Nichols 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.*

### IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

**ITEM 6. MCAC 1525 - Material Change of Appearance Certification** (Additions to and Remodel of Existing Cottages)- 27 & 29 Delaware Road – Ryan Lloyd, Echo Architecture, on behalf of Sandra Bigg and Christina Parker, Applicant.

Vice Chair Nichols, stated Mr. Lloyd was running late and asked for a motion to postpone until after Item 8.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Casey moved to postpone MCAC 1525 to follow Item 8.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Armstrong seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 4-0.

Senior Planner Michelle Anthony presented the staff report dated March 31, 2016

Vice Chair Nichols asked for any questions for staff. Hearing none, the applicant was invited to the podium.

Ryan Lloyd, 202 Echo Lane, Colorado Springs thanked Michelle for her analysis and he agreed with the findings and the majority of the conditions. He wanted to discuss the roofline and the windows. Mr. Lloyd wanted the deck and patio to have double hung windows and the majority of the other operable windows he proposed casement windows adding they will all have dividing lights on the interior and exterior. Mr. Lloyd stated he would submit a full window schedule

Ms. Nichols asked what staff's response to casement windows would be. Ms. Anthony felt on wholly new areas, casements could be supported. On areas where the existing windows staff would recommend double hung windows. It would still honor the history of the building. Ms. Anthony asked about the large picture window. Mr. Lloyd replied it would have divided lights. Ms. Anthony said that would be a huge upgrade.

Mr. Lloyd said regarding the height, connecting the two buildings required a link that had enough head height. The link or addition between the buildings made the eaves line up, the gutter is continuous and the ceiling heights are the same. It keeps everything neat and tidy. Mr. Lloyd said he matched the pitches to keep it as cohesive as possible. Mr. Lloyd said the width was driven by the stair and small powder room in the link portion. You can see that we have squeezed the stair and powder room as tight as it can go. We really wanted the roof lower than the highest existing point. Mr. Lloyd wanted to celebrate the link as an addition, keeping in compliance with the design guidelines and without hacking things in to reduce scale, which would make it look like a strange, addition and we wanted it to open it up from the inside and celebrate it from the outside. This was the best solution he could come up with adding he felt strongly this was appropriate to the neighborhood.

Vice Chair Nichols asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Ms. Anthony said just to be clear, if you started to bring the intersecting ridge down, you would flatten out the pitch which would then not match the pitch on the white cottage because there was no way to keep the width you need and lower that roof, it is a physical lowering of the pitch. Mr. Lloyd replied that was correct adding there were 7' ceilings in both existing buildings so the top of that wall is as low as it can be for function and code. Ms. Anthony said that was good information and detail that helps adding it would be less desirable not to have matching pitch.

Ms. Anthony asked Mr. Lloyd to talk about different colors or materials. Mr. Lloyd said they are proposing the hearty lap siding that imitates the clapboard on both existing buildings while the link is a painted hearty shingle. It is a different material and slightly different color yet still fitting the historic nature of the buildings.

Mr. Lloyd added he would provided all the material requested when we get there.

The meeting was opened for public comment.

Amy Cox, 112 Oklahoma Road this is the best time to be living in the Peak Subdivision. She had always wondered how to make the cottages livable for modern families. Ms. Cox said this was a very clever design to preserve those two cottages and she wanted to add her support for casement windows because the views are extraordinary which part of the appeal of that area is. Ms. Cox said again her concern would always be how it would impose on the neighbors. She had heard some of the neighbors' concerns that were how the new construction would impose and how would construction be managed on a little Billy goat road. She really liked the design and felt residents would have to follow and learn from these

redevelopment projects what the impact would be and make sure, if we do see overwhelming redevelopment that we modify our guidelines. She supported the project.

Ms. Anthony stated a neighbor had concerns about this project however, when she mentioned the height would be no higher than the white cottage, the fears were relieved and left her office.

Vice Chair Nichols asked if there were any other public comments. Hearing none, the meeting was closed to the public.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Casey moved to approve MCAC 1525 at 27 and 29 Delaware Road to allow construction of an addition that connects the two, existing homes and additions to both cottages that provide for approximately 1,562 square feet of total living area as proposed and with the following conditions and finding:

- 1) Windows on the front and on the side of the existing green cottage will remain 1/1, double hung window and the wholly new windows will be casement. A detailed window schedule shall be provided that outlines the size and operation of each existing window and the proposed replacement window.
- 2) Door specifications shall be provided at or before the issuance of a Building Permit for Staff review and approval.
- 3) All existing roofs shall retain the exposed rafter tails and this detail will be incorporated into the new roof areas. The Commission approved the height as proposed by the applicant.
- 4) Cornerboard trim shall be placed on both the existing structures and areas of new additions.
- 5) All clapboard shall have a smooth texture.
- 6) Mortar used for repair of existing or any new stone foundation or retaining wall areas shall be integrally colored to match and blend with the stonework. Mortar shall be of an appropriate mix in regard to the inclusion of cement and the resulting hardness so as to not damage stonework.
- 7) Any new or repaired retaining walls, walkways and stairs on this site shall be submitted to the Planning Staff for review and approval, or referral to the Historic Preservation Commission if there are concerns.
- 8) Exterior lighting design and specifications shall be provided for Staff review and approval prior to purchase and installation.

Finding the proposal is consistent with the purpose of the Historic Preservation Regulations by encouraging and fostering private rehabilitation and ownership (use) of historic properties.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Armstrong seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 4-0.

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

**ITEM 7. MCAC 1603 - Material Change of Appearance Certification** (New Construction) - 131 Deer Path Avenue – John McGee, Applicant.

Senior Planner Michelle Anthony presented the staff report dated March 31, 2016. Vice Chair Nichols asked if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Casey asked if the distance between the new build and the cottage was known. Ms. Anthony asked the applicant if he knew the distance. Mr. McGee said approximately 20'.

Hearing no further questions for staff, Vice Chair Nichols invited the applicant to the podium.

John & Fran McGee, 324 Clarksley Road, had no issues with the staff report but wanted to clarify they would replace the concrete wall on Deer Path. They may not replace the wall on the alley side, as that wall was not in as bad shape and are more hidden. Mr. McGee said he would work with staff to replace the retaining wall. Mr. McGee wanted to clarify regarding the elevations saying the trim over the window would be a 1 x 4 to match the other side. Regarding the windows, he was fine with the divided light on the square windows. On vertical windows, he would prefer no divisions. The porch is paintable.

Mr. McGee said if he does a driveway, it would be asphalt. Mr. McGee said regarding the sidewalk color, it would clash with the color of the house asking if he needed to color the sidewalk if it was not visible.

Ms. Anthony said one of the reasons that color was chosen was because most of the landscape in town has that reddish or brownish tones and pink sandstone is used adding if he used a darker brown that would disappear and frankly, it will take on red because the soil will stain it. If you start with brown, it will not be as vibrant.

Mr. McGee said the cottage roofing is square straight edge. We will repeat that and replace all the siding. The garage will match the cottage.

Vice Chair Nichols asked if there were any questions for the applicant. Hearing none, the meeting was opened for public comment.

Amy Cox, 112 Oklahoma Road thanked the McGee's saying this property had been in need of attention for many years. Her concern would be will the home overwhelm from the street. The drawings do not show the house in relation to the houses around it. It appears to be fine.

Vice Chair Nichols asked the applicant about moving the house back. Mr. McGee said there are too many structures on the property but the small garage is fine. We would like to push the house back by the cottage with 20ft between them. It is flat back there and we could save most of the trees.

Jan Johnson 932 High Road commended the applicant on the quality and improvement in the neighborhood.

Hearing no further public comments, the meeting was closed to the public.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Casey moved to approve MCAC 1603 for the proposed new construction at 131 Deer Path Avenue with the staff recommendations and finding the proposal promotes compatible architectural design of infill structures as called for in the Historic District regulations and with the following conditions:

1) The Applicant shall provide details for the Planning Staff's review and approval prior to issuance of a Manitou Springs Property Improvement Permit on:

- exterior lighting (location and design)
- the house will be set back further than appears in the site plan
- specification on materials for doors
- the windows will generally be 1/1, the small square windows will be with divided lights with external muntins
- any concrete walkways, driveways, patios, etc. visible from the street shall be colored per the City's approved mix
- applicant agrees to work with staff regarding the brown color of the concrete
- If there are any retaining walls or other stonework necessary or desired, the stone profile and color shall be specified to confirm a close match to the existing, natural stone materials in the area
- Specification of the roof color

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Armstrong seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no discussion

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 4-0

**ITEM 8. MCAC 1604 - Material Change of Appearance Certification** (Reconstruct Second Floor Porch) - 121 Deer Path Avenue – Scott Patterson, Applicant.

Senior Planner Michelle Anthony presented the staff report dated April 1, 2016.

Scott Patterson, 121 Deer Path said the deck is in need of repair and he is tired of staining and painting which was why he chose aluminum railing and composite decking.

Ms. Nichols said it sounded like what he was now proposing would be very compatible with what was there before and what was approved in 1997.

Ms. Anthony asked the applicant if he knew the spacing between the railings. Mr. Patterson said it about the same as what was being replaced and complies with regulations.

Ms. Nichols asked for any public comments

Amy Cox, 112 Oklahoma Road said this is probably the best maintained home and felt it was very compatible and she would appreciate the boards positive consideration of the request.

The meeting was closed to the public.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Casey moved to approve MCAC 1604 as recommended by staff for replacement of the second floor porch railing as part of the porch/deck reconstruction at 121 Deer Path Avenue as requested and with the finding the proposal is consistent with the purpose of the Historic Preservation Regulations by promoting compatible architectural design of infill structures.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Armstrong seconded the motion

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no further discussion

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 4-0

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

**ITEM 9.** Discussion and Recommendation to City Council Regarding PARAB Proposal to Exempt Parks in the Historic District from Colored Concrete Requirement.

Senior Planner Michelle Anthony dated April 2, 2016.

Ms. Anthony felt these types of determinations should be incorporated into a master plan. When you get to individual parks, that would be the place to monument what you are and are not going to do. Years from now everyone would know where to get the information adding it would be like going to a set of plans.

Ms. Nichols asked when the Master Plan for individual parks would occur. Danu Fatt, PARAB Chair said they are still in the rough draft stage of P.O.S.T. adding that is monumental.

Jan Johnson of PARAB said phase two of the Soda Springs Master plan was ready to be instituted when it was blown out of the water with flood and then we came to a screeching halt and now we don't know if we have to go to the citizens to revise the master plan. Ms. Fatt added there was more flood mitigation work to be done to the park. Ms. Johnson said the P.O.S.T master plan should be in June and will have some of those things in it however, they are also recommending we do a master plan for parks over 2 acres.

Ms. Anthony suggested mini plans for each of the parks. You could monument what is there or anything you know you want to put there in the next five years and set some standards as far as lights, etc. Some of the things you could come up with amongst yourselves.

Ms. Fatt said it seemed to her they are lacking ADA standards, which is a big issue. Their focus now is picnic tables, which are ADA compliant, and ADA curbs. We are trying to stretch our funds to do more.

Ms. Johnson added they have people waiting in line to get memorial benches. They have to pay for the colored concrete under the bench and she felt it was to the point where people would not be able to afford it.

Ms. Nichols agreed with Ms. Anthony saying the way to write your bids, you deal with that by indicating you would not pay more than 25% more than for plain concrete and if you don't get any bids then that would tell you something but her guess was as you find out, there would be a wide variety of practice.

Ms. Fatt said she got a quote from Transit Mix and they told her the cost of colored concrete over plain was approximately 75% more and if it was less than a yard of concrete, they charge a \$75.00 minimum delivery fee and they also recommend to contractors a minimum of two yards if they are attempting to match colored concrete.

Ms. Fatt discussed the problems she had been experiencing with staff turnover, inconsistencies, and communication with Public Works since Bruno retired. Ms. Anthony said she would work with the Public Works Director to get a standard bid criteria so whenever you are doing concrete, they would have something to which they could refer. This way it would not make any difference. Everyone would have the same criteria. Ms. Anthony felt if they put some controls in you would not have to pay 75% additionally for colored concrete.

There was discussion regarding getting bids three ways; plain, colored, and stained.

Ms. Nichols asked if they needed to make a recommendation. Ms. Anthony said if they are willing to try her approach but it still became an issue, we could come back and give a recommendation.

**ITEM 10.** Review and Recommendation Regarding Guideline Standard for Repair and Replacement of Mortar in Historic Stone Masonry

**ITEM 11.** Historic Interpretive Plaques – Repair and Replacement

This item was postponed to the May meeting.

**ITEM 12.** Discussion Regarding Preservation Incentives

Ms. Anthony discussed the RFP entitled Revision of Historic Preservation Incentives.

**ITEM 13.** HPC Honor Awards and Preservation Month Activities

Ms. Anthony discussed the handout provided adding she would circulate a voting sheet, much like the one Provided last year, and everyone could vote for what you would like included for the Honor Award. Ms. Anthony stated there are no rules generally; it should be a project that you feel is exemplary in some fashion.

There was discussion regarding when the Honor Awards would be held. It was decided the ceremony would be held May 26.

There was discussion about choosing a Preservation Pioneer and the possibility of having the ceremony at the Cog.

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Commission, Vice Chair Nichols adjourned the meeting at 8:23 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Sherri L. Johnson, Planning Technician*