



**MANITOU SPRINGS  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
Wednesday, February 4, 2009, 7:00 P.M.**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

A Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held Wednesday, February 4, 2009 in Council Chambers @ 606 Manitou Avenue. Chairwoman Nichols called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm, seated the Alternate Commissioner, and declared a quorum present. The following were in attendance:

**PRESENT:** Commissioner ROGER ARMSTRONG  
Commissioner KAREN CULLEN  
Chairwoman ANN NICHOLS  
Vice Chair SUSIE MARQUIS  
Commissioner BRUNO POTHIER  
Commissioner MOLLY WINGATE

**ABSENT:** Commissioner CHARLES CASE (excused)  
Commissioner TERESA BLAIR (excused)

**GUESTS:** None

**STAFF:** Dan Folke, Planning Director  
Kari Kilroy, Assistant

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**ITEM 1. Minutes from December 3, 2008 Regular Meeting.**

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Wingate moved to accept the December 3<sup>rd</sup> Minutes as submitted.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Armstrong seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

None.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 4-0 (Commissioner Cullen and Vice Chair Marquis abstained).

### III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

At their January 27, 2009 Regular Meeting, City Council unanimously approved Ordinance No. 1308: An Ordinance Amending Chapter 17.08, Historic Preservation District of the Municipal Code of the City of Manitou Springs, Colorado on 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading. Ordinance No. 1308 removed the Cottonwood Subdistrict (comprised of the Cottonwood Inn and Mo's Diner) from the City's Historic District.

### IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

**ITEM 2. MCAC 0810 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (Demolition & New Structure – Public Hearing) – 928 Osage Avenue, Unit #20 – David R. Noebel on behalf of Summit Ministries, Applicant. (APPLICATION WITHDRAWN)**

Dan Folke, Planning Director, explained that Mr. Noebel was not prepared to process the Development Applications triggered by this request.

### V. NEW BUSINESS

**ITEM 3. MCAC 0812 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (New Construction) – 24 Minnehaha Avenue – Herald Walton, Applicant.**

#### **DISCUSSION REGARDING REQUEST AND PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Mr. Folke presented the Staff Report prepared by Michelle Anthony. Staff recommended approval with 6 conditions.

*Chairwoman Nichols asked if any Commissioner had Ex Parté Contacts or Conflicts of Interest to declare. Hearing none, the meeting continued.*

Commissioner Wingate noted that Staff recommended approval of a 5” reveal, yet the Applicant submitted a 6” reveal. Mr. Folke confirmed that Staff recommended 5” and read from page 3 of the Staff Report: “Staff notes that a slightly narrower siding reveal and trim of a more uniform width would be more consistent with historic structures in the area.”

Commissioner Wingate wondered about the width of the porch. Mr. Folke said Staff had not measured it out but felt that it met the intent.

Commissioner Pothier asked Staff if the “bump out” on the west and south was too modern-looking. Mr. Folke said Staff had no concerns.

Herald Walton introduced himself as the Applicant and said he lived at 205 Trestle Trail – the “imaginary road in Manitou at the end of Mesa Avenue.” Mr. Walton thanked Staff for the informed review and recommendation. He requested an alternate approval stemming from Staff's Conditions #2 and #4. Mr. Walton explained that they had considered a porch on the west elevation but, due to elevation differentials, realized it was better on the north. He directed the

Commissioner to look at the south elevation gable over the new porch and noted that it would block the view of the rafter tails from Minnehaha Avenue (Condition #4). Mr. Walton went on to say that contemporary building procedures used trusses to support the roof so rafter tails were not necessary. He felt that adding rafter tails would be additional ornamentation – the equivalent of gingerbread. Mr. Walton finished by requesting that the approval be contingent on Conditions #1, 3, 5 and 6.

Commissioner Wingate asked the dimensions of the porch on the south elevation. Mr. Walton said approximately 6' x 15'. In answer to Commissioner Wingate's next question, he said the pillars would be approximately 2' square – something proportional.

Commissioner Wingate wondered about the material of the pillar next to the garage door on the east elevation. Mr. Walton said it would be similar to the south elevation – artificial stone – and confirmed it would be smaller because of the dimensions of that porch. Commissioner Wingate suggested it would be okay for Staff to approve, but she would like to know the materials.

Commissioner Wingate also said she would like similar details about the materials of the back porch on the east elevation. Mr. Walton said that that porch would be ground level because of the slope.

Commissioner Wingate confirmed with Mr. Walton that the easterly window on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the south elevation bumped out.

Commissioner Pothier commented that the “bump out” in the bedroom would be expensive to do and wondered if Mr. Walton would consider taking it out. Commissioner Pothier felt that it was very modern. Mr. Walton explained that it would enhance the ambiance of the room and make the bed and furniture arrangement more comfortable.

Commissioner Pothier felt that the post on the east elevation was not needed. Mr. Walton suggested that the stability of that porch would be a concern because it might be the major way to get appliances into the home.

Vice Chair Marquis commented that she was also disturbed by the “bump out.”

Commissioner Armstrong wondered about the patio. It was confirmed that it was moved to the north and was pictured on the east elevation as a porch with long legs.

Chairwoman Nichols opened the hearing for public comment. Seeing and hearing no one wishing to speak, she closed the hearing to the public.

Chairwoman Nichols asked the Commission if they had additional concern, questions or suggestions about the rafter tails. They were none.

Chairwoman Nichols next asked the Commission to comment on the “bump out.” Vice Chair Marquis noted that the design would look less modern without it. Commissioner Wingate agreed

and said it made the board and batten in that area look wild. She felt that flattening the façade would make it less conspicuous and look less brand-spanking new.

Per Chairwoman Nichol's question, Mr. Folke explained that Staff recognized that it was new construction and so gave leeway to the design. He said new homes should be identifiable as new homes so Staff did not make an issue of it. Mr. Folke added that the Commission would be on solid ground either way.

Commissioner Cullen commented that the "bump out" would be covered by the porch posts but others said it would not. Commissioner Cullen said she had no strong feelings either way.

Commissioner Armstrong commented that he was happy with the design as presented.

Chairwoman Nichols suggested that the Commission move forward and she would entertain a Motion.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Wingate moved to approve MCAC 0812 for new construction at 24 Minnehaha Avenue with the following conditions:

- 1) The front (south) elevation shall be amended to provide a second floor covered porch, with support columns/piers extending to the ground on at least the western 15' of this façade. The Applicant shall provide a detailed drawing for Staff review and approval of the porch railings, columns/piers and any stairs. Traditional porch railings with square posts and balusters (3" on center) between hand and foot rails shall be utilized on both the front porch and the side entry stairs. The porch columns/piers shall be of a height and width so as to be in proportion with the overall porch construction
- 2) Smooth, cement board siding with a maximum of 5" reveal is approved. Trim boards of 4" width shall be installed around all windows, doors and at the corners of the house. The gable decoration shall be of material that either depicts square cut shingles, or board and batten siding. The elevations/building plans should be amended to reflect these dimensions/specifications prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
- 3) The dimensional roof shingles to be a dark, earth tone color which shall be specified at the time of Building Permit.
- 4) The manufactured stone to be utilized on the foundation and porch piers shall be of a color blend and profile consistent with historic stonework found in the surrounding area. The final material choice to be Staff reviewed and approved prior to purchase or installation.
- 5) The bump out shown on the south elevation shall be flattened thereby simplifying the roof line.

**SECOND:**

Vice Chair Marquis seconded the Motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

Discussion ensued.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 6-0.

*Chairwoman Nichols asked if any Commissioner had Ex Parté Contacts or Conflicts of Interest to declare. Hearing none, the meeting continued.*

**ITEM 4. MCAC 0813 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (New Construction)  
– 2 Keithley Place – Tom Conley, Applicant.**

**DISCUSSION REGARDING REQUEST AND PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Mr. Folke presented the Staff Report prepared by Ms. Anthony. Staff recommended approval with 8 conditions.

Commissioner Wingate commented that the big blank garage wall on the north elevation seemed inconsistent with the rest of the house. She also said that she liked the idea of Staff sorting out the windows – what, where, etc. Mr. Folke pointed out that the garage was at an angle so it was not as massive as it appeared on the drawings.

Commissioner Pothier commended Staff on the report. Mr. Folke reiterated that it was prepared by Ms. Anthony.

Jerry Peterson, 3930 Constitution Avenue in Colorado Springs, introduced himself as Tom Conley’s architect. He requested that the roof remain as presented due to aesthetics. He commented that the building was almost 40’ wide and that the proportion of the roof was best at 6/12. Mr. Peterson said that 5/12 would be okay but would still exceed the height by 1’3”. He said that the owner was very pleased with the house design and appearance. Mr. Peterson showed the Commission elevations of the front façade – east facing – showing the roof options at 6/12, 5/12 and 4/12 commenting that 4/12 looked terrible.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Folke explained that per the City’s Code, the Commission could allow a height up to 30’ to accommodate steeply-pitched roofs. However, steeply-pitched roofs were not a prominent feature of the Log Cabin Subdistrict so that was the reason Staff had raised the issue. Mr. Folke also pointed out that if one was talking about 1’-3’, he did not think it would make a visible difference and, in that case, felt it was best to do what made sense for the project.

Discussion ensued.

Commissioner Wingate asked Mr. Peterson if they could break up the garage wall. Mr. Peterson suggested they could put in a window, which was not normally acceptable because of the risk of vandalism; however, it would be okay in this case because one would need a ladder to get to the window.

Commissioner Pothier asked about the divided lite windows. Mr. Peterson said that the owner objected because of the views. Commissioner Pothier wondered if it would be possible to do mullions only on the top.

Discussion ensued.

Commissioner Cullen wondered at what point the Commission allowed new construction to look like new construction. She also said she could understand the owner's desire for views.

Vice Chair Marquis agreed with Commissioner Cullen's statements.

Commissioner Wingate asked about the carriage doors for the garage. Mr. Peterson was agreeable, but cautioned that they would not be actual carriage doors.

Chairwoman Nichols wondered about the woven log corners. Mr. Peterson showed the Commission how it would be done.

Chairwoman Nichols opened the hearing for public comment. Seeing and hearing no one wishing to speak, she closed the hearing to the public.

Commissioner Pothier said he favored a 5/12 roof pitch.

Commissioner Wingate agreed and added that it was an awful lot of house.

Vice Chair Marquis did not see any reason to change the roof.

Commissioner Armstrong said he could live with a roof height of 28'.

Commissioner Cullen felt there would not be much difference and added that there were bigger homes in the neighborhood.

Chairwoman Nichols agreed with Mr. Folke in that a 1'-3' difference would not affect how the roof appeared. In addition, it was a large house that looked less appealing when flattened.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Cullen moved to approve MCAC 0813 for new construction at 2 Keithley Place with the following conditions:

- 1) All windows and doors will appear as shown on elevations presented to the Commission on February 4, 2009.

- 2) Roofing shall be a darker, earth tone color, which shall be specified at the time of Building Permit.
- 3) Specifications and a detailed drawing of the proposed steel deck railing shall be provided for administrative review and approval prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
- 4) The Applicant shall confirm whether or not the woven log corners are feasible using log siding.
- 5) Stone specifications and a sample shall be submitted for administrative approval prior to purchase or installation.
- 6) The concrete driveway, and any other areas of unfaced concrete visible from either Keithley Road or Place, shall either be integrally colored per the City's adopted formula, or a color proposed by the Applicant which matches the surrounding soil, to be approved administratively.
- 7) Carriage-house style garage doors shall be used in the two garage bay openings and specifications on these shall be provided for administrative review and approval prior to purchase or installation.
- 8) A window shall be added to the west wall of the garage.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Armstrong seconded the Motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

None.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 4-2 (Commissioners Pothier and Wingate cast the dissenting votes).

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

**ITEM 5. Update on Historic Design Guidelines Revision Project.**

Mr. Folke showed the Commission the latest (and hopefully final) draft version of the Guidelines, telling them that they would receive a copy within the next week. He told them that the intent was proofing (typos, etc.). The Commission would finalize the Guidelines during their March meeting, they would have a joint worksession with Council in April, and hopefully adopt the final version in May.

**ITEM 6. Update on Historic Bridges and Walls Assessment Project.**

Mr. Folke reported that Staff was still working with the State Historical Fund to finalize the report. He also told them about a workshop he had attended regarding State Historical Fund grants which were funded through gaming revenues. The deadlines for the grants were April 1 and October 1.

Mr. Folke told the Commission that he wished to form a working group consisting of HPC members, someone from Public Works, the Planning Staff and Steve Lowe (a local bridge engineer who specialized in masonry bridges and spent 8 years working on masonry bridges in Ireland). The purpose of the group would be to delve into the assessment report and prioritize the recommendations. Commissioners Armstrong, Pothier and Wingate volunteered to serve on the working group.

Mr. Lowe spent some minutes talking with the Commission about his background and recommendations.

**ITEM 7. Other**

None.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business before the Commission, Chairwoman Nichols adjourned the meeting at 9:12 pm.

*Minutes submitted by Kari Kilroy*