
MEETING DATE: Thursday, April 27, 2006
MEETING TIME: 7:00 p.m.
MEETING LOCATION: City Council Chambers, 125 East 3rd Street, Salida, CO

Present: Chairman Kittleman, Chivvis, McMillan, Cronenwett, Shomion, Bergin, Husen, City Planner MacDonald

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kittleman 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 March 23, 2006 as presented. The motion was made by Cronenwett to approve the minutes and Bergin seconded the motion. All were in favor.

III. UNSCHEDULED CITIZENS

There were no unscheduled citizens at the meeting.

IV. AMENDMENT(S) TO AGENDA

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. 124 E. 2nd Street – Major Certificate of Appropriateness application. The request is to receive a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove an addition and sandstone siding on the front of the structure, expose an historic external wall and substantially return the front façade of the structure to the original façade as depicted in a 1937 photograph.

Husen recused himself from Commission discussions as he is the contractor for the applicant.

MacDonald summarized the recommendation in the staff report. **Peggy Armstrong**, applicant, noted the changes in the plans since the last meeting including the uncovering of the brick wall with original window and door openings. She presented the entire application again including the wish to return to the 'L' shape of the building, matching the old roof line, placing two new windows, brick exterior and decorative cornice. **Cronenwett** asked about the porch roof and the two doors in the front. **Armstrong** and **Husen** noted that the porch roof shown in the photograph was an add-on to the original structure and they would like to have the option of not including it. By not including the porch roof they feel the brick will be more visible and they will get more light in the new windows. There was discussion about approving the application with the porch roof as an option in case the applicants found it was desired for shade.

Bergin asked if the windows would be double-hung. **Armstrong** stated that they would be double-hung, wood windows. **Husen** stated that the project would begin as soon as possible. **Chivvis** asked about the removal of the stucco from the interior (soon to be exterior) wall. **Husen** explained that it was backed with chicken wire, and all came off fairly easily and that they

left the nails in the brick for the most part. **Chivvis** asked about matching the bricks and mortar. **Husen** stated that he has acquired some old brick that will match and the Commissioners offered him several suggestions on where to acquire more 'Salida brick'. They also had some suggestions on mortar mixtures and matching joint patterns. **Kittleman** asked about the decorative cornice and it was explained that the parapet was removed when the addition was done but that they would try to replicate the decorative brick pattern shown in the photograph which also exists on other properties in Salida.

Public Hearing was closed at 7:29 p.m. **Bergin** made a motion to approve the application as presented in the staff report with the porch roof as an optional part of the renovation. **Cronenwett** made the second and all were in favor.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Local Landmark designation for the historic Heart of the Rockies Regional Medical Center - The request is to designate the site of the Heart of the Rockies Regional Medical Center (HRRMC) at 448 E. 1st Street as a local historic landmark.

MacDonald presented the staff report and recommended that the Commission recommend local landmark designation of the old hospital site to the City Council. **Cronenwett** summarized the past discussions with the hospital CEO and the prospective buyer, Robin Avery. **Greg Messmer**, VP of Ancillary Services at HRRMC, spoke on behalf of the HRRMC Board and staff. He stated that they certainly support designation of the historic part of the hospital, but referred to the letter submitted by HRRMC on April 26, 2006 regarding their concerns and requests. They would like to see either designation of only the oldest part of the structure, not the entire site, or, to have designation delayed until they were confident that the property would be sold. His concerns were that the designation would lock in the existing footprint and that no alteration of the site would be possible and suggested that if the entire site was designated that the ordinance includes language providing for the removal of non-historic outbuilding and portions of the building.

Robin Avery spoke representing Harbor Legends, the potential buyer of the site. He stated that he is basically in agreement with Mr. Messmer and spoke about his intent to help "close the gap to downtown" by creating a more seamless transition to the historic district. He is ok with designating the entire site as a landmark and wants to be a partner in maintaining the charming character of Salida. His specialty is in creating communities for seniors and he thinks he has an adequate budget to meet everyone's interest. **McMillan** asked why Mr. Avery had selected this property. **Avery** stated that he has been involved with a number of assisted living centers in the state and that the connection was made through a financier the hospital was using who also knows Mr. Avery and thought it would be a good fit. He stated that his organization and the HRRMC share similar values in that they are both community and service-oriented businesses that make money. **McMillan** asked if the existing facility can meet the needs of Harbor Legends. **Avery** stated that he had just read the 1999 review of the facility and was still digesting that information, and had also been on a tour of the facility with Mr. Messmer that day. He is still in the due diligence phase and while not all of the space can be converted to living quarters, those areas will serve as social spaces. The assessment may come back and say that it should be both independent and assisted living for 'successful aging'. He has conducted his own due diligence but the HUD analysis may bring

up new issues.

Bergin asked if he foresaw the need to build additional structures on the site. **Avery** stated that his initial answer is no, but that could change with due diligence and market assessment. He thinks that everything can fit under the existing roof. Also stated that he would like to reclaim part of the parking area in the rear and return the area between the river and the building to a park-like setting. He would like the facility to meet a range of need from Medicaid to financially independent clients. **Shomion** asked if as a buyer, Avery had a problem with landmarking. **Avery** replied that no, but he would like to avoid heavy regulation. It was agreed that removing outbuildings and site improvements described are compatible with the landmark designation. **Kittleman** provided an explanation of how the historic district evolved and how we have come to designating local landmarks. **Avery** stated that he would like to build on the core character of Salida and that whatever he does should help make the whole community better by preserving the character.

Cronenwett stated that the whole site should be designated, not just the oldest part of the building because that allows for review of the site around the oldest portion of the building. Stated the importance of keeping the site whole. She noted that Mr. Avery had suggested at an HRRMC board meeting that there was a possibility of providing employee parking off-site to allow for more of the site to be reclaimed. **Avery** stated that there are still three weeks left in the feasibility study and asked how the HPC would react if the investors felt that the “highest and best use” of the site would require an additional structure. **Chivvis** stated that he thought there was a misconception about the landmark designation and the review by the HPC. Landmark designation does not “lo-up” a property, it simply adds a layer of design review. He doesn’t feel that the HPC would be opposed to demolition of non-contributing parts of the site or construction of complimentary additions or structures.

Donna Francis representing Historic Salida Inc., read the letter that was submitted by HSI on April 24th. She stated that she was gratified by the comments of Mr. Messmer and Mr. Avery. **William Boddy** echoed the comments that the old part could be removed and there could be new appropriate structures added.

The public hearing was closed. **Bergin** stated that the grounds should be considered part of the landmark area and included in the designation. **Chivvis** stated that the green space is an important part of the site. **McMillan** feels that there is consensus on that. **Husen** stated the entire area should be designated to prevent inappropriate development on the site. **Shomion** agreed the entire site should be included. **Kittleman** expressed concern at Mr. Avery’s request for further delay. **Bergin** thinks that the designation sets the standard for how everyone can move forward. There was discussion of whether to move forward with landmarking now or to wait until the purchase process has moved further along. **Cronenwett** feels it should proceed now and **Kittleman** was concerned that the owners be supportive of the designation. **Chivvis** asked about the timing of the Council process. **MacDonald** stated that it would likely be heard for 1st reading on June 5th and 2nd reading June 19th. **Avery** expressed sympathy for the concerns of the current owners in case something falls through with the current purchase proposal and that other buyers may not be interested in a landmarked property. **Bergin** recognizes that but the reason for designation is to protect a site, not to ensure a sale of the property. She further stated that

while the HPC wants to work with all parties involved, the HPC is not here to pander to concerns of real estate. **Avery** asked what the downside would be if the deal doesn't happen and the site is designated. **Kittleman** reiterated that the HPC wants a willing partner in the owners and not have to utilize the supermajority of City Council to designate the property. **Chivvis** asked if they were asking for a delay. **Messmer** stated he does feel better after hearing the discussion tonight regarding the amount of restriction that comes with designation; however, they would like to reserve as much flexibility as possible. Understands that demolition of the non-historic parts would likely be acceptable. There was further discussion of the implications of designation. With an assurance of continued reasonableness, **Messmer** stated the HRRMC were willing participants in the process.

Cronenwett made a motion to recommend designation of the Heart of the Rockies Regional Medical Center site and all its contents be locally landmarked as presented in the staff report. **Shomion** made the second and all were in favor.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

VIII. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

1. **Chivvis** commented that a bench was installed in Riverside Park last week in front of the war memorial and that it was not placed in accordance with the Riverside Park plan. He emphasized that because the Park is within the historic district that such changes should be reviewed by the HPC.
2. **Bergin** asked what was happening with the Clamper's plaque at the Steam Plant. **MacDonald** explained that the HPC comments were forwarded to the Council, but that there were no further comments or concerns from the Council. The plaque is now being manufactured and will be placed in August. There was discussion about the concerns of HPC members that they should be consulted on such things and the frustration that Council does not recognize the concerns they have raised.

IX. ADJOURN.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m.