



**MANITOU SPRINGS  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 2016**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, May 4, 2016, in Council Chambers at 606 Manitou Avenue. Chair Minch called the meeting to order at 5:57 pm. The following Commissioners attended:

- PRESENT:** Vice Chair ANN NICHOLS  
Commissioner DEB MOORE  
Chair NEALE MINCH  
Commissioner BOBBY JACKSON
- ABSENT:** Commissioner TAMMILA WRIGHT (Excused)  
Commissioner LISETTE CASEY (Excused)
- STAFF:** Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner  
Sherri Johnson, Planning Technician

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Item 1.** April 6, 2016

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Nichols moved to approve the April meeting minutes as presented.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Moore seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no further discussion

**VOTE:**

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

**III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION**

There was no City Council action to discuss.

**IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no Unfinished Business to discuss.

*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.*

## **V. NEW BUSINESS**

### **ITEM 2. MCAC 1605 - Material Change of Appearance Certification (New Construction) - 0 Chelton Road – Dennis and Deborah Johnson Applicant**

Senior Planner Anthony presented the staff report dated April 30, 2016.

Chair Minch asked Ms. Anthony to explain how height was calculated for those who many not know. Ms. Anthony replied the height is calculated by finding the average grade of the highest and lowest points where the grade touches the building, and then going from that point to the allowed height, which in this case would be 25' to the highest point of the roof.

Chair Minch asked if the color of the retaining wall was to be different from on the house. Ms. Anthony recommended the retaining walls should be more consistent with the rubble stone found throughout the area, noting that the Manitou Pink sandstone was a more regular slab and a larger profile than the rubble stone would be.

Commissioner Nichols asked if the noncontributing properties mentioned in the Staff Report pre-dated the historic district. Ms. Anthony replied all but one; the large Southwestern stucco home had been approved by the commission as the original structure, which did pre-date the historic district was an abandoned concrete block bunker.

Chair Minch asked for any public comment. Hearing none, the applicant was invited to the podium.

Debbie Johnson, currently residing in Woodinville, WA, stated the reason she and her family were seeking residence in Manitou Springs was because their children are speed skaters and they had been going to the Olympic Training Center for six years and her son has been attending the Air Force Academy. Ms. Johnson stated they had fallen in love with the area and the people and wanted to retire here in 10 years. Ms. Johnson indicated she was disappointed that the plans did not show their log cabin vision. Unfortunately, AutoCAD software did not illustrate the siding or the stonework in the plan. She noted they had been working with Ms. Anthony for the past year to learn about how they could blend in with the neighborhood and had looked for advice on lighting, etc, and welcome feedback from the commission and the neighbors. Their inspiration came from historic fire lookouts her husband has encountered.

Chair Minch asked Ms. Johnson about additions or edits from what was presented in the Staff Report in regard to supplemental information. Ms. Johnson said she emailed the answers to the majority of the Staff questions to Ms. Anthony – she recalled the posts in front of the house would be a minimum of 10" in diameter and logs. They proposed, because of the low pitch of the roof, a metal roof similar to the one on a house about two properties to the north. Ms. Johnson stated they had selected a vendor that offered a painted metal that was very low glare and showed the material and color called Fresh Rust. She noted they tested several different materials in the direct sunlight to ensure low glare. With respect to window trim, they planned to use the exact same log siding, but in smaller dimensions, referring the commission to the picture in the packet of the siding..

Chair Minch asked about the landscaping saying the Guidelines encouraged native vegetation. Ms. Johnson said they planned on native landscaping, for example cactus and other plants found on the site.

Chair Minch noted the other question was concerning the appearance of retaining walls. Ms. Johnson said the retaining walls were currently broken concrete which has been stained by the surrounding dirt. They had been thinking of the Manitou Pink but if there were objection, this was not an issue as they wanted to do whatever they could to blend in. Ms. Anthony offered she could suggest places to obtain stone similar to the rubble native to the area.

Ms. Johnson said it had taken a year of planning to get to this point and thanked the City for all the help in coming up with creative solutions.

Ms. Anthony said there was one other question regarding the railing around the upper deck. Ms. Johnson she they were looking at black metal similar to the neighbor at 202 Cheltenham and a few other houses in the neighborhood. They felt this would be simple and disappear as you looked at the house so you would see the log siding. In regard to lighting, Ms. Johnson said they had visited the property at night and wanted to be sure the lighting was appropriate and welcomes any feedback.

Chair Minch thanked Ms. Johnson and opened the meeting for public comment.

Chuck Smith, 12 Spur Road, stated he had written an email to Ms. Anthony which she referred to in her report and noted his home was the red log cabin at the end of Spur Road. Mr. Smith stated sheet L0.4 of the applicant's plans was what was circulated through the neighborhood with regard to what the property would look like. (Chair Minch noted in the packet that would be sheet L0.2.) Mr. Smith gave a history of how the neighborhood had grown over the past 40 years, stating the character of the area was relatively small homes on multiple lots. However, in the last 10 years when the earlier generations started dying off people had purchased existing lots and built homes on these much smaller parcels because it was legal to do so. Mr. Smith stated when he received the drawing his first thought was Frank Lloyd Wright, which isn't appropriate for the Log Cabin area. Mr. Smith said ribbon windows do not occur in log cabins and the design did not strike him as a log cabin. He also stated most log cabins are not two story.

Charles Barnhart 10 Short Road, stated his was the second original cabin in the area that had been home to five generations and they had received three HPC wards for Historic Preservation. Mr. Barnhardt stated they had a very expensive, original stone wall surrounds the property and his concern, which needed to be addressed by the City, was the very poor drainage in the area. With the construction of this house, there would be three driveways that dump water on his wall he spent \$8000 restoring. The street had no gutters, no paving and he thought that street drainage needed to be addressed before another driveway was put in.

Bill Luche, 196 Cheltenham Road, stated he was one of the newer homes and his concern was the "watchtower" look of the design, the as mentioned by Mr. Smith, and how the proposed house would match the neighborhood. Mr. Luche stated he liked the wood color proposed and he respected the Barnhardts' concerns about water runoff. He stated drainage needed to be taken into consideration and the roads were very small, short, and narrow.

Chair Minch asked Ms. Anthony about the windows and where these were addressed in the Guidelines and noted the comment about not looking like a log cabin resonated with him. Ms. Anthony said windows are under Architectural Features in the Guidelines and that they need to be a factor in the consideration of the design. She noted multiple double-hung windows had been accepted in the past. Expansive plate glass

windows are generally not considered compatible. Ms. Anthony said when the Applicant's Architect first contacted her with the fire tower concept, she had encouraged him to ground the design and not have it be a tower popping out of the ground, which is one reason for siting the garage as proposed and sinking the building into the grade. The Architect worked to make the design less vertical. She agreed it did look like a Frank Lloyd Wright design with the low roof and the big wide overhangs.

Chair Minch was reminded of the house with the fire on Canon Avenue and the change to the windows facing the street but in this case the windows being discussed were on the back not facing the street. Ms. Anthony said the ribbon window Mr. Smith referred to would be on the south side of the building; it was not the primary façade, but would probably be the most visible of either side because of the siting of the house on the north side of this property. She felt that the design was not a traditional log cabin and not pretending to be, but the applicants proposed good materials to reflect the area. However, this could not be seen on the Cad drawing.

Commissioner Moore said the plans were beautiful but the biggest reason she wanted to be on the Commission was because America was becoming homogenized and she felt Manitou was one of the last authentic places she had experienced. She loved the preservation of the City's historical value. She saw nothing historical about the plans. Again, it was beautiful but she did not see how it fits in historical Manitou.

Chair Minch stated the Commission had to be careful because this was new construction not a modification or repair to an existing cabin and there is a difference. The Guidelines allow to new building construction.

Commissioner Nichols said it still had to be compatible in order to make that finding. She agreed the drawings did not give a sense of what the building would look like in order for the Commission to make the finding it would be compatible and contribute to the historic district. She stated concern about the expansive windows in the top section. Commissioner Nichols stated compatibility depended on how much of the building was visible and how much it was built into the hillside. She stated the guidelines did not want replication of historic structures by new buildings. She felt some of the details were interesting and probably appropriate. Her concern was the top tower and the expansive windows were clearly not a typical log cabin design.

Ms. Anthony noted that the large, expanses of windows were actually on the backside on the home, which would not be visible to the street and were not addressed in the Staff Report for this reason. She suggested that they could attempt to bring the home more into the grade to further reduce the tower appearance.

Chair Minch said, as the applicant had stated, the drawings do not do the building justice. He also wondered how much it rose above the canopy of the trees. A better picture of how it fit in would be helpful.

Commissioner Nichols said sheet LI0.0 on the bottom left showed an artist rendering of what the building would look from the street and it appeared to be well hidden by the trees.

Ms. Anthony said it might help if a pole could put out on the property, at the building site, approximating the height of the roof. It may also be helpful to have an elevation drawing showing the stone and the logs. Having substantial stonework on the bottom level was something she suggested so the building was grounded. Ms. Anthony said the applicant was right about the drawings not doing the design justice and she understood the concepts because she had been working with the applicant for such a long time. The building looked a lot different without the details is on the drawing. She suggested the applicants provide a

perspective drawing showing the materials and how the building will be viewed from Chelton Road. Ms. Anthony stated this would help everyone to see what was really proposed and get to a point where the Commission could make a decision.

Chair Minch said the focus would be the view from the street not the backside.

Mr. Smith said if you think of the essence of the log cabin, it is one log on top of another and the ribbon windows did not fit the nature of a log cabin. Iron hand rails were also not traditional on log cabins in this area and stated these should also be logs. Mr. Smith stated they would not be able to get up the proposed driveway at 11% in the winter. Windows and shape help create style.

Commissioner Nichols stated she owned a log cabin that has double-hung windows; she agreed about the ribbon windows being uncharacteristic.

Chair Minch said about the drainage, that was a Public Services issue. Commissioner Nichols agreed that was not an issue for the HPC. Ms Anthony agreed saying the City should look at how the road is graded and she would pass the comments and concerns to Public Services and suggested the neighbors should get in touch with the Public Services Director as well.

Commissioner Nichols agreed with Ms. Anthony's suggestions as she felt additional information was needed, such as a better representation of the materials. Additionally, Commissioner Nichols suggested the applicant rethink the windows on the south side; she felt the double-hung windows in front were fine and those on the north side and back were fine. She agreed there should be some additional thought about the railing.

Ms. Johnson stated they were still in the early stages and if the neighbors wanted them to have wood railings that would not be an issue.

Ms. Anthony suggested postponement of the item to allow the Applicant to present the additional information as discussed.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Nichols moved to postpone MCAC 1605 for additional information to be provided by the applicant to include a better drawing of the front view of the home, a more realistic representation of the materials such as the stone cladding of the foundation, as well as ideas for the ribbon windows on the south side and options for the railing. She further noted that the Applicant would install a pole in the site of the home as the tallest point of the structure.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Jackson seconded the motion

**DISCUSSION:**

There was no further discussion regarding the motion.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 4-0.

## VI. OTHER BUSINESS

### ITEM 3. Update on Plan Manitou – Karen Berchtold, Planner

Ms. Berchtold presented a brief update regarding Plan Manitou discussing why a master plan and hazard mitigation plan was needed, noting the state had legal requirements for communities with 5,000 or more population. She noted the Vision and Planning Guide was a foundation for the new document and the master plan would have more structure and items that were not addressed in the previous community effort. The process began with vision and goals that help to help develop policies and actions. She described the schedule of events adding the Planning Department was working on community meetings as well as smaller events. Ms. Berchtold said June will focus on Vision and Goals; final presentation of the plan would be discussed in November. She further noted the Hazard Mitigation Plan was new for Manitou and began with a natural hazard assessment. Ms. Berchtold presented a month-by-month outline of what should be accomplished during the course of the plan development.

### ITEM 4. HPC Honor Awards and Preservation Month Activities

Ms. Anthony relayed that Council approved the Resolution adding there is a draft in the packet. She reported the Honor Awards would be held on May 26, 2016 and hosted by The Cog at their new pavilion. The Commission confirmed the awardees as follows:

- ❖ John & Fran McGee for a new home in the Log Cabin District at 193 Chelten Road
- ❖ Douglas Greeley & Karen Sutherland for a new garage at 208 Chelten Road
- ❖ Kurt Meredith & Jeannie Steele for a new garage/studio at 213 Mesa Avenue
- ❖ Gary & Karen Michels for rehab of windows and wooden storms at 37 Washington Avenue
- ❖ 856 Prospect, LLC, for interior/exterior work at 823 Duclou Avenue & 856 Prospect Place
- ❖ Kathy Tuten & Matt Fago for restoration of the greenstone wall at the rear of 15 Washington Avenue
- ❖ Louis & Rosalie Kolm for window replacement at 125 Ruxton Avenue
- ❖ Amir and Laura Safayan for restoration of the greenstone wall at the front of 7 Washington Avenue
- ❖ Manitou and Pikes Peak Railway for the new Passenger Pavilion at 515 Ruxton Avenue

Ms. Anthony proposed, as much as possible, that the Commission participate in the This Place Matters campaign.

### ITEM 5. Discussion Regarding Preservation Incentives

There was no information presented regarding incentives.

## VII. ADJOURNMENT

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

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