



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

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, July 6, 2016, in Council Chambers at 606 Manitou Avenue. Chairman Minch called the meeting to order at 6:02 pm. The following Commissioners attended:

PRESENT: Chairman NEALE MINCH
Vice Chairman ANN NICHOLS
Commissioner BOBBY JACKSON
Commissioner LISETTE CASEY
Commissioner PATRICIA MCLEAN
Commissioner TAMMILA WRIGHT (arrived at 6:05pm)

ABSENT: Commissioner DEB MOORE (Excused)

STAFF: Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner
Karen Berchtold, Planner II
Sherri Johnson, Planning Technician

GUESTS: Randy Hodges, Council Liaison

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ITEM 1. June 1, 2016

MOTION:

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

SECOND:

Commissioner Jackson seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no further discussion

VOTE:

Motion passed, 3-0. Chairman Minch and Commissioner McLean abstained, as they were not present for the June meeting.

Commissioner Wright arrived at this point in the meeting.

III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

Council Liaison Randy Hodges addressed the Commission to inform it Council voted to demolish the Brooke Street Bridge and bypass the HPC process due to the condition of the bridge and its potential for failure. Mr. Hodges said it was a difficult decision considering how important historic preservation is to the community and the decision was based on an assessment by engineering firm Ames Foster Wheeler indicating the bridge was in immediate danger of failure and recommending immediate demolition. Mr. Hodges said the historic structure would be documented prior to removal and the demolition plan will be prepared within 10 days, with the process taking up to 4 weeks to complete. He noted the budget should allow for a replacement bridge in 2017, adding the City would also seek grant opportunities for a new bridge.

Commissioner Nichols stated she always checked the Council Agenda and did not see this item on it. Had it been on the agenda, she and other HPC members would have been at the meeting. Commissioner Nichols asked what formal action was taken under the demolition ordinance. Mr. Hodges said they weighed the analysis by the engineering firm and with the risk of the bridge collapsing into the creek.

Commissioner Nichols said under the ordinance there were two ways to deal with demolition – the Council could, without a public hearing, declare an emergency caused by a natural disaster and take action. The second option was that Council must hold a public hearing. Commissioner Nichols said the item was not posted or on the agenda and she had an issue with that. She wanted to go on record that the HPC's advice was very clear in its June meeting. The emergency option could be invoked by declaring a threat to health, safety, and welfare. She felt a public hearing should have been held. Maybe it could have been argued the bridge had to be demolished, bypassing the HPC, if the damage was a result of a natural disaster within a reasonable timeframe, not 13 or 14 months later.

Mr. Hodges apologized for the Council not following the process and said there was no going back. Commissioner Nichols said she understood there was nothing that could be done now, but this should not be the way the City does business.

Chairman Minch felt there was a process breakdown and felt a follow-up with the Planning Director might be necessary. Senior Planner Michelle Anthony said that if it was determined the process wasn't correctly followed there was the option of putting on a Council agenda, posting the property, and holding the formal public hearing.

Stacy and Jason Fortune, 1 Brook Street, stated they were told the public hearing was at this meeting; they were not aware of the Council meeting. Jason Fortune wanted to know what their life would be like as it had been hard having the road closed. Mr. Fortune stated he would like to keep and preserve the historic bridge, adding any new bridge should match the Church bridges since they were so close together.

Brandon Barbara, 9 Brook Street, also stated he thought this meeting was the public hearing and wanted to know what would happen if there was a fire. He noted the bridge had been in bad shape for 10 years, so he questioned why nothing had been done and why this was now an emergency.

Mr. Hodges stated the Fire Department indicated it could address any issues from the street above this area.

Manitou resident, Dale Latty, said an engineering team came to review the bridge and were very confident it could be saved for less than the \$110,000 allocated in the budget. Mr. Latty said the Catholic Church was considering financial assistance, as they are very interested in preserving the historic structure and the access. Mr. Latty said there were real options on the table and attempted to deliver those to Council the previous evening, but was denied.

Chairman Minch stated Ms. Anthony would follow up but he felt he should also send a message regarding the potential breach in process and he would push for a public hearing. Chairman Minch thanked the residents that came to express their concerns.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

At this time, Chairman 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 1605 - Material Change of Appearance Certification (New Construction) - 0 Chelton Road – Dennis and Deborah Johnson Applicant

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

Chairman Minch asked if there were any questions for Staff. Hearing none, the applicant was invited to the podium.

Property owners Deborah and Dennis Johnson stated they were interested in moving to Manitou for retirement in 10 years or less. Ms. Johnson said their home in Washington State had a Bavarian theme, as did that community. One thing that drew them to Manitou was they truly appreciated historic preservation and trying to stay true to the themes of the community. She stated they fell in love with the concept of their home, however what they received from the Architect did not convey what was planned. Ms. Johnson stated they would replace the ribbon windows with logs and provided a sample of the log siding. Concerning the railing, they thought of blending wood and metal as found in the neighborhood. They were leaning toward the darker color logs as they wanted the house to look as authentic as possible. They felt a uniform look made the home look newer and they wanted a hand-hewn look. They want to match the color of the stone as much as possible and planned on using the Manitou Pink sandstone. The garage will be log and the stonework would butt up against the logs. They noted the patios on each side. Ms. Johnson clarified the pole was not located correctly. Ms. Anthony confirmed the pole was higher on the lot than where the highest part of the house was going to be placed.

Ms. Johnson continued that they duplicated the wood railing they were proposing on the board they had created. They did not want the driveway to go straight up so because of the grade of the property and they had determined they should be able to keep most of the larger trees. They liked the Carriage house-style garage door and they planned to anchor the house using boulders that are already on the site. The roof was not reflective and would be a brown, rusted tone, which gave it an aged look. The double-hung windows in the drawing are what they were proposing.

Chairman Minch asked if there were any questions. Chairman Minch thanked the applicants for the new drawing saying it made a difference in being able to visualize the proposal and called for public comment.

Sue Barnhardt, 10 Short Road, stated her property was directly across the street and showed pictures of her historic cabin. Mrs. Barnhardt was concerned about run off from the new driveway and the effect of the additional water on her stone wall and property. Mrs. Barnhardt stated she would like to see some drainage plans before any approval. Chairman Minch said the drainage concern had been mentioned at the May meeting and noted drainage plans were not something the HPC reviewed.

Ms. Anthony noted drainage would be addressed in the stormwater plan at the time of permitting, adding the drainage plan had to be approved by the Stormwater Manager.

Mrs. Barnhardt asked if this would be a summer home or a year-round home. Mrs. Johnson replied this would be their permanent home.

Chairman Minch asked if there were any more comments from the audience. Hearing none, the Public Hearing was closed. Chairman Minch asked if there were any further questions from Commissioners.

Commissioner Wright stated she was very interested to see how the house turned out, adding she liked the watchtower design.

Commissioner Nichols stated she felt the house would fit in to the neighborhood very well.

Commissioner Jackson commented the new picture was a much better representation.

MOTION:

Commissioner Nichols moved to approve **MCAC 1605** for a new single family home with the finding the request is consistent with the purpose of the Historic Preservation regulations to promote compatible architectural design of infill structures and with the following conditions:

- 1) A lighting plan and fixtures shall be provided for Staff Review and approval to confirm both compatibility of design, but also with the low lighting levels typical to this neighborhood and the use of appropriate shielding from neighbors and the street.
- 2) The landscape plan for the property shall feature native vegetation consistent with the area and focus on screening the development from the street.
- 3) Driveway retaining walls and landscaping walls shall either be constructed/clad with stone from the property, or a compatible stone profile and color consistent with the more rustic and random stonework in the area.

SECOND:

Commissioner Wright seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no further discussion

VOTE:

Motion passed, 6-0.

V. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business to discuss.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

ITEM 4. Plan Manitou Presentation and Discussion - Planner Karen Berchtold.

Ms. Berchtold stated Plan Manitou had three public engagement sessions in June with the mission of getting as much feedback as possible regarding the draft goals. She provided a PowerPoint presentation and followed up by saying the next phase would be development and comments on the Objectives and then the draft Plan would be presented in November.

Chairman Minch thought the goals should be more specific and focused around protecting the historic districts.

Ms. Anthony indicated the Planning Commission had a strong reaction to some of the wording in the Historic Preservation section and they had recommended different wording and stronger statements.

There was discussion among the Commissioners about properties that had opted out of the Historic District. Commissioner Wright spoke about some of the negative impact of withdrawn properties, such as loss of grant funding.

Chairman Minch asked for any other comments on the Plan Manitou goals.

Ms. Anthony encouraged everyone to participate as an individual by going to the Plan Manitou website and taking the survey.

Brook Street Bridge –

City Administrator Jason Wells asked to address the Commission concerning the Brook Street Bridge demolition and apologized for some confusion regarding the Commission's previous recommendations being relayed to the City Council. Discussion ensued in the same vein as previously with Councilman Hodges. Mr. Wells indicated he would follow-up with the City's Council to insure the correct process was followed.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, Chairman Minch adjourned the meeting at 8:04p.m.

Minutes submitted by Sherri L. Johnson, Planning Technician