
MEETING DATE: Thursday, October 25, 2007
MEETING TIME: 7:00 p.m.
MEETING LOCATION: City Council Chambers, 125 East 3rd Street, Salida, CO

Present: Chairman Kittleman, Graham, Boddy, Evaskovich, Shomion, Golson, City Planner Dara 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 September 27, 2007 meeting. The motion was made by Golson to approve the minutes and Graham seconded the motion. All were in favor.

III. UNSCHEDULED CITIZENS

None

IV. AMENDMENT(S) TO AGENDA

None

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. Sherman Hotel, Certificate of Appropriateness – 115-123 G Street and 149-151 W. 1st Street** – The request is to receive a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace existing windows with new windows in the existing openings, infill one existing window, install two new doors and install a new exterior stair.

Commissioner Boddy recused himself from the hearing because he is a tenant in the subject structure.

Staff Review. MacDonald presented the staff review of the project. Staff has found that the review standards have been met for all aspects of the application with the exception of the removal of the existing windows. Staff did not find that the windows were beyond repair and therefore that their proposed removal did not meet the review standards.

Applicant's Presentation – Sarah Whittington is the architect for the project. She addressed the design of the proposed exterior stairs explaining that the design was the least obtrusive she could develop. The proposal does include replacing the existing wooden deck and the addition of new roof structures above each of the two doors. The placement of the stair necessitates that an existing window be brought to a fire-rated material. The applicants have proposed to infill the window with plywood and sheetrock and covered by a shutter to give the appearance of a closed window. This would maintain the same opening. There is a fire-rated glass product that could be used but it is cost prohibitive. There was discussion of the placement of these alterations as well as alternate materials for the window infill and the stair. The stair will have a dull metal finish.

Whittington went on to explain that the applicant would like to maintain consistency in the windows with the replacements that have already been made. The tenant will be the same throughout the space and they would like the interior finishes to remain consistent. Many of the windows are interior to the property and can not be seen from the public view. They expected that the prior approvals would lead to approval of this application. They are in the midst of a multi-phase project and would like to remain consistent. They do not believe it is cost effective to restore the existing windows. When they attempted to contact Older than Dirt construction (who is able to restore windows) they were told he was too busy to consider another project at that time, or even get a bid. Some of the windows are in better shape than others but they would like visual consistency. She submitted a letter from the mechanical engineer stating his feelings on energy efficiency of old windows.

Bill Smith, attorney representing the applicant, introduced **Greg Follet** of Fish Builders of Colorado who is the general contractor for the project. **Follet** feels that one of the issues is energy efficiency. He feels that it is worth it to replace the windows for energy savings. He also pointed out that comfort levels are not taken into account when considering energy savings. Windows are an important factor in comfort because drafty windows are uncomfortable even if the temperature is at a comfortable level. He did see some water damage in the windows and restoration is very labor intensive for 27 windows. There are continuing maintenance issues on the existing windows. He does not feel that there is any substitute for a new window for performance. There was discussion of previous work that was done without approval. **MacDonald** asked the life expectancy of new windows. **Follet** estimated 60-70 years, maybe 100 years. **Whittington** stated that there is a lifetime warranty.

Kittleman explained why windows have become a more prominent issue for the HPC. There was discussion of insulating values and other ways to consider energy efficiency and heat loss. He noted that windows are very characteristic of historic structures. The HPC may not have adequately addressed the issue in the past. There was discussion further discussion of the importance of windows. **Golson** noted that she has been told that new windows have a life expectancy of only 15 years and discussed the lifecycle costs of replacing windows in sustainability terms.

Kittleman noted that he would like to save what can be saved and that he does not mind the inconsistency between the three structures that make up the property. **Chivvis** asked how other communities are dealing with this issue. He noted that the energy comparisons are with historic windows with storms and that there are visual problems with storms as well. There was discussion of storm window options and replacement of the glass with double-pane. **Golson** pointed out that the Standards say that air flow and peeling paint are not reason enough to remove the historic windows. **Smith** noted that there do not seem to be any guidelines for when it is alright to replace old windows. **Shomion** agreed and noted that the HPC has discussed bringing in an independent expert who can assess historic windows.

Kittleman noted that the objective is to preserve what is historic and operates and is functional. Once windows are replaced, the visual quality is lost and so is some of the heritage. He suggested tabling the application in order to get more information. **Smith** noted that the applicant has been waiting for a long time for this project and would not

agree to a delay. **Evaskovich** noted that the first thing he did when he bought his historic house was replace the windows, prior to learning about the importance of historic windows. He also feels that the lifecycle costs or embodied energy should be considered. **Follet** explained that proper installation helps to protect windows. It was discussed that the design of the replacement windows was not an issue, just the removal of the existing windows. **Evaskovich** commented that there is a lack of visual continuity between the three buildings in the project with varying materials and cornices. He does not think that the new windows detract architecturally from the building.

Steve Stucco, representing the tenant BBI, and speaking as a citizen of downtown. He is concerned about how we define “windows that work”. He explained that when BBI was in the Headwaters building the old single-pane windows were cold and loud. The windows were not conducive to a comfortable work environment. They are also concerned about ultra-violet. He feels that the HPC must balance preservation with the economic life of downtown. Preservation increases costs and lead times for the developer and investors are already apprehensive about investment in downtown. He noted that tenants do not want old interiors. He asked how many people notice that the old windows have already been replaced. **Kittleman** is concerned about incremental changes in the downtown. **Stucco** went on to say that storm windows are not an acceptable alternative because the tenant wants operable windows and continuity in the interior. **Kathy Stucco** from BBI noted that the tenant is concerned with sustainability issues and that they are supportive of fixing something rather than replacing it if fixing is possible. However, that is not a solution in this case.

Commissioner Comments – **Kittleman** feels that the stairs and infill window are ok, but that he would like more time or information on windows. He does not know how to get the information he would like to see. **Evaskovich** asked how this application differs from the funeral home application that was recently approved. **Shomion** commented that it is not that different and that was an application which helped bring this issue to the forefront and that the HPC has learned more since then. **Kittleman** noted that as time passes the CMC program in historic preservation will educate more craftsmen who can repair windows. For **Chivvis** the concern is visual. The aesthetics are the most important thing and the HPC needs to consider the economic vitality of the downtown. He finds the new windows acceptable if the relief is done correctly. There was discussion of the importance of considering economic vitality. **Graham** does not want to create a situation that makes a place difficult to live in or work in and asked what the HPC would gain by denying the application especially since some of the windows have been replaced.

Decision – **Evaskovich** made a motion to approve the request. There was discussion about what the findings should be. The findings are to approve based on a finding that the windows will not detract from the quality of the building, that the application is in compliance with the overall character and that replacement of some windows has already been necessary. **Chivvis** seconded the motion. **Golson** made a motion to amend the motion to separate elements into 1) the fire escape, infill window and doors and 2) windows. **Shomion** seconded the motion. The motion to amend the original motion failed in a tie vote.

Shomion suggested considering an amendment that would allow windows on G Street as a separate motion. This would retain the four original, 1st floor windows on G Street. He suggested an amendment to the motion to approve everything except the four windows on the ground-floor along G Street based on a finding that we have not gotten an opinion from an established window expert and because windows are important to the character of the building and adequate steps have not been taken to investigate options. Also, these windows are the most prominent as street-facing, ground-floor. **Graham** seconded the motion to amend the agenda. The motion to amend the original motion made by Evaskovich failed in a tie vote.

Kittleman asked **Boddy** if he had any comments. **Boddy** stated that he had checked all the windows and that most are on metal tracks, operate smoothly and that there is no dry rot. His experience is that these windows can be repaired. He questioned the cost of new windows and understands the concerns about comfort as well as sustainability. He is frustrated that more investigation has not been done. He suggested they be allowed to complete replacing windows along G Street for visual consistency, but leave the remainder of the windows. He further discussed the cost of repairing existing windows versus replacing the windows with new material.

Smith noted that the cost is more expensive to repair the old windows than to replace them according to their contractor, Greg Follet. He further commented that they are in the middle of their project and that these windows have been approved in the past. **Nichole Balaun** from BBI explained that President of BBI wanted to stay in the downtown because she has a passion to keep the downtown alive. Their goal is to recycle an old building and put new life into the building. They need to find a balance between the old and the new amenities they need for their business. The decision by the HPC will affect whether they stay downtown or not because their business will not be successful if the employees are not comfortable. **Golson** pointed out that this is the Historic Preservation Commission not the City Planning Commission.

The vote on the original motion by Evaskovich failed in a tie vote.

Graham made a motion to approve the application with the exception of the window replacement in order to revisit the windows and to allow time to get more information about the condition of the existing windows including how other communities deal with these issues. **Golson** made a second to the motion. There was discussion about how the Commission could get additional information on windows. **Chivvis** commented that the decision should be made tonight. **Shomion** asked if staff's opinion had changed through this discussion. **MacDonald** stated that the charge of the HPC is to be concerned with the standards that are in the ordinance which do not address economic development, but are concerned purely with preservation with respect to changes to structures. The Standards say that the windows must be shown to be beyond repair in order to permit removal.

The motion carried with Golson, Shomion, Kittleman and Graham voting in favor and Evaskovich and Chivvis voting against.

Smith requested that the HPC make a motion to deny the application so that they could appeal the decision to the City Council. **MacDonald** clarified that the decision that was made can be appealed.

The hearing was closed at 8:43 p.m.

MacDonald reminded the members that the windows portion of the Sherman application is still a quasi-judicial matter pending before them and that they should therefore avoid ex-parte discussions about the matter.

- 2. Grether, Certificate of Appropriateness – 148 F Street** – The request is to receive a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter the façade materials, create a new display window on the south elevation, install sign brackets and install awnings.

Kittleman and Shomion recused themselves from the hearing. **Evaskovich** chaired the hearing.

Staff Review. **MacDonald** presented the staff review of the project noting that the applicant has made some changes that were explained during the site visit on October 24th and are presented on paper tonight. Staff has recommended approval of the application.

Applicant's Presentation – Robert Grether explained that there is nothing behind the plastic above the windows except drywall and framing – no transom, so he will leave that plastic in place noting that it will be located behind the awnings. He discussed the brick that will be used in the place of the kickplate and fin as well as around the new display window. If the stucco can be removed he would like to come back with a proposal to remove it on the balance of the south elevation. The awning will provide protection to the display in the new window. The new brick will compliment the historic brick, but not imitate the existing brick by using smooth brick and less relief.

Boddy asked a question about the brick pattern under the sill of the new window. **Grether** will match the pattern of the sill along each of the windows. There was also discussion on the color of the awnings and the placement of future signs.

Commissioner Comments – None

Decision – Boddy made a motion to approve the application as presented with the changes presented. **Golson** seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- 3. Harvey Properties, Certificate of Appropriateness – 122 E. 1st Street** – The request is to receive a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace existing windows and doors with new windows and doors in the existing openings and to install awnings above the windows.

Staff Review. **MacDonald** presented the staff review of the project noting that this is a noncontributing structure in the downtown. Staff has recommended approval of the application.

Applicant's Presentation – None

Commissioner Comments – Evaskovich noted that the proposed changes are an improvement to the noncontributing building.

Decision – Chivvis made a motion to approve the application as presented. **Graham** seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. **Preservation of historically significant signs –**
No action was taken.
2. **Discussion of plaque program –**
No action was taken.
3. **Historic windows –**
No action was taken.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Boddy read a statement from the article “Historic and Green” by Donovan Rypkema about sustainability and historic preservation. He is concerned that the focus of the HPC is being lost. We are charged with the sustainability of these buildings. Need to not let developers push the commission around and not succumb to business pressure. Also need to consider that we do not want empty buildings. **Evaskovich** feels torn to consider the economics.

MacDonald commented that tenants come and go in the downtown and that the charge of the commission is to preserve the district for future generations. The Commission also needs to be aware of the economic benefits of heritage tourism. Reducing the integrity of the downtown reduces those economic benefits.

Shomion noted that it is not the fault of the HPC that developer made promises to a tenant without getting approval. The tenant has a responsibility to do proper due diligence.

Boddy feels that local architects have responsibility to keep abreast of concerns of the HPC.

Graham suggested that one of the CMC instructors may be willing to consult on the Sherman application as an expert

Golson suggested that we make our own window guidelines that are more flushed out and objective.

Shomion commented that the onus falls on the applicant to show they have explored all options.

MacDonald suggested that she could look into working with the applicant and tenant to have someone versed in preservation inspect the windows and provide more specific information on the condition of the windows and possibility of repair.

MacDonald noted that **Kittleman** would like to step down as chair and that **Shomion** will be resigning from the Commission.

IX. ADJOURN.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m. with a note that unfinished business be moved to the next agenda.