
MEETING DATE: Thursday, July 26, 2007
MEETING TIME: 7:00 p.m.
MEETING LOCATION: City Council Chambers, 125 East 3rd Street, Salida, CO

Present: Chairman Kittleman, Evaskovich, Chivvis, Boddy, Cronenwett, Shomion, Golson, City Planner Dara MacDonald, Planning Tech Kristi Jefferson

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 June 28, 2007 meeting. The motion was made by Cronenwett to approve the minutes and Chivvis seconded the motion. All were in favor.

III. UNSCHEDULED CITIZENS

Mayor Danny Knight commented that he has heard a lot of concern recently about the new water tank at the airport both because the tank has a shiny finish and because of the proximity to the Valley View School. He noted that the metal is a necessary moisture barrier and that the finish may not be able to be modified. He also stated that water service will be available for the Valley View School in the future with the installation of the water tank and transmission line.

IV. AMENDMENT(S) TO AGENDA

Boddy suggested that the Commission discuss the water tank and Valley View School under new business. All were in favor.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. Lewis and Glenn Funeral Home – 203 E. Sackett Street** – The request is to receive a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the windows and construct three additions to the structure at 203 E. Sackett Street.
 - A. Open Public Hearing – 7:09 p.m.**
 - B. Staff Review of Application – MacDonald** summarized the staff report by stating that the applicants were seeking the Certificate of Appropriateness for three changes to the building 1) construct roofs over the two entries to the chapel along E Street, 2) construct a carport and crematorium along the parking lot connected to what is already an addition to the historic structure, and, 3) replace all of the windows in the historic structure with new, metal windows. It was noted that the addition of the roofs over the entries would also need to be approved by the Board of Adjustment because they would encroach into the side setback. **MacDonald** noted that staff had recommended approval of the application although there is always hesitation with removing the original windows since they are original to the building.

She noted that the replacement windows would replicate the reveals and operating characteristics of the original windows.

- C. **Applicant's Presentation- Danny Knight, Knight & Sons Construction**, explained the mechanical systems of the old windows and how the windows have failed. He noted that there are many which are cracked, that they are single-pane and that they have little thermal value. He is proposing to install a remodel window which does not have a flange. They will remove the existing sash and the wood sill and jamb will remain in place. The new windows will be custom ordered for each opening and placed in the jamb with the same reveal that the original windows had. The fixed-panes, single-hung and double-hung windows will all maintain that same operation type with the new window.

He noted that that the existing chapel will not be changed. The cedar trees along E Street will be removed and the roofs over the entries to the chapel will be added to address safety concerns with snow and ice build-up at the doorways. He noted that they will be removing the shingles on the roof and replacing them with architectural shingles that will look very similar to the current roof material. The stucco on the crematory addition will match the existing stucco on the addition.

Cronenwett asked if the new sash would fit exactly into the old jamb – will they be custom windows or stock windows that are the closest size match? **Knight** explained that each new window will be built to fit the existing jambs to within ¼ inch. **Boddy** stated that in the past when the HPC has approved replacement windows that they have insisted that the reveals, design and all dimensions have been matched to the look of the old windows. **Knight** stated that would be the case with these windows. **Cronenwett** wanted to confirm that included the top and bottom offset and that the height of separation between the top and bottom panes would be the same as the original. **Evaskovich** asked if the metal would have an anodized finish and **Knight** confirmed it would.

Golson asked the applicant to explain the benefit of the new windows versus repairing the existing windows. **Knight** described that the single-pane windows are not energy efficient and that they have lost a lot of utility over the years and that many are inoperable and damaged. He feels it would take a fortune to repair the existing windows. **Boddy** commented that the energy savings are not as large as people think and that new double-pane windows do not garner that much in savings. **Golson** explained that new windows generally have a shorter lifespan and will need to be replaced in twenty years where the wooden windows, if properly maintained, can last much longer. There was discussion about recycling and repair options on newer windows.

Knight emphasized the need for the roofs over the entries on the chapel. **MacDonald** commented that she had had a discussion with **Knight** about the

possibility of extending the existing porch roof on the historic structure to cover the northern entry to the chapel. **MacDonald** did not recommend pursuing that option as it would be a significant alteration to a roof element that was an important feature of the historic structure. **Knight** explained that there is a lot of ice build-up in that area and that the creation of a gap between the two roofs would contribute to that problem. **Kittleman** commented that he is concerned about keeping the separation between the historic structure and the newer addition and that extending the roof would blur that separation.

Tim Glenn, explained that while they would like to have the roofs connected, that it is not a necessary element of their plans. He explained that the major objective is to provide shelter over the entries. A lot of the windows are rotten and many are inoperable and may be beyond repair. He described how the building has been repaired and improved since they purchased the building in the 1980s including removal of the paint from the historic portion of the structure. The addition was constructed to expand the facility and was constructed on a budget. They have continued to improve the addition over time and hope that the addition of roofs over the entry and the crematory will help them to provide their services to the community. **Kittleman** asked if there were any historic photos of the building. **Glenn** had photos going back twenty years, but not prior to that. He noted that if he thought the windows were sound that he would attempt to repair them.

Kittleman asked if there were plans to restore the transoms. **Cronenwett** asked if the balcony was utilized and if the entry off the balcony that had been filled in could be restored. **Knight** noted that the drop ceiling on the interior might limit that.

Boddy noted that he was opposed to extending the porch roof from the historic structure to cover the chapel entry. **Knight** explained that he would like the entry roofs to be hipped roofs to match the roofs on the historic structure. The Commission was supportive of that proposal.

D. Public Input – None

E. Commission Discussion- **Kittleman** noted that it is a goal of the Commission that additions be distinguished from the old and that often the HPC has to resist attempts to imitate historic styling when people want to construct additions. In this case the addition does not have a great deal of style. He is concerned about replacing the windows and thinks the Commission needs to be more consistent in their decisions about window replacements and encourage maintenance and repair of old windows. He would agree to go with a modern window but emphasized the importance of paying attention to the dimensions. He likes the archway on the second floor and would welcome the restoration of the transom. He further suggested that relocation of the ramp along E Street might not infringe on the view of the historic structure as it does now. He would prefer if the railings had more

style. He also noted that he is concerned about adding more stucco on the addition in the parking lot.

Cronenwett commented that if the ramp were relocated that it may help reduce ice build-up. She understands the deterioration of wood windows and the impossibility of repair. She is in favor of the replacement windows that have been selected. **Shomion** commented that he liked the research and effort that had gone into selecting the replacement window product. **Boddy** asked if the metal door on the west elevation could be a raised panel instead of the blank panel it is now. He liked the idea of hipped roofs over the entry. He asked the applicant to consider painting the stucco around the upstairs door to alleviate the contrast of the stucco fill in that area and blend better with the brick structure. He noted that it appears the balcony railing could use some repair. He generally agrees with the staff recommendations for approval and also offered to refer the applicant to a wood replacement window manufacturer if they were interested in pursuing that route.

Chivvis is fine with the replacement windows and would object to joining the two roofs. He likes the proposed roofs over the entries and noted that snow and ice problems are tough on the north sides of the downtown buildings. He would also encourage any attempts by the applicants to restore the door openings that have been altered on the historic structure.

Evaskovich stated he is comfortable with the additions because you can't really see the crematory from the street and the roofs over the entries will improve the look of the building. He understands the difficulties with the old windows. **Golson** added that she too was ok with the architectural changes but added that she was concerned about removal and replacement of the windows. However, she did note that even from the street the deterioration was visible. **Boddy** commented that the concern of the HPC is not the cost or expediency of the proposal. The charge of the HPC is to protect the historic look and feel of the district. He is only in favor of approving the replacement of severely deteriorated windows.

Kittleman stated that he was impressed with the applicant and their willingness to consider suggestions of the HPC. He agrees that the windows can be replaced so long as they are replaced to match the reveal and dimensions of the original windows. **Shomion** stated he liked the ramp relocation idea as it would help to further separate the old structure from the addition. **Knight** and **Glenn** explained that the ramp orientation facilitated the connection between the office in the historic structure and the chapel and that the connection between the two was essential for operation of the business.

F. Close Public Hearing – 8:17p.m.

G. Commission Action – Boddy made a motion to approve the application as presented with the condition:

Conditions:

1. That rooflines not be joined between the addition and the historic structure.

Chivvis seconded. All were in favor so the motion passed unanimously.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Discussion of plaque program.

Kittleman explained that he was hoping to get more feedback from the Commissioners regarding the documents he presented at the last meeting of the HPC. He feels like he needs more guidance. There was discussion regarding the merits of central information areas with small plaques on each building versus placing more information on each individual building. **Boddy** feels that there are multiple possible solutions to placing plaques on or very nearby individual structures and he does not like the idea of central information locations. He feels that the bronze plaques look nice and suggested trying to find sponsors for the program.

MacDonald reminded the Commissioners of the August 6th workshop on State Historical Fund grant applications that will be held in Salida at the Methodist Church at 12 noon. She suggested that the SHF grant might be a good opportunity to obtain funding and that interested HPC members should attend the workshop if they are interested in pursuing grant funds. **Evaskovich** volunteered to help with creating a brochure for property owners to explain the plaque program and get support.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Removal of obsolete signs within the historic district** – **MacDonald** explained that planning staff had recently sent notice to the owner of the Unique Theater and Sherman Hotel requiring the removal of the marquee on the Unique and the “Hotel” sign on the roof of the Sherman. The City sign code requires the removal of signs that advertise a business that is no longer in existence. After discussion with **Kittleman** about these requirements she wanted to get feedback from the HPC to see if there was a different policy they would like to pursue.

There was discussion about the importance of some of the old signs in the historic district and whether the HPC should exercise some oversight. **Chivvis** was particularly concerned with the removal of the old neon signs. **Boddy** explained that the marquee from the Unique had been sold and would likely be removed next week. It was generally indicated that the HPC would like to be involved in determining whether some of the older signs are significant and should be permitted to remain. **MacDonald** agreed that staff could suspend enforcement of obsolete signs in the historic district while the HPC considered the issue. She suggested that staff could look at the code and see what options are available and perhaps suggest changes to the code to address the concerns. Such allowances may include exempting certain signs from the obsolete sign code provisions, not counting those exempted signs from the permitted sign area for a building and not limiting the owner’s ability to remove those signs if they so chose.

2. **Valley View School and the water tank** – The HPC recognizes that the Valley View School and the water tank are outside of their jurisdiction.

VIII. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Golson is concerned about the HPC actions regarding replacement of historic windows. The Commission discussed this issue and determined that they would like to see more information when these applications come forward in the future. They would like to see samples of the proposed replacement windows as well as documented information about the deterioration of the existing windows. A site visit would also be helpful in these cases. The Commissioners felt strongly that replacement of historic windows should only be done when there was no hope of repair of the existing windows and again noted that the cost of such work is not their concern so much as protecting the integrity of the historic structures and the district as a whole. It was agreed that more education could be done to let property owners know the importance of maintenance and options of repairing existing windows or replacing damaged windows with replica windows.

IX. ADJOURN.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.