



**MANITOU SPRINGS  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
Wednesday, September 1, 2010, 7:00 P.M.**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

A Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission was held Wednesday, July 7, 2010 in Council Chambers @ 606 Manitou Avenue. Chairwoman Wingate called the meeting to order at 7:03 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:** Dan Corson, Director of OAHP Intergovernmental Services

**STAFF:** Dan Folke, Planning Director  
Michelle Anthony, City Planner (arrived @ 8:05 pm)  
Kari Kilroy, Assistant

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**ITEM 1. Minutes from July 7, 2010 Regular Meeting.**

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Nichols moved to approve the minutes as presented.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Hyde seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

None.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 6-0 (Commissioner Diamond abstained).

### III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

None.

### IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

### V. NEW BUSINESS

#### **ITEM 2. MCAC 1004 – Material Change of Appearance Certification (Install Vinyl Siding) – 5 Cherokee – Frederic & Elizabeth Beattie, Applicants.**

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

Dan Folke (Planning Director) presented the Staff Report prepared by Michelle Anthony (City Planner) and dated 08/26/10. Staff recommended denial of the request with the finding that it would be inconsistent with the Design Guidelines and would have a detrimental effect on the integrity of the existing cottage and on the Historic District.

*At this point, Chairwoman Wingate realized that she had not inquired about any Commissioner ex parte contacts or conflicts of interest to declare. Hearing none the meeting continued.*

Commissioner Case confirmed with Mr. Folke that the property was not opted out of the Historic District.

Commissioner Case asked Mr. Folke for more details regarding the siding damage. Mr. Folke characterized it as mainly peeling paint.

Commissioner Hyde asked to see color versions of the Applicants' photos.

Chairwoman Wingate commented that because they were not Colorado residents, the Beatties would not be eligible for state tax credits. Mr. Folke suggested that a local benefit could be the waiving of the required use tax.

Chairwoman Wingate realized that she had not explained the meeting procedures and did so.

Chairwoman Wingate invited the Applicants to the podium.

Ted Beattie (Applicant), 5 Cherokee Road, said that he had just received the Staff Report that day. *(Note: Planning Staff emailed the agenda and Staff Report to the Applicants on Friday, August 27 at 3:08 pm. Michelle Anthony called the Applicants on Tuesday, August 31 and discovered that they had not received the email. It was resent at 8:50 am and the Applicants responded at 9:01 am that they had received it.)* He said that they had bought the cottage in 1972 from the daughter of Mr. Moore who had developed the Peakview Estates and that they really thought that this would improve the appearance. Mr. Beattie said they were not terribly wealthy but that they were not that concerned about the

money. He pointed out that the cottage next door had vinyl siding and said that in his mind it would maintain and improve the appearance. Mr. Beattie finished by saying that their real motive was to maintain and improve the cottage.

Beth Beattie (Applicant), 5 Cherokee Road, also said that they had just received the Staff Report that day and that they had owned the cottage since 1972 when it was “yellow and black and horrible”. Mrs. Beattie pointed out that it was not the original structure as when it was built in 1913 – a porch and two other additions had been added. They had also reinforced the foundation, added new floors, etc. She said that the cost to paint it in 2003 was \$2,200. The paint was now peeling because the wood was almost 100 years old. The wood was soft and not from water. Mrs. Beattie handed out a brochure and color samples of the proposed siding saying that she was attracted to other houses in Manitou with vinyl siding. She read Guideline 4.1 from the Staff Report – *An addition or alteration to an historic building shall ensure that the original architectural character and style of the structure is maintained and the addition is subordinate in appearance to the original building* – saying that what they were asking to do (and what others had done without permission) was to improve the cottage’s appearance. She then read Guideline 4.15 – *Architectural details, such as trim, combine to establish distinct character and shall be preserved, whenever feasible. Damaged and/or missing detailing shall be replaced and shall match the original detailing* – saying that they would be preserving that. Mrs. Beattie also said that vinyl may not ever need to be painted and finished by mentioning a handout detailing costs that had been given to the Commission.

Commissioner Case pointed out that the existing home had 2” lap siding whereas the proposed was 4”. Mrs. Beattie referred to the brochure and said that it looked similar and that they did not make wood with that lap anymore. She also referred to a picture of the home below theirs.

Chairwoman Wingate confirmed with Mrs. Beattie that the trim would be covered in vinyl but Commissioner Hyde read from the cost handout that the contractor was proposing “green metal finish over existing fascia and window trim”.

Commissioner Hodges wondered if the home had been properly scraped and primed before painting in 2003. Mrs. Beattie said that the painter was Eric Wellborn, a Manitou resident who had come highly recommended and who was certainly expensive. She felt that he did a good job but added that she can now peel the paint down to the bare wood.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Wright felt that continuing to allow vinyl siding would make the town look plastic.

Commissioner Case mentioned that the Commission had put a great deal of thought into the Guidelines and the Appendices. He was struggling with how to approve the Applicants’ request and still meet the Guidelines. The Guidelines were very clear and were there for a reason – to keep the historic look and feel of the environment in which we live. It was also upsetting to him that the reveal would be 4” versus the existing 2”.

Discussion ensued regarding vinyl siding on the neighboring house.

Per Mrs. Beattie's question, Chairwoman Wingate explained that "repair first" had been the spirit of the Guidelines from the beginning and that a new version had been approved by Council last year. Chairwoman Wingate also said that the Guidelines took their lead from the Department of Interior Guidelines.

Commissioner Nichols wondered if there was any flexibility between repairing the existing siding and replacing it with vinyl.

Commissioner Case mentioned that vinyl siding would not have the same shadow and suggested that cement board looked more similar to the existing.

Discussion ensued regarding siding at 947 Osage Avenue. Staff confirmed that the Applicants in that case had requested cement board but that the Commission had required wood since the Applicants had applied for (and received) state tax credits.

Commissioner Case reiterated that the first option, as stated in the City's and the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines, was repair.

Chairman Wingate invited the Applicant back to the podium.

Mrs. Beattie said that the only cement board that they had seen came in 4"-6" reveal and that they did not want that look. They also did not want stucco. She also mentioned that cement board was heavier and they did not want to put more weight on the house. Mrs. Beattie was puzzled because they wanted to retain the original look of the cottage. One of the reasons why they had investigated vinyl siding was because they were impressed with the house below them. She said it looked snazzy and like a million dollars.

Mr. Beattie commented that the house below them had been done in the recent past. He also said that they had never received any opportunity to opt-out after the initial one.

Mrs. Beattie felt that they were being punished for wanting the best for Manitou.

Chairwoman Wingate asked if there was any more deliberation.

Commissioner Wright asked if there was any information on cost for painting.

Commissioner Case started to explain that discussions like that were always hard when Mrs. Beattie interrupted him. She was very angry saying that if they had not come to them in the first place they could have just done it like everyone else did. Commissioner Case was sympathetic and congratulated them for doing the right thing.

Chairwoman Wingate said that if there was no more deliberation, she would request a motion.

**MOTION:**

Commissioner Case moved to reject MCAC 1004 for application of vinyl siding to the existing residence at 5 Cherokee Road because the request was not compatible with the Historic Design Guidelines.

**SECOND:**

Commissioner Wright seconded the Motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

None.

**VOTE:**

Motion passed, 7-0.

Mr. Folke explained to Mr. Beattie (Mrs. Beattie had already left the room) that there was an appeal process and to contact him if they wanted to pursue that avenue.

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

**ITEM 3. CLG Evaluation and Feedback**

Dan Corson, Director of the Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, introduced himself to the newer Commissioners. He explained that Manitou Springs was a Certified Local Government (CLG) and that his office conducted an evaluation of all the CLGs every four years – he had last been here in 2006. Mr. Corson said that his goals were to:

- a) Inspect our records – how we maintain and make them available to the public;
- b) Take a short tour of the community;
- c) Attend a meeting – and remind us of what it means to be a CLG; and
- d) Observe a public hearing.

Mr. Corson then presented a PowerPoint presentation regarding CLGs.

*Ms. Anthony arrived at approximately 8:05 pm.*

**ITEM 4. Discussion and Review of Demolition Evaluation Procedures (Return on Investment)**

Before beginning his presentation, Mr. Corson pointed out a few things:

- “Return on Investment” may not be the most important factor
- Owners are entitled to a *reasonable* return on their investment, not the highest/best return
- The Commission should analyze the whole property, not just a piece of it
- What income a new house would produce is irrelevant

Mr. Corson then presented a PowerPoint presentation titled “Request for Demolition Due to Economic Hardship” which was a case study about a home at 429 Spruce Street. He presented the principles of evaluating economic hardship as follows:

- Burden of proof is on the applicant.

- Did the owner or prior owner cause deterioration? (If yes, then go no further.)
- Evaluate the property's economic potential not the owner's financial situation.
- Obtain your own appraisal.
- Remove costs associated with BOTH rehab and new construction.
- Subtract financial incentives from the difference between rehab and new construction (because the incentives would not be available absent rehabilitation)

Discussion ensued.

**ITEM 5. Discussion and Approval of Changing October Meeting Date to Monday, October 4<sup>th</sup>.**

Mr. Folke explained that he and Ms. Anthony would be at the State Planning Conference in Steamboat Springs during the regularly-scheduled October 6 meeting and requested that the date be changed to Monday, October 4. The consensus of the Commission was yes.

**ITEM 6. Discussion of Implementation of Historic Subdistrict Signage**

Mr. Folke explained that there was \$500 in the budget. He asked the Commission to discuss adding signs to the already existing street signs or perhaps installing monument signs to identify the historic subdistricts.

Commissioner Diamond mentioned that signs in Pueblo used different colors and fonts.

Chairman Wingate agreed that that would be a good way to distinguish the signs.

Ms. Anthony pointed out that they weren't needed on every existing sign.

Chairman Wingate suggested looking on the map and Commissioner Nichols indicated that she had already done that and had picked out strategic/prominent areas for the signs.

Ms. Anthony and Mr. Folke suggested that the Streets department could do mock-up signs and give us an idea of cost.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Folke pointed out that one reason to identify the subdistricts was so people would start identifying with their neighborhoods.

Commissioner Diamond suggested the signs could look Victorian.

Commissioner Case suggested a rectangle with scroll-work on top.

Ms. Anthony suggested oval and then said that Staff would give the Commission several options.

Chairwoman Wingate suggested keeping the signs vandal-proof.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business before the Commission, Chairwoman Wingate adjourned the meeting at 9:32 pm.

*Minutes submitted by Kari Kilroy*