
MEETING DATE: Thursday, January 24, 2008
MEETING TIME: 7:00 p.m.
MEETING LOCATION: City Council Chambers, 125 East 3rd Street, Salida, CO

Present: Chairman Boddy, Kittleman, Evaskovich, Chivvis, Barton, Golson, City Planner Dara MacDonald

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Boddy called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

A motion and second were made to approve the minutes from the December 27, 2007 meeting. The motion was made by Golson to approve the minutes and Kittleman seconded the motion. All were in favor.

III. UNSCHEDULED CITIZENS

None

IV. AMENDMENT(S) TO AGENDA

None

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Veazey, Certificate of Appropriateness – 138 W. 1st Street** – The request is to receive a Certificate of Appropriateness to modify the front storefront façade including new windows, door, trim and other details.

Staff Review - MacDonald suggested that the applicant proceed with their presentation since they had a lot more information and material samples than had been provided with the application.

Applicant's Presentation – Robert Veazey explained that the downstairs has been completely remodeled from the original appearance and that there is no original material remaining on the lower façade of the building. **Wade Veazey** explained the history of the building as a part of the Union Block. He noted that all work will be below the sills of the windows to the second floor (with the exception of the finials). He is not sure what they will find behind the plaster band just below those windows. The steel posts will remain; however, they will be on the exterior of the structure following the construction of the new façade. The column between the resident's door and the store front will also remain. **Veazey** showed photos of the building at 113 E. Sackett which has similar details. The entry will be constructed to include 8' French doors rather than the single door that currently exists.

Veazey pointed out that he is not trying to duplicate the original storefront because it is not practical as all three of the buildings in the Union Block would have to cooperate. He has created this design in an attempt to utilize elements of other historic buildings in town. He

has identified at least one supplier for reproduction tin ceiling for the new entry. He will apply cast iron sections at the top and bottoms of each of the two iron posts. A lower cornice will be constructed below the sills of the second story windows to cover the existing band below the windows. The details of the lower cornice including the corbels are shown in the section view provided at the meeting. The applicants would like to use a poly-urethane material for the corbels. The column between the resident's door and the storefront would be trimmed similar to the column on the Gamble's building. The finials on the roof would be duplicates of those shown in historic photos. The glazing and doors would be produced by Kolbe. **Veazey** submitted two window samples for review and noted that the doors would be clear fir and would remain unpainted.

Chivvis noted that the detail shown for the transom windows was more of a later Arts and Crafts style and he recommended either using one large pane or including the squares around the perimeter of each transom. **Veazey** would prefer to have a simple pane window. **Cronenwett** asked if they have planned to accommodate awnings in the design. **Veazey** said they had not considered it yet, but they would make sure that they took that option into account. **Barton** noted that a low-E glazing would also help with the sun. **MacDonald** asked if the note on the plans was correct regarding "hard board smooth siding" on the kick plates. **Veazey** stated that was incorrect and that they would be using wood for all of the trim exclusive of the corbels. **Chivvis** asked how the kick plate would be constructed. **Veazey** agreed that they should be framed with a recessed panel finished with molding. **Chivvis** agreed that the 113 E. Sackett building was a good sample for the type of finish details proposed by the applicant. **Golson** asked about the hardware on the doors and was informed it would be period style.

Public Comment – The public hearing was opened at 7:50 p.m. **Jackie Powell** agrees that Kolbe makes good windows but stated she is nervous about using poly-urethane corbels. She questioned the longevity of the material and whether it would truly be lower maintenance. She assumed there would be another meeting to review the project as there are still details to be finalized. She feels it is a good copying of an original storefront and thinks crank-out awnings would be a good addition to the design. She has heartburn with the metal windows and likes the fir doors.

Robert Veazey commented that his company had manufactured a large cornice for the Union Station in Kansas. The cornice was made from poly-urethane and he explained the properties of the material that support durability. He stated that they want to create a beautiful building but also want to have limited maintenance.

Cronenwett commented that they had used Kolbe windows in the Hively project and she had been concerned about using the metal windows. However, she has been pleased with their appearance since they have been installed. The public hearing was closed at 8:00 p.m.

Commissioner Comments – **Barton** appreciates the research that has gone into the design but thinks the details may need further discussion. **Evaskovich** appreciates the plan and the presentation. He is concerned about using metal windows but is comfortable with allowing the poly-urethane corbels. **Chivvis** thinks that overall the applicant is on the right track. He noted that this is the first real storefront rehabilitation that has been attempted in downtown. He asked if they had considered building window frames and installing a double

plate glass window. **Veazey** responded that they are not trying to fool anyone that this is an original storefront. They feel that everything will be new material but with an historic twist. **Chivvis** stated that he is ready to approve the application tonight.

Boddy commended the applicant's efforts. He is comfortable with allowing the metal windows but is concerned that the change of materials isn't cohesive. He does not think that the HPC should be concerned with the details on this type of project. **Golson** thinks there is adequate information to make a decision. She remains concerned about the Fypon (poly-urethane) material and thinks that wood is preferable. She likes the overall appearance. **Kittleman** asked that if there were a significant change in the plan that the applicant return for additional review. He feels he could approve the application. **Cronenwett** thinks it makes sense to use modern materials as long as you can't really tell the difference. If the storefront were intact, original materials should be utilized.

There was further discussion about the windows. There are two styles proposed, a sash set for the transom and a window with more detailed molding for the storefronts. **Cronenwett** commented that the two styles do not match. **Veazey** proposed that all windows be the sash set style. The Commission agreed. **Boddy** would like to see some center relief in the corbels.

Decision – **Kittleman** made a motion to accept the proposal with the following conditions:

1. That the windows be the sash set style.
2. That the finials on the roof match the historic appearance.
3. That if they uncover something unexpected that alters the proposed design the applicant will return to the HPC to amend their application.
4. That the transoms be a single large pane style without the proposed squares in the corners.

Evaskovich made a second. All were in favor.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. **Plaque Program Discussion** – **Boddy** presented a sample brochure that he had created to distribute to property owners who might be interested in placing plaques on their buildings. There was discussion about the graphic of Master Electric and other suggestions for ways to improve the brochure. **Boddy** will revise the brochure based on suggestions.

Historic Windows – **Gary Higgins** stated that the draft addition to the *Design Guidelines* are a good start and will help solidify the recommendations of the *Secretary's Standards*. Both he and Bobby Hartsliel had submitted questions/comments that were distributed to the HPC. **Higgins** stated that there are a lot of certified preservation specialists in Colorado and explained that "certification" is part of certain job descriptions such as positions with the Colorado Historical Society. There is no certification per se for a preservation architect, but that they would be a licensed architect who has at least one year of preservation experience. The *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* include some description of what qualifications the HPC should look for. **Higgins** went through the four points included in his email comments.

Higgins suggested that the language be changed to “original windows ‘shall’ be retained unless the survey determines they are beyond repair”. There was discussion about requiring the window survey for only contributing structures in the district, not for non-contributing structures. There was further discussion of whether cost considerations should be taken into account in determining whether original windows should be retained. Also, the Commissioners discussed how to determine if a window can be repaired. The Commission agreed that they should rely on the survey to determine whether a window should be retained or replacement would be appropriate.

Higgins further suggested that the HPC delete the reference to “secondary” and “tertiary” facades. He felt that less stringent requirements for these facades should not be stated as the norm. Instead he suggested the guidelines state, “on a case by case basis, less stringent requirements may be considered on less prominent facades”. This would allow the HPC to allow a lower standard for secondary or rear façade but would also allow them to hold more prominent secondary facades to the same standard as the primary façade if warranted. **Boddy** is sensitive to the concerns of builders and the expense of the higher standard. **Powell** suggested the HPC keep their options open while in practice they may hold non-primary facades to a lower standard. **Higgins** feels that when someone buys a property in the historic district they have taken on a commitment to the community.

There was some general discussion on the use of substitute materials. **Higgins** will forward a Preservation Brief on this topic. If a historic material is being removed because it is beyond repair, it may be acceptable to replace that element with one constructed of a modern material. **Whittington** is still concerned about trying to balance preservation with energy efficiency concerns. The HPC members who are attending the CPI conference will report back at the next meeting regarding windows.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Education Program – MacDonald** introduced the existing brochure that the City has for the historic district. Several of the Commissioners had comments on how it could be improved. **Boddy** will review the brochure and recommend changes. **Powell** suggested that perhaps HSI could help with education also. **Whittington** noted that she would like to see more education provided. **MacDonald** has requested one of the City’s Friday columns for the HPC. **Golson** will coordinate an article to introduce the Commission to the community and explain the importance of preservation.

VIII. COMMISSIONER’S COMMENTS

None

IX. ADJOURN.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:21 p.m.