
MEETING DATE: Thursday, November 15, 2007
MEETING TIME: 7:00 p.m.
MEETING LOCATION: City Council Chambers, 125 East 3rd Street, Salida, CO

Present: Chairman Kittleman, Boddy, Evaskovich, Chivvis, Cronenwett, 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 October 25, 2007 meeting with the removal of the first sentence of the second paragraph on page 4 of 7. The motion was made by Golson to approve the minutes as amended and Chivvis seconded the motion. All were in favor.

III. UNSCHEDULED CITIZENS

Kittleman recognized Bob Ogle who was in attendance. Mr. Ogle is the head of the historic preservation program at Colorado Mountain College. **Kittleman** noted how valuable the program is for Chaffee County by providing education on historic preservation theory as well as the hands-on techniques necessary for preservation.

IV. AMENDMENT(S) TO AGENDA

Boddy requested that the Sherman Hotel issue be moved to the end of the agenda since he would be recusing himself. This would allow him to depart the meeting at that time. The Commission declined to amend the agenda.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. Juchem, Certificate of Appropriateness – 140 W. 1st Street** – The request is to receive a Certificate of Appropriateness to rehabilitate an existing carriage house for a work studio. The rehabilitation includes new doors, windows and skylights.

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 proposed brick rowlock above the two new windows. Since all of the existing openings on the structure have flat, wooden headers, staff felt that a flat header would be more appropriate than arched for these new openings.

Applicant's Presentation – Sarah Whittington explained that the applicant is proposing to leave all of the existing windows and the existing garage door which will be refinished. They would infill the existing window above the garage door to get the window above floor height. That space will then be infilled with a plate glass window. The existing door on the side does not meet current head height requirements, so the applicant has proposed a new recessed entry that would be at floor height, below exterior grade. The arched windows would match the primary structure so the courtyard would all have the same style windows. The skylights are low profile and would supply more natural light to the space.

Golson asked if the new windows could be all wood rather than clad. **Evaskovich** asked about the use of arched headers versus flat. There was discussion about this topic. **Boddy** noted that the wooden headers all look new and that all of the other windows addressing this space have arched headers. **Kittleman** noted that the headers are asymmetrical. He asked what the applicant would like to do. **Whittington** explained the applicant would like the headers to match the others facing the courtyard – arches. **Cronenwett** commented that the arches are just as logical as the flat headers. **Chivvis** noted that the openings in the carriage house seem to have been added at a later date than the original construction of the building.

Kittleman asked why the bricks at the top of the north elevation were slanted. **Boddy** commented that he thought that was done to address drainage. **Boddy** does not think that arched openings for the new windows would detract from the architectural integrity of the building.

Whittington asked how the Commission would feel about an application to change all of the openings to arched? **Golson** suggested that further research should be done to determine the history of the openings.

Public Comment – None. The public hearing was closed at 7:22 p.m.

Commissioner Comments – **Golson** is in support of the application as long as the new windows are wooden instead of clad. **Evaskovich** asked about the proposed cladding – aluminum with color to match the primary structure. **Whittington** noted that the applicant wanted clad windows for easier maintenance.

Decision – **Golson** made a motion to accept the proposal with the modification that the new windows be all wood windows instead of metal clad. **Boddy** made a second. All were in favor.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Sherman Hotel Windows –

Boddy recused himself from the discussion. **MacDonald** presented the memo from staff explaining the steps that had been taken since the last hearing and proposing that the HPC approve the replacement of the windows in the space to be occupied by BBI which includes the center and southern of the three buildings. Staff recommends that based on a finding that there is a lack of skilled craftsmen in the area and the timing of the project, it is too onerous at this time for the portion of the project that will house the tenant BBI. The applicant has indicated that they will work with the Commission to consider restoration of the windows in the buildings at 115 G Street and 149-151 W. 1st Street.

Golson asked if interior storm windows could be installed for the time being until the windows could be repaired. **Whittington** explained that repairing the windows later would disrupt the tenants after they have occupied the space.

Public Comment – Leslie Walker wondered how long that period of disturbance would be in order to restore the windows in the future.

Using the photos supplied for the original application, **Whittington** showed the HPC exactly which windows would be replaced.

The hearing was closed at 7:43 p.m.

Commission Discussion - Kittleman stated he was in favor of the proposed compromise. He noted that the HPC has been struggling to learn more about the building and about historic windows. He understands that the HPC might be guilty of being arbitrary because the guidelines are unclear. They will work to clarify the guidelines in the future. **Evaskovich** likes the compromise given the circumstances. He would like to see more definitive guidelines. He noted that the applicant should have thought ahead and planned out the project more thoroughly. **Golson** thinks the Standards are clear and so are the design guidelines. She is concerned about the remainder of the project and noted that the decision should not be made at the whim of schedules. **Chivvis** noted that this project spans three separate buildings. He feels that the applicants should be able to complete the project that is underway. The next applicant can be approached with more knowledge.

Decision – Chivvis made a motion to approve the compromise proposal as proposed in the staff memo. **Evaskovich** seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-1 with **Golson** opposed.

2. Discussion of plaque program –

MacDonald noted that the City had approved some funding for a match to a SHF grant for two larger informational plaques at each end of the downtown on F Street. Someone will still have to write the grant and oversee the project. This funding would not include plaques for individual structures. **Boddy** will work on a brochure about the plaque program that can be used to encourage property owners to participate. He will also work on drafting the grant application.

3. Preservation of historically significant signs –

Chivvis explained the signs that he had included in his proposal for what signs should be considered historic and which should be exempt from enforcement of the obsolete sign provision of the sign code. He identified a number of neon and painted-on signs. The HPC accepted the recommendations made by **Chivvis** and staff agreed no enforcement of the obsolete sign provision of the code would be pursued for those signs.

4. Historic Windows –

Kittleman noted that staff had provided information that was compiled by Gary Higgins regarding preservation of historic windows. **Boddy** feels that some of the language in the Standards may be arbitrary or vague such as “obscure” and “detracting”. He would like to be more specific about when a window should or should not be

repaired. There was further discussion of the role of the Design Guidelines, the preservation ordinance and the Standards. The HPC determined that they should consider revising the Design Guidelines to be more clear with respect to windows. They also determined that they need to provide education to the public and the building community about window restoration. They scheduled a work session for Tuesday, November 27th at 10:00 a.m. at Bongo Billy's to discuss these topics.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

None

VIII. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

None

IX. ADJOURN.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.