



**MANITOU SPRINGS
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, November 3, 2010, 7:00 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

A Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held Wednesday, November 3, 2010 in Council Chambers @ 606 Manitou Avenue. Chairwoman Wingate called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm and declared a quorum present. The following were in attendance:

PRESENT: Commissioner CHARLES CASE
Alternate Commissioner BARBARA DIAMOND
Vice Chair RANDY HODGES
Commissioner ANNE HYDE
Commissioner ANN NICHOLS
Chairwoman MOLLY WINGATE
Commissioner TAMMILA WRIGHT

ABSENT: Commissioner KAREN CULLEN (excused)

GUESTS: Councilman Rick Barry

STAFF: Dan Folke, Planning Director
Michelle Anthony, City Planner
Kari Kilroy, Planning Assistant

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ITEM 1. Minutes from October 4, 2010 Regular Meeting.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Hodges moved to approve the minutes as presented.

SECOND:

Chairwoman Wingate seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

None.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 5-0 (Commissioners Case and Hyde abstained).

III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

AP 1001 – Appeal of HPC Denial of MCAC 1004 (Replacement of Siding) – 5 Cherokee Road – Frederic & Elizabeth Beattie, Applicants. During their October 5, 2010 meeting, City Council reversed the HPC’s decision to deny the request and signed an Approval of Order to issue an MCAC for vinyl siding during their October 19, 2010 meeting. Mr. Folke explained that out of this item came the opportunity to talk about the Guidelines and he suggested to Council that they meet with the HPC in January.

Mr. Folke discussed his 11/03/10 email and the Code regarding conflicts of interest and when it was appropriate to recuse oneself or testify at other meetings. He emphasized that it was not Staff’s role or desire to decide who could attend meetings; it was up to each individual member to decide how to conduct themselves; it was not a Staff decision.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

V. NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 2. MCAC 1007 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (Exterior Changes) – 42 Park Avenue – Dave Spiers (Contractor) on behalf of Tim & Kris Monroe, Applicants.

MOTION:

Commissioner Case moved to postpone MCAC 1007 until the December 1, 2010 meeting because the property owners had requested postponement so that they could attend the meeting.

SECOND:

Commissioner Hyde seconded the Motion.

DISCUSSION:

None.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 7-0.

Chairwoman Wingate asked the Commissioners if they had any ex parte contacts or conflicts of interest to declare. There were none. She then reviewed the meeting procedures and explained that no action would be taken during the meeting; the purpose was to make sure that the Commission had enough information to go forward with the regular design hearing next month.

ITEM 3. MCAC 1006 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (Demolition and New Construction – Initial Meeting) – 36 Park Avenue – Paul York (Cliff House General Manager) on behalf of Dan Dick, CFO (Colorado Landmark Hotels LLC), Applicant.

DISCUSSION REGARDING REQUEST AND PUBLIC COMMENT:

Dan Folke (Planning Director) presented his Memo dated 10/29/10 explaining that MCACs were good for one year and because a building permit had not been pulled nor was the project vested, it was necessary to rehear the request. He explained the purpose of the preliminary meeting and also mentioned that what Staff called the “Wheeler House” the Applicant referred to as the “Windemere Bowling Alley”. Mr. Folke finished by summarizing the purpose of the meeting as a “fact-finding” mission.

Commissioner Case wondered if there were any material differences between the MCAC 0901 application and the MCAC 1006 application. Mr. Folke replied no.

Commissioner Case asked if there had been any changes in the Code regarding demolition since the approval of MCAC 0901. Mr. Folke replied no.

Chairwoman Wingate explained that a demolition could not be approved unless a new design was approved and Council would be making the final decision. Mr. Folke clarified that the purview of the HPC was to approve the design and make a recommendation to Council regarding the demolition.

Commissioner Case wondered if the application could be approved administratively given that there were no changes to the materials presented or to the Code. Mr. Folke said that there was no language in the Code for administrative approval and that the only option was to re-review it. He also pointed out that new Design Guidelines had been adopted since MCAC 0901 was approved.

Chairwoman Wingate suggested new language in the Code regarding extending MCAC approvals that would mirror the Planning Commission’s. Staff agreed.

As there were no more questions for Staff, Chairwoman Wingate invited the Applicant to the podium.

Chad Hartley (Land Elements, Inc.), 118 N. Tejon Street in Colorado Springs, said that he would talk for 10-15 minutes giving the Commission an overview of the project and process and highlighting the changes made as a result of previous meetings. He introduced the project’s architect, Doug Comstock (Comstock & Associates, Inc.), said that there was a representative from Peak Construction present in case there were questions regarding the demolition, and introduced Dan Dick (Colorado Landmark Hotels LLC) and Paul York (Cliff House General Manager). Mr. Hartley said that the application before the Commission was exactly the same as what was approved in June 2009; absolutely no changes had been made. The new hotel would have a rooftop garden, public park, and parking garage. They were decreasing 93% hardscape to 80%, increasing the landscaping from 7% to 20%, and the lot coverage would be 70% where the zoning allowed 75%. They were proposing new sidewalks with color curbing and bump outs with trees and landscaping. The service area on Grand Avenue would be buffered and they had designed that elevation to a community and pedestrian scale as much as possible. The project met the setbacks on Grand Avenue and they would be building to LEED standards. Mr. Hartley

then went through the timeline of meetings and approvals starting in March 2008, pointing out that they had had an approved plan in 2008 but that there were enough neighborhood concerns to make more changes so they went back to HPC in 2009 and Council approved the exact same plan in June 2009 as was before the HPC now. Mr. Hartley said that the big issue was massing and scale, especially along Grand Avenue. He displayed drawings and explained that they had broken up the massing, lowered the overall height, increased the landscaping and view corridors, decreased the total square footage, redesigned the Wheeler House porch connection, reduced the driveway slope, redesigned the rooftop mechanics and changed the color of the roof from white to an earth tone. Mr. Hartley then referred to the August 2008 HPC approval and read the conditions to the Commission:

- 1) The Applicant shall present for Staff Review and Approval design specifics for:
 - a) Either metal and/or wood porch railings.
 - b) The front porch awnings.
 - c) The metal, prefabricated balconies proposed along the Grand Avenue façade.
- 2) A detailed window schedule, with materials and features specified shall be provided as part of the Building Plans.
- 3) Staff will consult with the contractor in charge of retaining wall construction/removal/modification prior to any work occurring on the property. All Greenstone salvaged from the site shall be stockpiled and used for new walls or wall repairs on the property. The City would like to discuss obtaining any surplus stone. Either Staff or the Applicant will photo document the existing walls and review this information with the contractor.
- 4) All new fencing and gates shall match or complement the historic iron fencing to be reinstalled along the rear of the property.

He went on to explain that a long list of requirements would have to be fulfilled if blasting was required and then said that between August 2008 and March 2009 they had made even more revisions to the plan. The March 2009 approval included:

- 1) The conditions of approval stated under MCAC 0804 shall be incorporated into this approval and applicable to the updated design.
- 2) All retaining walls shall be consistent in materials and design with the existing historic greenstone walls on the property.
- 3) Specifications for screening to be applied to the driveway gate and eastern iron fence, as needed, shall be reviewed by the Planning Staff.
- 4) All new/replaced sidewalks shall be consistent with the colored concrete sidewalks installed Downtown.
- 5) All roofing, including flat roof areas, shall be a dark, earth-tone color.

Mr. Hartley summarized that all of that was part of the plan that Council approved in June 2009 and then pointed out some of the additional conditions placed on the project by Council: “The objective of the project will be to build to LEED Certification standards; recommendations made by the Colorado Geological Survey will be incorporated into development planning and final approvals; and delivery to the Grand Avenue service entrance will be restricted to the following times: weekdays 8:30 am – 5:00 pm; weekends and holidays 10:00 am – 4:00 pm.”

Doug Comstock (Comstock & Associates, Inc.), 523 S. Cascade Avenue in Colorado Springs, said that it had been a long, involved process with a lot of back and forth resulting in a historically-sympathetic project. The only real change along the way in terms of appearance was on the northeast corner elevator tower and it was as a result of helping to buffer from the neighbors; the neighbors had thought that it was more appropriate and representative to round the

corner so it had resulted in a turret. Mr. Comstock also said that they had moved the service drive to the middle of the lot instead of close to Grand Avenue and had added a lot of historic-manner fencing and vegetation. Regarding the Park Avenue side, Mr. Comstock explained that the concept had been to take the elements of the Wheeler House and the Cliff House and create a blended transition of the two using two-tone stone, roof coloration and siding and that they had spent a lot of time trying to achieve that. The post office side was a littler plainer plus it had a lot of large vegetation. On the Grand Avenue side, Mr. Comstock explained that they had originally tried to treat it simply and make it “go away” but had ended up breaking it up and reducing it to a residential scale. Mr. Comstock showed the Commission drawings of the view of the proposed hotel from Grand Avenue and said that it resulted in a “garden level” feel.

Chairwoman Wingate referred to elevation drawing A02E and asked about the “darkened area” near the center of the Grand Avenue view. Mr. Comstock explained that it was the maids’ quarters and that they had originally planned a mirror but the result was to treat it simply and hide it with trees.

Mr. Folke pointed out that elevation drawing A02D showed how the buildings were lowered and also mentioned that the maids’ section was set back 30’ – an additional 10 feet from the building.

Chairwoman Wingate reminded the Commission of the demolition side of the project and asked if there were any comments about why demolition was okay. Mr. Folke said that Staff had found the structures to be noncontributing. Michelle Anthony (City Planner) also pointed out that findings would come out of the next meeting. Mr. Folke went on to explain that Staff findings were based on the 2002 Agate Hill survey and a document submitted by the Applicant’s architect, Bill Brown. Staff considered the structures noncontributing and that was the basis for Staff’s demolition recommendation. Mr. Folke also said that now was the time to ask for any additional information.

Chairwoman Wingate asked the Commission if anyone wanted additional information regarding the demolition. No one did.

The Commission had no further questions for Staff or for the Applicant so Chairwoman Wingate opened the meeting for public comment asking speakers to keep their comments brief and on point.

Teresa Blair, 62 Grand Avenue, introduced herself as a former HPC Commissioner and as an architect licensed in California. She handed out a letter and then summarized the letter saying that she felt that the Applicant should provide better graphics because their simulations were deceptive, she felt that the last review focused on details too soon and the focus should be on the fundamental issues such as massing, and she felt that the Commission should consider soliciting the opinion of a recognized historic preservation architect and the opinion of a professional in the area of historic preservation regarding the economic impact of a convention hotel on the residential historic housing market.

Tim Plass, 655 Maxwell Avenue in Boulder, said that he had helped his parents restore Davis Castle on Spencer Avenue. The amazing natural setting and the built-in environment – historic buildings, streets, bridges, and walls – made Manitou special. Mr. Plass felt that it was important to follow the Guidelines saying that he had served on the Boulder Landmarks and Planning

Boards and he felt that this project did not balance priorities – 5,000 square feet of historic building versus 135,000 square feet of new building. Mr. Plass wanted the Commission to look at the application with a new set of eyes and not just rubberstamp what was approved before, look at using the new Guidelines, and require computer modeling so that they could get a feel of the scale. He said that they should ask if it really complied with the Guidelines and before they looked at the materials and colors they should ask the threshold questions: massing and scale. Mr. Plass finished by saying that he felt it was inappropriate for the District and that it would set a bad precedent.

David Beers, 62 Grand Avenue, pointed out that part of the demolition requirements was an explanation of economic viability. Things had changed and people were not building convention hotels in this country anymore; even the Broadmoor was not doing well right now.

Seeing and hearing no further comment, Chairwoman Wingate closed the meeting to the public.

Chairwoman Wingate, in regard to Mr. Beers' point, referred to the June 15, 2006 Crowley's Consulting, Inc. report. Ms. Anthony suggested that the report be updated saying that Staff usually did not accept information that old.

Commissioner Case said that he would feel more comfortable if it were updated.

Vice Chair Hodges wondered why a building permit had not been issued. Mr. Hartley said that there were many factors including the economy, a VP passing away in the fall of 2009, and a hurricane but the bottom line was the economy. He explained that they were currently drafting a Development Agreement with the City to give them more flexibility saying that Colorado Springs had a 4-year vesting period so one year was short. Mr. Hartley finished by saying that they were definitely 100% behind the project still.

Vice Chair Hodges asked if this [meeting] would be repeated year after year until the economy improved. Mr. Hartley reiterated that the Development Agreement would vest them for 5 years.

Commissioner Case wondered what impact vesting would have on the MCAC approval. Mr. Folke and Ms. Anthony said that the Development Agreement would essentially supercede the 1-year MCAC approval. Commissioner Case felt that that made it even more important to have some consensus on the economic viability issue.

Commissioner Nichols felt that the Crowley report was the appropriate approach; it just needed updating.

Chairwoman Wingate suggested going through the demolition checklist 17.04.080(C)(5):

- a) *Statements regarding the architectural and historical significance.* – The Commission determined that the current information was sufficient
- b) *A report on the structural integrity, as provided by at least one certified, structural engineer.* – The Commission determined that the current information was sufficient
- c) *The location within an Historic District, as shown on a vicinity map.*
 - Commissioner Hyde wanted a site plan showing what was next door.
 - Commissioner Case wanted the context of the elevation to neighboring structures and to the Cliff House.

- Vice Chair Hodges liked the idea of a 3-D representation.
 - Mr. Folke tried to clarify what Commissioner Hyde wanted.
 - Mr. Comstock said that they had already done a lot of comparison studies and showed the drawings to the Commission.
 - Mr. Folke again tried to pin down what additional information the Commission was seeking.
 - Ms. Blair explained that what they were talking about was not the kind of information she had suggested. She had suggested a 3-D model that you could manipulate – computer modeling.
 - Ms. Anthony suggested that she was talking about something like Google Earth and Ms. Blair said yes.
 - Mr. Folke suggested that the Commission continue with the list and that computer modeling could be addressed under item “h”.
- d) *The economic feasibility of Rehabilitation, including the anticipated economic return after Rehabilitation has been completed.*
- Commissioner Nichols thought that “d” was addressed by the Crowley report; it just needed updating.
 - Mr. Folke confirmed with Mr. Hartley that the intent of the report had been to satisfy 17.04.080(C)(5)(d).
 - Chairwoman Wingate was in agreement that the report needed updating.
- e) *The applicant’s plans if the Demolition is approved. No removal or Demolition shall be considered if plans for the use of the property after Demolition are not provided. Such a plan should be in accordance with any adopted Design Guidelines.*
- Commissioner Nichols thought that what they had all been discussing in relation to scale applied here. If feasible, the idea of a computer-generated 3-D model would be a nice addition to help the Commission understand better.
 - Ms. Blair said that she had already done a model and could supply it.
 - Chairwoman Wingate suggested that Ms. Blair and the Applicant work together.
 - Paul York (Cliff House General Manager), 306 Canon Avenue, wondered about Ms. Blair and the public comment being closed. He felt that Ms. Blair was interrupting the proceedings and said that it was inappropriate for someone not directly involved in the scope of the project to do the computer imaging.
 - Mr. Comstock told the Commission that he was an architect registered in 15 states, including Colorado, and that it was not an easy, quick or free process.
 - Commissioner Nichols wondered about a ballpark cost but Mr. Comstock was not able to give her an estimate. Commissioner Nichols felt that the Commission needed some context – it would be different if the 3-D modeling took a month and cost \$10,000 or only took a week and cost \$2,000.
 - Mr. Hartley said that they had computer models of the proposed project that they were going to submit for the next meeting. He described them as pretty rudimentary and also from an earlier version of the project – heights, set backs, etc. had changed. Mr. Folke asked Mr. Hartley if the models could be manipulated but Mr. Hartley did not know.
 - Jason Brungardt with Comstock & Associates said that it would be difficult because they had only created part of the modeling.
 - Ms. Anthony felt that this issue was much like the Crowley letter in that if the Applicant was going to submit something it needed to be up-to-date. She

suggested that if Ms. Blair was willing to submit her modeling to the Applicant then the Applicant could verify if it was accurate and that way they could save a lot of time and money. Mr. Folke felt that it was up to the Applicant to accept or not.

- Commissioner Case wondered what was missing that they didn't already have. In some sense he felt that the Applicant had already showed the "worse case".
- Chairwoman Wingate acknowledged that the Applicant's exhibits spoke to the views but said that the question was the other buildings around the proposal. She would like to see what it would look like from across the valley saying it would help her. She would also like to see the model expanded to include at least 2/3 of Grand Avenue and a couple of buildings on Park.
- Commissioner Wright said that she was confused. She confirmed that the mass and elevation had been reduced and that the last revision had been approved. She asked if this was exactly how the last Commission had seen it. Staff and the Commission confirmed yes.
- Commissioner Case wondered if erecting poles again showing the proposed height of the buildings would help. The Commission's consensus was no.
- Chairwoman Wingate said that they needed to see the neighborhood. She then wondered if they should ask for a more trained set of eyes.
- Vice Chair Hodges wondered about the cost.
- Commissioner Case wondered what they would ask. Chairwoman Wingate replied mass, scale and the viability of the residential community, but they would not ask anybody to weigh in on the economic housing future.
- Mr. Folke suggested asking whether or not the proposal fit the Guidelines.
- Vice Chair Hodges suggested asking if it fit the historic character of the neighborhood.
- Chairwoman Wingate wondered if it could get done in a month. Mr. Folke felt yes and said that Staff would get a quote and a timeline.
- Vice Chair Hodges felt that because of the scale of the project they should request the services of a professional historic preservation architect.
- Commissioner Hyde commented that all she was asking for was help in envisioning the project because she couldn't picture what it would look like.
- Mr. Hartley wondered if this had ever been done before. Ms. Anthony replied that other professionals had been consulted but not specifically a historic preservation architect. Mr. Hartley remarked that time and cost was of concern to the Applicant. Ms. Anthony did not see a problem with getting feedback in a timely manner and did not think that the cost would be astronomical.
- Discussion ensued.
- Chairwoman Wingate commented that it was her intent that if they hired a professional historic preservation architect then they would skip the requirement for additional modeling.
- Mr. Folke read from the Historic Preservation Commission Ordinance 2.52.020(B) – "The City shall appoint both professionals and lay Commission members and alternates who have a demonstrated interest, knowledge or training in fields closely related to historic preservation such as history, architecture, landscape architecture, archeology, planning the building trades, real estate or law....When professionals from the above disciplines are not represented in the

Commission membership, the City shall seek additional expertise in the unrepresented area when considering National Register or Historic District nominations, or when any other actions are taken which may effect properties and which are normally evaluated by professionals in that discipline.”

- Commissioner Nichols felt that the request for a professional historic preservation architect fell more under the auspices of “e” in that the Commission would be seeking help with making an assessment “in accordance with any adopted Design Guidelines”.
 - Mr. Folke confirmed that the Commission was in agreement with pursuing the services of a historic preservation architect in accordance with 17.04.080(C)(5)(e). Chairwoman Wingate added that it was specifically in regard to the compatibility of the proposed mass and scale to the surrounding neighborhood.
- f) *Feasible alternatives to Demolition including, but not limited to, abatement of the immediate threat through repair, securing the premises through security fencing or other measures, stabilization and limited Demolition.* – The Commission determined that the current information was sufficient
- g) *If Demolition is approved, proof that the owner has the financial ability, demonstrated by appropriate documentary evidence, to complete the proposed plans for the property.* – Commissioner Nichols commented that the current letter was consistent with what had been accepted for most other “like” projects and the Commission agreed
- h) *Any other information which the Commission may deem appropriate to further the purposes and objectives of this Chapter.*
- Commissioner Nichols asked for copies of minutes from the other meetings and for Staff to call out any differences in the new Design Guidelines from what was previously referenced.
 - Mr. Folke wondered if it was still necessary for Staff to do a full review if a hired historic preservation architect was going to do it. Commissioner Case said that a project this size needed as many eyes as possible and he would like Staff to also review it totally independent of the reviewer’s review.
 - Vice Chair Hodges confirmed that since the Commission was hiring an architect they would not be requesting a 3-D model. The consensus was that that was the intent.

Mr. Folke said that their next task was to schedule a site visit. Discussion ensued. The two possible dates were Monday, November 11 or Saturday, November 20.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

ITEM 4. Other

Ms. Anthony updated the Commission regarding the Subdistrict signage.

Discussion ensued regarding the Design Guidelines checklist.

Mr. Folke introduced Vicky Bunsen who would be seated as an Alternate Commissioner by Council during their November 9 meeting.

Ms. Anthony suggested that the December 1 meeting start at 6:00 pm.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business before the Commission, Chairwoman Wingate adjourned the meeting at 9:10 pm.

Minutes submitted by Kari Kilroy