



MANITOU SPRINGS
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, August 5, 2009, 7:00 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

A Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held Wednesday, August 5, 2009 in Council Chambers @ 606 Manitou Avenue. Chairwoman Nichols called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and declared a quorum present. The following were in attendance:

PRESENT: Commissioner BARBARA DIAMOND @ 7:05 pm
Commissioner CHARLES CASE
Commissioner RANDY HODGES
Chairwoman ANN NICHOLS
Commissioner BRUNO POTHIER
Vice Chair MOLLY WINGATE
Commissioner TAMMILA WRIGHT

ABSENT: Commissioner KAREN CULLEN (unexcused)

GUESTS: None

STAFF: Michelle Anthony, Planner
Kari Kilroy, Assistant

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ITEM 1. Minutes from June 3, 2009 Regular Meeting.

MOTION:

Commissioner Wingate moved to accept the Minutes as submitted.

SECOND:

Commissioner Hodges seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

None.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 5-0 (Commissioner Case abstained and Commissioner Diamond was not yet seated).

III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

None.

Chairwoman Nichols asked if there were any ex parte contacts or conflicts of interest to declare. Hearing none the meeting continued.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

ITEM 2. MCAC 0903 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (Demolition & New Construction – Public Hearing) – 25 Fountain Place – Joe Church (Architect) on behalf of Amanda Occhi & Greg Augspurger, Applicant.

DISCUSSION REGARDING REQUEST AND PUBLIC COMMENT:

Michelle Anthony (City Planner) presented the Staff Report dated July 31, 2009. Staff recommended approval of the demolition and approval of the new design with 3 conditions.

Vice Chair Wingate asked Ms. Anthony if she knew the dimensions of the windows on the east elevation. Ms. Anthony did not.

In response to Chairwoman Nichol's question, Joe Church (Architect), 1422 Delgany Street in Denver, replied that the only issue was a request to waive the trim requirement. Mr. Church felt that the design satisfied the intent of the Design Guidelines and his clients' intent was to have a low-maintenance house; synthetic materials seemed inauthentic and the relationship to Fountain Place would make the trim out of sight.

Commissioner Case asked Mr. Church if there was to be brick molding or curved stucco around the windows and doors. Mr. Church replied that both were feasible options but the details were yet to be worked out.

Commissioner Case confirmed with Mr. Church how the casement windows would open, that there would be no sliders, and that the majority would be double hung.

Commissioner Pothier wondered how high the living room was inside. Mr. Church replied the ceiling was approximately 14' high.

Commissioner Pothier wondered how they proposed to open the casement windows. Mr. Church replied using an extension rod and explained that the intent was to provide passive ventilation in the summer.

Commissioner Case asked if the soffits were horizontal. Mr. Church thought that they would follow the pitch of the roof but explained they were still in the schematic phase and he had not discussed it with the owners.

Commissioner Case said he applauded the design and that it responded to the comments made at the last meeting.

Commissioner Pothier wondered which design the owners preferred. Amanda Occhi (home owner) said that she liked both and was thankful that the floor plan had remained the same. She also like the overhang on the back and described it as a place to tuck away.

Commissioner Wright asked Ms. Occhi if she was opposed to the trim. Ms. Occhi replied that they were bad at keeping up with things and the trim [maintenance] scared her.

Vice Chair Wingate wondered how wide the windows were on the east side. Mr. Church did not know and said that they were not currently dimensioned but they were egress windows so they would be at least 2'8" when open. Vice Chair Wingate explained that she was trying to get a sense of how much glass there would be. Ms. Anthony pointed out that the east elevation was on the back. Vice Chair Wingate retracted her question.

Commissioner Pothier asked Mr. Church if he had thought about less and wider windows. The other Commissioners pointed out that the windows did not face the street so the Commission could not address that issue.

Mr. Church explained the process of working through the redesign based on the comments made during the first meeting [July 1, 2009]. He said he had worked with the windows and the spacing and he was quite happy with the current design.

Commissioner Hodges asked Mr. Church how he felt about re-siting. Mr. Church replied that he had looked at a number of site orientations and many physical possibilities. He felt that it was ultimately up to the client – how they wanted to live in the house.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Case felt that there was a preponderance of other stucco houses in the neighborhood and they had narrow brick molding or none, but the houses with siding had trim.

Chairwoman Nichols confirmed with Ms. Anthony that Staff was not suggesting siding on everything – only on a portion of the house.

Commissioner Pothier preferred trim that stuck out a bit and referred to the Applicant's exhibit map #11. Commissioner Case said that brick molding would do that.

Vice Chair Wingate commented that the photo to which Commissioner Pothier had referred was not in the Historic District. But she agreed with Staff about putting trim around the windows.

Commissioner Case referred to the Applicant's exhibit maps #18 and #19 and said that they were examples of brick molding. Vice Chair Wingate commented that it looked like narrow wood

trim. Commissioner Case explained that it was wood and it was called “brick” molding because it was traditionally used on brick houses.

Vice Chair Wingate said that she would like to support Staff’s recommendation regarding trim.

Commissioner Case did not agree with Staff.

Commissioner Pothier remarked that he did not either and felt that because of the number of windows it would look like just a big piece of trim.

Discussion ensued.

Chairwoman Nichols summarized that the question was if the Commission felt comfortable enough with the proposal or did they agree with Staff.

Commissioner Wright said that she agreed with Staff.

Mr. Church said that if trim was required he would most likely recommend a stained wood like iron wood that would require no maintenance and would keep it appropriate to the scaling of the house.

Discussion ensued.

Vice Chair Wingate suggested that if trim was made a requirement, the Commission not oblige the Applicant to return for approval, but work out the materials with Staff.

Chairwoman Nichols confirmed that all agreed to let the issues of siding materials and changing the orientation of the house drop.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Wingate moved to approve MCAC 0903 for demolition of the existing structure and construction of a new single family home at 25 Fountain Place with the following finding and conditions:

“The circa 1940 house is noncontributing to the Local and National Register Historic Districts and restoration to a contributing status is not feasible. Therefore, demolition of this building will not have a detrimental impact on the historic or architectural integrity of the surrounding neighborhood or the Historic District as a whole.”

Conditions:

- 1) The proposed height of approximately 26’ as indicated in the application is approved in order to facilitate a pitched roof on the proposed structure, which is a desirable feature for compatibility with the historic neighborhood.

- 2) Smooth, flat trim in wood or another material that replicates the look of wood trim shall be added around doors and windows. Revised elevation drawings showing this detail shall be provided either before or at the time of Building Permit.
- 3) The dimensional roof shingles shall be a dark, earth tone color which shall be specified at the time of Building Permit.

SECOND:

Commissioner Pothier seconded the Motion

DISCUSSION:

None.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 6-1 (Commissioner Case cast the dissenting vote).

V. NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 3. MCAC 0905 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (Addition) – 31 Waltham Avenue – Danu Fatt on behalf of Eli Hartman, Applicant.

MOTION:

Commissioner Case moved to postpone Item 3 until the September 1 meeting.

SECOND:

Vice Chair Wingate seconded the Motion.

DISCUSSION:

None.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 7-0.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

ITEM 4. Update on Historic Bridges and Walls Assessment Project.

Ms. Anthony announced that the City had been awarded the State Historic Fund Grant and it was enough to repair the Canon and Park Avenue bridges.

ITEM 5. Other.

Ms. Anthony announced that the CLG had gotten some stimulus money and the City could get up to \$600 for the Colorado Restoration, Inc. conference in Denver in February. Ms. Anthony strongly suggested the Commissioners, especially the newer ones, attend. She also told them about CLG training in Breckenridge in October.

Vice Chair Wingate told Ms. Anthony about a house near her that had opted out of the Historic District and had mounted a satellite dish on the front fence. She wondered if there was anything the City – Code Enforcement – could do. Ms. Anthony replied that since the house was opted out of the District and unless the dish was inhibiting parking or traffic, there was nothing to be done.

Vice Chair Wingate wondered how many unexcused meetings a Commissioner could miss before being removed from the Commission. Ms. Anthony replied 3.

Commissioner Case announced that the Alabama house on Washington Avenue was about to go on the market for \$390,000.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business before the Commission, Chairwoman Nichols adjourned the meeting at 8:04 pm.

Minutes submitted by Kari Kilroy