

Verbatim Transcript

Historic Preservation Commission
April 17, 2024

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

CITY OF FORT COLLINS

Held APRIL 17, 2024

300 Laporte Avenue

Fort Collins, Colorado

In the Matter of:

2601 SOUTH COLLEGE: APPEAL OF DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY

Meeting Time: 5:30 PM, April 17, 2024

Commission Members Present:

Jim Rose, Chair
Bonnie Gibson, Vice Chair
Margo Carlock
Chris Conway
Jeff Gaines
Tom Wilson

Staff Members Present:

Heather Jarvis
Jim Bertolini
Maren Bzdek
Yani Jones
Rebecca Schields
Melissa Matsunaka

1 CHAIR JIM ROSE: And now moving on to item number five, consideration of the appeal of
2 determination of eligibility for 2601 South College. And because this is a de novo hearing, we are going
3 to be determining eligibility, and it is an appeal of a staff decision. So, I'd like to simply review what we
4 will be doing and the procedure we will follow so that everybody understands the time and the
5 appropriate place where all the input that is needed and appropriate can be received. The first thing I'm
6 going to do, however, is ask if anyone on the Commission would wish to disclose any conflict of interest.
7 Okay, seeing none, we will then have a staff report, and I'll turn that over to the staff, and then we will
8 hear from the appellant, and then members of the Commission will be given the opportunity to ask
9 questions of the staff and the appellant, so it will open for Commission questions and discussion, but we
10 will not completely discuss the final decision until all the various parties have had a chance to provide
11 their input. We will, after questions of staff and the appellant, we will open it up for the public to provide
12 comments in support or in opposition, and then we will ask our staff and the appellant to provide any
13 commentary on any public input that was received. The appellant will have an opportunity to address any
14 comments made by the public and by City staff. We will then ask Commissioners for any final comments
15 or clarifications, questions of staff or the appellant, or anyone who has entered testimony as the public,
16 and after that period, when all of that has taken place, we will close the taking of any additional
17 information and the Commission itself will then engage in a discussion. We may do that prior to a
18 motion, or we may do a motion first and then discuss the motion. But, at any rate, we will, at some point,
19 once a motion has been made and voted on, we will then ask each Commissioner to provide an
20 explanation for their vote. So, that's pretty much how things will go, and I will begin this process with a
21 staff report.

22 JIM BERTOLINI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Jim Bertolini, your Senior Historic Preservation
23 Planner; I'll be giving your staff presentation this evening. As you noted, this is an appeal of a staff
24 finding of eligibility for the property at 2601 South College Avenue, historically the Ghent Motors
25 facility.

26 This is just providing some background on the building...this is at the southwest corner of Drake
27 and College, kind of on the north end of midtown, and this is showing a site map of the three features that
28 were documented during the historic survey process, the primary automobile showroom and service
29 garage, which is feature one, feature two, which is an accessory drive-through shop for auto parts, and
30 then feature three, which is non-contributing, but certainly has some historic interest, that's a carriage step
31 with W.A. Drake on it in reference to the former Drake Farm that used to be on this location.

32 Just a bit about how we got to this appeal process. In this case, the role of the Historic
33 Preservation Commission tonight...this is a de novo hearing. Effectively, what that means is that your
34 decision tonight replaces the staff finding. So, you're not beholden to the staff finding; it would be
35 weighing the information that you have in your packet that you received for this meeting, and then
36 making a new decision. And as outlined in the Municipal Code, specifically Municipal Code 14, Article
37 2, the role here is to consider evidence regarding the historic significance and the historic integrity of the
38 buildings on the property addressed at 2601 South College. And, in considering that evidence, to then
39 provide a determination of eligibility for this property, whether it qualifies or not as a Fort Collins
40 landmark. Your decision tonight will be a final decision, which means it is subject to appeal. Anyone
41 who has standing to appeal will have the right to appeal...and file an appeal with the City Clerk's Office
42 within two weeks.

43 One of the things staff did want to note is that, in this appeal hearing, the role is not to consider
44 adaptive reuse potential since that's not a consideration that's outlined in Municipal Code 14, Article 2.
45 This is considered if the resources is first determined eligible and that standing holds during the actual

1 project review stage...the Preservation Commission would have a role as a recommending authority to
2 whoever the decision maker is, and in that case, you could consider adaptive reuse potential, but for the
3 purpose of tonight's hearing, the expectation of the Code is that you will consider the standards in
4 Chapter 14, Article 2 that deal with historic significance and then historic integrity, which we'll discuss
5 on later slides.

6 A bit about the current review timeline, how this appeal got to the Preservation Commission.
7 This started with a preliminary development review meeting for the developer proposing a new project
8 for this site back in August of 2023. As is required under the City's Land Use Code regarding properties
9 that have resources over fifty years of age on the development site, a historic survey was ordered shortly
10 afterwards to determine if the resources on the development site met the standards of the City regarding
11 landmark eligibility. That survey was completed on October 17th of last year, and then an appeal from the
12 developer was received shortly thereafter, on October 27th. We do allow...the reason for the delay was
13 really at the appellant's request since we allow them up to six months to consult any land use
14 professionals, consult their own historian, et cetera, and that can take some time, and so we provide up to
15 six months before scheduling their hearing. One of the things to emphasize here is that we do require,
16 this is a Code requirement, that we complete an intensive level survey that takes a fairly comprehensive
17 look at the history and potential historic significance of any site that's proposed for redevelopment. And
18 then when we issue those findings as staff, we typically evaluate that site form that's received from the
19 historian, or in this case, this was produced by our staff historian, and look for any important factual
20 errors, we look for questions that would impact arguments for significance as outlined in the City
21 standards, and then we do come to a staff consensus on whether we feel the property actually qualifies for
22 listing or not, and in this case, that was the staff consensus.

23 Just to dig a little bit deeper into that Code process...so, as most development projects...any
24 development proposal, whether it's preliminary or a formal proposal, is processed under the Land Use
25 Code, and the cultural resource protections afforded to properties under the Land Use Code are in Section
26 3.4.7. And there's a process that really starts with identifying whether any properties that are over fifty
27 years of age on a development site qualify as City landmarks, and we're in that stage currently, where
28 we're determining eligibility of those properties. Now, that process uses the same standards we use to
29 landmark properties when property owners request that, or other parties that have the ability to request
30 nominations. So, the standards are the same whether it's a development project or if someone were
31 requesting a landmark nomination...use the same metric to measure that. And so, that's where we're at
32 currently is measuring this property against those standards and determining if it meets those standards
33 for eligibility. If the property is found eligible, then we move on to the next step, which is just part of the
34 larger development review process of how those historic resources are being treated as part of the
35 development, and typically, eligible properties are expected to be preserved...that is the standard that
36 needs to be met in that case.

37 So, just to reinforce this a little bit more, if the Commission determines this property eligible, that
38 does not require or initiate a formal landmark designation. City landmarks are designated by ordinance
39 by City Council; that process would not be started. It does require, if the property is determined eligible,
40 that it is preserved and adaptively reused as part of a development application. There is an option for a
41 modification of standards...any Land Use Code requirement has the potential for a developer to request a
42 modification of standards...that's outlined in Land Use Code 2.8, and there's some provisions for what
43 kinds of situations can receive a modification of standard. If it's the Commission's decision that the
44 property is not eligible, that would...assuming no appeals come forward...that would end preservation

1 concerns related to this development site, since there are no other historic resources on or near this site
2 that are of concern.

3 Dealing specifically with our methodology for how the City determines whether something meets
4 the eligibility requirements or not...this is a two-step process that's modeled off of a federal program
5 called the National Register of Historic Places that was created in 1966, just a couple years before Fort
6 Collins created its own landmark program. These standards were created in reference to the same
7 standards that the National Register uses, and we have for the most part adopted the standard language
8 from the National Register into our City Code in Chapter 14 with some modifications to allow for more
9 appropriate recognition of locally significant resources that are important to the city and the community.
10 But, this process is a two-step linear process. The very first thing we assess is whether or not a property
11 is even important in local, state, or national history...that's what we mean when we say significance is, is
12 it actually important? It has to meet one of these standards for us to continue with this process, and we
13 have four different standards in City Code, again modeled off of the National Register. The first is events
14 or trends in local, state, or national history, the second is association with important persons or groups of
15 people, the third is importance as an example of significant design or construction, and then information
16 potential which tends to be applied to archeological sites that may have important research potential for
17 our area.

18 If, and only if, something is significant under at least one of those standards, then we measure
19 what's called historic integrity, and that's really the ability of a historic place, whether it's a building, a
20 site, a landscape, to continue to tell its story, or to reflect that historic importance in its physical features.
21 It's not required that all seven of these aspects, also modeled off the National Register...it's not required
22 that all seven aspects are met, but it is important that key aspects of integrity are met in relation to why
23 that property is important. So, which aspects of integrity matter are really going to depend on why the
24 property is important in the first place. So, for example, a farm property that's significant for its
25 association with agriculture in a particular area really needs to have integrity of location, setting, and
26 feeling and association, in order to really connect with that agricultural story. A property that's important
27 for its architectural design may not need to still have integrity of location, it may even be relocated, but it
28 should have fairly good integrity of design, so perhaps if it's architect-designed, it still should reflect that
29 original architect's vision for that property, materials, which are often part of that vision, should generally
30 be intact. Perhaps if it's an adobe building in Alta Vista that's important for its method of construction,
31 its workmanship may be important...reflecting that kind of handcrafted, adobe walls and adobe bricks
32 that make up that building. So, while integrity varies based on the importance of the property. Both of
33 these things need to be met for something to qualify as a landmark. So, that outlines the process by which
34 we measure historic places to see if they qualify as a historic resource under our City Code.

35 So, moving specifically to 2601 South College. This is just showing a historic photograph of the
36 building shortly after it was constructed in 1966, and then a recent photograph of the building from its
37 historic survey last year. And this is just some physical history of the property. Again, this location, that
38 southwest corner of College Avenue and Drake Road is formerly the Drake Farmstead, the namesake of
39 what used to be a farming village called Drake, and now the namesake of Drake Road itself. That
40 farmstead was mostly demolished, except for that carriage step that's still on site, in 1966 to make way
41 for the Ghent auto dealership, and that's the building that's in question this evening. There was at one
42 time, 1972, there was a carwash structure added to the northwest corner, about where Drake and
43 McClelland is now. That was removed again sometime between 1983 and 1999, we don't have an exact
44 date for that. Then in terms of other significant modifications, the main one would be the replacement of

1 the original roofing, which from historic images looks like it was rolled asphalt, and replaced that with
2 standing seam metal in 1998...that's what is still there currently.

3 Running through the standards that staff considered the property eligible for, under the City
4 standards. The first was standard one for events and trends, and this relates to the South College
5 commercial expansion after World War II. We see after World War II, especially over the 1950's and
6 '60's, a lot of our downtown businesses move away from downtown, and move to areas outside of town,
7 especially South or North College, in this case South College, and especially for businesses that in some
8 way depended on, or were embracing the shift, to kind of automobile-focused commercial and public life
9 in the 1950's and later. And so this property appears to be a significant example of that, just based on it
10 being a surviving example, and based on it's scale, in terms of the redevelopment of this area. Generally,
11 when we are measuring any property under a standard, we do consider it in that context, so that context of
12 South College commercial expansion, we consider it not only in its historic context during that time, but
13 then what's still around to tell that story as well, what other, what we might call peer properties, exist that
14 might tell the story equally well, that might tell that story better. And so, in this case, we did consider
15 some other properties that we have at least taken a preliminary look at in terms of historic significance,
16 and that includes just a couple of other surviving examples of that post war expansion on South College
17 Avenue around the Drake and College intersection. So, there's a couple of other buildings that are a bit
18 farther south on College that are reasonable examples of that, that are fairly well intact, and then we have
19 what is currently the Key Bank building at 100 East Drake that's just across the street, kind of caddy
20 corner to the northeast from the property in question this evening. There were formerly a lot of other
21 examples in this area, but most have either been altered or demolished at this point, which is one of the
22 reasons that we consider this as a significant reflection of what was a major trend in Fort Collins history
23 after World War II.

24 The second standard that staff considered this property significant under was standard two for
25 persons and groups, specifically for association with Frank and Dwight Ghent, the owners of the
26 automobile dealership here. In this case, this was one of our more significant auto dealerships. It was
27 actually established prior to World War II, and there main showroom at that time was at the northwest
28 corner of Laporte and College, and that's what you're seeing here in the bottom center photograph; it's
29 currently the location of Beau Jo's and City Drug. In this case, the Ghent's were one of our more
30 successful business owners during that time period, especially when we're considering the automobile
31 industry in Fort Collins from the 1920's forward to the 1960's and '70's. They have already been
32 recognized as significant individuals in Fort Collins history...their two properties...their two residences
33 have been landmarked, one at 638 Whedbee Street for the older Frank, and then Dwight, the younger, at
34 1612 Sheely Drive. One of the reasons that staff considered this in part of our comparative research that
35 2601 South College would be significant, is that as much as we might prefer to consider a property that
36 has a little bit more length of history, a little bit more foundational history, with a successful
37 businessperson, or businesspeople, like the Ghent's. This has been fairly heavily altered in a way that
38 really doesn't reflect that Ghent Motor Company period in the property's history in terms of the property
39 at Laporte and College, and so in terms of reflecting their contributions to the commercial and business
40 history of Fort Collins, the 2601 South College building becomes really our last reflection of that
41 commercial history. So, for that reason, and for that association, staff considered the property eligible
42 under standard two.

43 And then finally, under significance, standard three for design and construction, staff did consider
44 this a significant example of modern architecture in Fort Collins, and especially along South College, and
45 a significant surviving example of an auto dealership in Fort Collins, which considering the immense

1 importance of transitioning automobiles...transitioning American cities to automobiles after World War
2 II, these do tend to be a fairly significant reflection of that if they survive, which is something that they
3 don't often do since then tend to have a pretty high churn in terms of alterations or redevelopment. And
4 so, in this case, from staff's research, we determined this was one of the only intact auto dealerships from
5 either the early automobile period in the 1920's or the mid-20th century period in Fort Collins. This
6 appeared to be one of our only places we could really tell that story of transition during the 1960's, and so
7 for that reason, we considered it significant as a property type under standards three. We also considered
8 it a significant surviving reflection of modern architecture in what was then south Fort Collins. Again,
9 most of those other examples in this specific area of town had been redeveloped. We do have other good
10 examples of modern architecture elsewhere in the city that are outlined here on the right side of the slide.
11 We did consider it potentially one of the only examples of commercial contemporary style architecture in
12 Fort Collins. Contemporary style refers to...this kind of broad, kind of open gables with lots of glass
13 curtain walls, a lot of open space that's contrasted with some of these naturalized materials like the rock
14 veneer that you see on this, and occasionally some other institutional and public architecture, especially
15 on campus at Colorado State University.

16 So, in terms of comparing this and kind of assessing whether this was significant in its context,
17 we measured it against some of our other surviving automobile dealerships, or at least auto related
18 properties. You have a couple of others in that context that appear to still be intact, but nothing at this
19 scale or significance. And in terms of modern commercial architecture, it's also a significant reflection
20 with only a few peers at least of this scale and prominence throughout Fort Collins. Probably the other
21 peer property is the one that we've pictured here, Lucky's Market, that's at the northwest corner of
22 Mulberry and College. So, overall, staff considered this a fairly significant reflection of modern
23 architecture in Fort Collins, at least in terms of what survives here, especially when we consider it as
24 commercial architecture.

25 Moving on to historic integrity. Again, this is the measure of whether or not a property that has
26 importance still reflects that importance with its physical features. So, this is a comparative image of the
27 service bays off the back of the building. And this is really about whether or not a property has enough of
28 its historic materials or design features to sufficiently kind of tell its story, to convey that important
29 historic significance. Staff certainly acknowledges there are some losses of integrity for this property that
30 do matter. Specifically, when we're dealing with the service garage, the loss of most of the overhead
31 garage doors that have been replaced with newer versions of those. The openings remain, but the doors
32 themselves have been replaced. That is a detraction, and then of course the 1998 modification of the roof
33 to a standing seam metal roof...that's a fairly prominent modification. But, by staff's judgment, while
34 those are impositions, they are not so significant that we can't still tell that story of post-World War II
35 expansion on South College Avenue; that still appears apparent with a preponderance of resources and
36 materials at the site.

37 So, this is just a...kind of a run down of the staff evaluation of integrity with those seven aspects
38 that are outlined in the City Code. So, with location, that one's a lot more obvious just because the
39 property hasn't been moved, it's still in it's original location where the buildings were constructed. The
40 overall design, again, there's some impositions on this, there's two small additions of the west elevation
41 towards McClelland, there's been some window infill, but overall, those design elements, especially the
42 long, low massing, the asymmetrical plan, the large and low-pitched gable roof with the overhanging
43 eaves, the big window walls, all of those features, especially the exposed rafter beams which are a pretty
44 distinctive part of this part of this particular building, all remain. So, generally, the property still has
45 integrity of design.

1 Setting...there's been some change to the overall setting of the property just with redevelopment
2 throughout the years. The general commercial character of the setting is retained, although the substance
3 of that setting has certainly changed with new construction. Materials...these are the physical elements
4 that form a resource. Most of this is retained, at least by staff's estimation. There are some distractions,
5 we mentioned the replacement of the roof with standing seam metal, replacement of the overhead garage
6 door bays, but otherwise we still have a lot of those character-defining materials like the laminated
7 exposed roof beams, the fixed glass window walls, and the broad expanses of exterior cladding which is
8 concrete block, stucco, and that stone veneer.

9 Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture. In this case, this is
10 going to be a modern construction, and so most of those are retained, including that stone veneer over
11 concrete which is still apparent at the property. Feeling is the resource's expression of its overall historic
12 sense of a particular time. Oftentimes it's a measure of kind of the preponderance of some of these other
13 aspects of integrity, especially since we have most of our modern architectural features and materials,
14 staff's assessment was that the property maintains it's overall sense as a 1960's mid-century dealership.
15 And then association deals with that direct link, can we still property associate this property with it's
16 important history? Again, kind of leaning on a preponderance of the other aspects of integrity to make
17 that judgement. And, especially since we have most of our exterior cladding, the historic massing of the
18 building, the window walls, the overall plan and roof massing and things like that are still present, the
19 overall connection and association with the mid-20th century, by staff's estimation, is still apparent on the
20 property. So, we considered the property to have sufficient historic integrity to be eligible as a landmark.

21 Did want to provide a little bit of staff evaluation of appellant materials related to significance.
22 This is just kind of a comparison with what we just went over in terms of staff conclusions. They won't
23 emphasize as much here versus what the appellant was arguing in their own historic survey form about
24 each of the significance standards. They did assert that car dealerships cannot individually contribute to
25 patterns of urban development under standard one, and that's something that staff would certainly argue
26 against, especially just in our own research determined that there are multiple dozens of car dealerships
27 that are currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places by themselves. They do tend to be the
28 earlier examples, in the 1920's, of auto dealerships, but there are some from the mid-20th century and the
29 1950's and '60's as well.

30 When it comes to standard two, persons and groups, the appellant's survey form argued that the
31 best years in sales for the Ghent family were at other sites in Fort Collins and that their social
32 contributions were not directly related to the dealership property. Especially that second point is certainly
33 a fair point to make, and in terms of the best years in sales, though that's not a specific metric in the
34 standards, it's certainly something to consider. By staff's estimations, we still would consider the
35 Ghent's as a significant two individuals in Fort Collins history, and that there's enough association with
36 the site and their commercial contributions, to make it eligible. That's certainly something that we'd
37 encourage the Commission to consider in terms of the appellant's arguments.

38 And then standard three for design and construction, we already went through staff's arguments
39 for this. The appellant's arguments in their survey form are, while there are specific elements of the
40 property that represent the style of the period, that being that mid-century modern period, that the design
41 and details are very common and in no way remarkable for the period. Obviously, staff's assessment is a
42 little bit different than that. And then they do introduce the scale of one to ten for mid-century design
43 value. In this case, I will just note that staff is not familiar with a measuring scale; that's certainly not
44 something that's outlined in any of the federal guidance for how to apply the National Register standards

1 for the National Register of Historic Places. And since our landmark program is modeled after that
2 national program, we use their guidance, which doesn't appear to have this in it at all.

3 And the appellant does go into some notes on integrity, and as noted, staff acknowledges that
4 there's been some modifications to the property that are noticeable and do detract from integrity, and
5 most of those are noted in the appellant's materials as well. However, we would note that a lot of the
6 appellant's materials, specifically the memo and the survey form that are in your packet, suggest that the
7 perceived lack of adaptive reuse potential is a factor in historic integrity, and so staff just would like to
8 further reinforce for the Commission that, under City Code and the federal guidelines for the National
9 Register that we use for our City landmark program, historic integrity is a measure of the presence of
10 historic materials, features, and overall connection to an important historic period, it's not intended as a
11 measure of adaptive reuse potential; that's something that comes up in our City Code elsewhere, but not
12 typically as part of this kind of evaluation.

13 Want to highlight a couple of requests from the Historic Preservation Commission from your
14 work session. You did request that the previous determination and appeal that was made for this property
15 in 2018 be added to the record, and that is your new attachment five that's in your packet. We did
16 provide a cover memo for that just to clarify that that was completed under a different Code process that
17 was amended in 2019. And so, while there are not significant changes to the eligibility standards
18 themselves, there are some significant changes to how we process these kinds of determinations of
19 eligibility, the main difference being the requirement that staff, at the applicant's expense, complete an
20 intensive survey form before we make our finding related to historic significance. Under the pre-2019
21 process, staff was not using, or not generating, any kind of new historic survey, we were just relying on
22 whatever material was available, generally set these conversations up to be a little bit more confusing
23 since a lot of research was completed kind of on the fly as the appeal process, in particular, progressed,
24 which didn't really set the conversation up for a good and informed conversation. So, the new Code
25 process, the main change, is that we just require a more thorough investigation before staff makes our
26 determination. Of course, related to that, the appellant did request that we add red lines from the 2019
27 Code changes to Chapter 14, specifically the standards for eligibility, and those are in your packet, should
28 be attachment six.

29 Just a quick summary of public comments. The Commission should have received these,
30 including one that we received this morning, in your email...those will be added to the meeting record.
31 And just to provide a summary of what we've received, we have received seven written comments that
32 are opposed to the eligible finding, or more generally opposed to the preservation of the site, and then we
33 have received three comments in support of an eligible finding and adaptive reuse, those are either in your
34 packet, or again, have been emailed to you for your consideration in terms of whatever evidence they
35 provide to support your finding under the Code requirements.

36 So, again, as a reminder, this is a de novo hearing. Your decision will replace staff's finding,
37 depending on what you decide at the conclusion of the hearing. That is expected to be based under the
38 City's Municipal Code, Chapter 14, Article 2 standards related to significance and integrity, and that
39 you're providing a determination of eligibility for this property, whether it is subject or not subject to the
40 City's Land Use Code requirements. A final decision that the Commission makes tonight will be subject
41 to appeal, again, just as a reminder. And again, reinforcing that the expectation is that your finding be
42 based on the standards in Chapter 14, Article 2 of the Municipal Code, and to avoid considering factors
43 that are not outlined in that Code section, such as adaptive reuse potential.

1 That concludes the staff presentation. Once we're at the appropriate time, I'll be available for
2 questions, but I believe we have an appellant presentation, so I'm going to pull that up and we'll drive
3 their slides for them, but I'd invite the appellant up to the podium. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and
4 Commissioners.

5 CHAIR ROSE: Thank you, Jim. Now we'll hear from the appellant.

6 ANGELA HYGH: Good evening, Commissioners, before I begin the presentation, I just wanted
7 to confirm, we were told by City staff that we would have up to thirty minutes for our presentation, and I
8 wanted to confirm that that was acceptable? Thank you.

9 Good evening, Mr. Chair, Commissioners, and members of the public. I am Angela Hygh of
10 Brownstein, Hyatt, Farber, Schreck, and I am land use counsel to the appellant along with my colleague,
11 Nina Sawaya, who is here with me this evening. May I have the next slide please?

12 So, to give you a brief introduction to the team who is here with me this evening, we are joined
13 by the appellant, who is the property owner in this case, Mr. Kriss Spradley, Mr. Bill Barr. We are also
14 joined by Ms. Natalie Feinberg-Lopez of Built Environment Evolution, and she is the historic
15 preservation expert who prepared the cultural resource survey on behalf of the appellant that is included
16 in your packet. We are also joined by, of course, Brownstein, me and my colleague. Next slide please.

17 So, as you know, we are here to appeal the determination by City staff of the eligibility of the
18 property at 2601 South College for historic eligibility. And one...a couple of things that I would like to
19 add without rehashing all of the excellent process history that staff has already provided to you, is some
20 clarification about the de novo standard. And it is correct that the de novo standard means that your
21 decision this evening would replace any decision by City staff, and it also means, unlike other standards,
22 that you are not required to give deference to the prior decision that is on appeal tonight, the decision of
23 City staff. And it also means that the burden is not on the appellant this evening with respect to your
24 decision, based on the information in the record. I would also like to emphasize that in 2018, City
25 Council already made a determination, as you know, with respect to this property, and the information
26 about that is included in your packet. And what City Council found was that this property is ineligible for
27 historic designation. That determination expired five years later, in 2023, but the neighborhood
28 surrounding the property has changed, and continues to change significantly since that time, and in fact
29 there is construction across the street to the north of this property, but the property itself has remained
30 largely the same, and the criteria as well as demonstrated in that red line that City staff pointed you to in
31 your packet, those criteria are also substantially the same. So, these are some factors that we would like
32 to ask you to keep in mind.

33 Now, for a brief roadmap of our presentation this evening, you are going to hear from the
34 property owner, Mr. Kriss Spradley, and you are also going to hear from Ms. Feinberg-Lopez about her
35 findings from the cultural resource survey. Next slide please.

36 I would like to first invite up Mr. Kriss Spradley, who is one of the property owners.

37 KRISS SPRADLEY: Good evening, my name is Kriss Spradley, thank you, Angela. I, along
38 with my partner, Bill Barr, are owners of the property. We have been business owners here for a long
39 time. We originally leased the property back in 1988 when we bought the Ford franchise, so we've
40 actually occupied the building longer than the Ghent's did, so we've been there since 1988. By 1998, that
41 location no longer met Ford's image standard, so we built a new facility south of Harmony Road on
42 College Avenue, and in the process we acquired Mazda to occupy that franchise. Then, in...well, in

1 2012, we purchased the property after our lease expired with the intention of redeveloping the site. By
2 2018, the site no longer met Mazda's image standards, so Mazda gave us an ultimatum, either build a new
3 facility or sell the franchise. We opted to sell the franchise. The current owners of the Mazda franchise
4 we sold to will be vacating that building in May. After operating the business for over forty years, I can
5 confidently state that it is no longer feasible to operate this property as a car dealership, or new car
6 dealership, without completely redeveloping the site. The site no longer conforms to modern dealership
7 standards. The building as it exists now is very inefficient. As you saw in the slides, the garage has many
8 overhead doors...this creates high energy costs. Most modern dealerships only have one or two entrances
9 for that reason alone. We looked a number of times at remodeling the building, and every time it came
10 back it would be more economical to build a new facility.

11 We are excited about the potential for this property. We have been working with the developer
12 on the project that aligns with the vision for the site with the City Plan and Midtown Plan. Thank you for
13 your consideration and I'd like to bring Angela back up.

14 ANGELA HYGH: Thank you, Commissioners, Angela Hygh, land use counsel for the appellant.
15 So, the criteria you are familiar with, and may I have the next slide please? The criteria you are familiar
16 with...there is a requirement to find both significance and integrity. On the next slide please, thank
17 you...we have significance, which is the importance of a site to the history of a community, and there are
18 those four criteria that City staff walked you through, and we agree with City staff that criterion number
19 four is not met; however, based on the findings in our cultural resource survey, we disagree with City
20 staff's findings with respect to the first three criteria and found that none of those were met. Next slide
21 please.

22 The other component of eligibility is integrity, as you know, and it is composed of these seven
23 criteria, and according to your Code, not all of these criteria need to be met for a finding of integrity;
24 however, your Code requires that an overall sense of time and place must be found and must be evident
25 on the site. And what we found, and what is documented in our survey, is that even if the site were to
26 meet the criteria for significance, which it does not, the site fails to maintain sufficient integrity in order to
27 convey that significance. And I would also like to remind you that these criteria are substantially the
28 same, as I mentioned, from what were in your Code in 2018, and those are the criteria that were
29 considered in the cultural resource survey that was prepared by Ms. Feinberg-Lopez. She is a historic
30 preservation expert who was approved by City staff in accordance with the requirements of your Code,
31 and I would like to invite her up here now to describe the findings of the survey and why the site is
32 ineligible for historic designation.

33 NATALIE FEINBERG-LOPEZ: Good evening, Commissioners. You'll forgive me, I'm going
34 to read notes tonight because I want to keep on time for your proceedings. So, I've been asked to give
35 you some of my resume to start off with. I am Natalie Feinberg-Lopez; my company is Built
36 Environment Evolution, and I prepared the cultural resource survey included in your packet. I wanted to
37 begin by sharing some qualifications. I am National Parks Service level three architectural conservator,
38 background in architecture, engineering, and chemistry. I have architectural survey service in the work I
39 commonly do with clients, including the Kansas state capital, the Colorado state capital, and their
40 surrounding buildings, the National Parks Service, the General Service Administration, as well as many
41 local municipalities including Fort Collins. I have extensive survey work in the mid-century modern
42 structures throughout the U.S., and I served as the Historic Preservation Officer for the city of Aspen. I
43 consider many landmarks there, particularly in the mid-century modern category. I also had fifteen years
44 working with Boulder County both as a Commissioner for their Historic Landmark Board, the HPAB, as
45 well as on their Planning Commission, so I'm familiar with what you're considering. I've been on your

1 side, I've been on the city side, and now I'm on this side. So, before I begin, I just wanted to take a
2 moment to thank the preservation planning staff of Fort Collins, their time and dedication to this issue.
3 There are many communities that do not give due process to our historic structures, and they've gone
4 above and beyond on this, and I really appreciate the time and effort. I think it really shows what type of
5 program you have here in Fort Collins that I hope many other communities emulate. But, I also really
6 think that it's important that this come to your decision making process. So, while staff has made a
7 decision, it really is important for the Commissioners to weight in for historic preservation standards.

8 My determination differs from staff, and I'll outline this now as we move forward. This property
9 I found does not meet the standards in your Code for eligibility for historic preservation. Next slide.
10 Oops, we've got the right slide, thank you. So, first, the property does not meet the criterion for
11 significance related to events. A resource may be determined to be significant if it were associated with
12 events that have been made as a recognizable contribution to the broad patterns of history of the
13 community, of the state, and of the nation. This can be a specific event marking an important moment in
14 Fort Collins history, or it can be a pattern of events or a historic trend that contributes to the community's
15 development. Staff claims under criterion one, events, is met because auto dealerships are, quote,
16 strongly associated with post-war movement in Fort Collins business shifting toward the edge of the city.
17 However, in my finding, it is extremely rare for a car dealership individually to contribute significantly to
18 the urban development, to the urban fabric. Urban expansion to suburbia is what was happening
19 everywhere in the United States, and by the construction date of the Ghent's...I was corrected that the
20 pronunciation is Ghent's...the dealership...the construction date of the dealership in 1966, this movement
21 to suburbia had already been in process for two decades. So, while there's changes in transportation that
22 certainly altered the standards and patterns of the urban planning, and all were sort of starting to move
23 towards the individual car, dealerships were not the source of the change, whereas the Ford Motor
24 Company, or other major motor companies were in Detroit. This is one reason that the car dealerships
25 across the U.S. are rarely designated at any level.

26 A similar comparison could be made to something like a chain store of Walgreens...sorry, I
27 searched for something that we could compare to this day in age, but this, I hope will make sense because
28 across the street, there is a Walgreens. So, the parent company of Walgreens really changed the cityscape
29 with new chain stores displacing the mom and pop pharmacies that were on the downtowns, and while
30 Walgreens, the parent company, could be significant, the individual stores would not generally warrant a
31 landmark, particularly when chain stores look similar from corner to corner and state to state. This is
32 something similar that the car dealerships had in the '60's and today. They were under regulations to
33 have a format that needed to be met to be the dealership. And there is no specific type of...typology in
34 architecture that is a car dealership from that period or others. So, these dealerships are designated...if
35 they are designated, sorry, lost my...the dealerships that are designated are typically related to the major
36 car companies, so, Ford, Mazda, so on, as we see that were already discussed by the owners. And
37 typically...really had directions from Detroit in this era from the '60's.

38 Now, I must ask forgiveness, it appears that there was misinformation in the packet...a piece of
39 my assessment was missing. There were no dealerships after World War II that are listed on the National
40 Register. As staff points out, there are twenty-nine dealerships listed on the National Register, and none
41 are from this period of expansion that we're discussing; all of them are from a pre-World War II period.
42 And this was actually a really important time of change when the U.S. was moving from a horse and
43 buggy to a car, and the Beau Jo's site that was mentioned at 205 North College is an excellent example of
44 this, that it's a livery stable that then changes to a car dealership in 1914. And again, the owner at that
45 time would be the person that's important in working with that site. They say that we don't get to talk

1 about this because of the loss of integrity, but you can't transfer the importance of that one site and the
2 history from that site to this site instead; it doesn't usually work that way. You can't say that the mom
3 and pop pharmacy is significant, and so therefore we have to landmark the local Walgreens. The car
4 dealership at 206 South College [*sic*] was not remarkable, and it did not contribute significantly to the
5 patterns of development required by criteria one; therefore, I disagree with staff and the criterion for
6 significance as related to events is not met.

7 For, next slide, persons and groups. Similarly, the property does not meet the criterion for
8 significance as related to persons and groups. The property meets this criterion if it were associated with
9 the lives of persons or groups, or persons recognizable in the history of the community, state, or nation,
10 whose specific contributions can be identified and documented. Staff contend that this is met by the
11 property's former association with Frank and Dwight Ghent, and that the Ghent's were influential
12 members of the business community. I might add that there's a third person associated with this site,
13 which is Dwight's brother, so there were three. I researched all of the Ghent's family, and while my
14 research showed a loving family with many relatives and several in car sales, the Ghent's related to this
15 property, Frank and his sons Dwight and Eldon, did not make any specific contributions to Fort Collins
16 community that warrant landmarking at this site. The previous car dealership locations that were
17 associated with their best years in sales were not deemed to be eligible for designation. You can't transfer
18 that at a later date to this location, again. The Ghent's might be associated with the business community,
19 particularly Dwight who participated in many clubs, it was not enough to warrant significance that
20 landmarking requires, and it was not related, again, to this car dealership site. T

21 his is a difficult piece for me because I've had people who have said, you know, grandchildren of
22 a state senator lived at a house for a couple of years, and it's worthy of designation under this criteria.
23 I've seen where the first freed slave is not deemed appropriate. I will say, typically, if you're going to
24 make a contribution to the community, mayors are not typically put into this category. They need to be a
25 mayor of some notoriety, something like a Harvey Milk, or somebody who has really strong importance
26 to the community. So, this is really a difficult one for me to stretch, to envelop what the Ghent's provided
27 to the community, which is not to disparage them under any circumstances. Other times that I've seen
28 that this is expanded to allow other people that may be not as significant is specifically to correct issues
29 with inclusivity, so who is in a marginalized community that needs to be included in our history, so that
30 might be a Latino community, or Black American history, but we're not qualifying under this either.

31 Staff notes that both Frank and Dwight Ghent's homes were landmarked, and thus showing their
32 importance in the community. I have to take a moment to address this. I looked at both of the
33 landmarking...both homes. The first one is Frank's house, which was landmarked under criteria one and
34 three, was not landmarked under number two. Again, we can't go backwards in history and make him
35 significant for the site when the original HPC did not find that specific location relevant under criteria
36 two. Similarly, with Dwight's house, I can't find any documentation that it's been landmarked. It is a
37 contributing and significant building in the historic district of Sheely Drive, but I don't see anything
38 where Dwight is the piece that is the critical part, it's all about the architecture and the significance of that
39 specific architect...and type of architecture of the site there, and the historic district.

40 Pardon me, my phone keeps messing up my...where I'm at. Next slide please? So, when we're
41 talking about design and construction, the character and the type. I apologize...thank you. Similarly, the
42 property does not meet the criterion for significance related to design construction. The standard in the
43 Code for significance, design and construction, is high. A resource must embody the characteristics of a
44 type of construction to represent the work of a craftsman or architect whose work is distinguishable from
45 others by its characteristic style and quality. However, the findings in the historic survey do not reach this

1 standard. The survey prepared by City staff states that the style of the representation of the mid-century
2 automobile dealership design of the modern movement and contemporary architectural style. This
3 architectural style of the property can be called mid-century, but it is a term that can be used to describe
4 nearly all buildings constructed during the '60's. The Ghent dealership shows elements of the style and
5 period that are significant actually typically for...not commercial buildings, but typically for suburban
6 structures, which is single-story, gabled roof with exposed rafters, large areas of glass, and the
7 showrooms exterior walls veneer, and all of this echoes in the smaller garage. However, this does not
8 represent the work of a master, master being key here, nor a high artistic value, nor a distinguished entity.
9 While there are specific elements that represent the style of the period, the design and details are very
10 common, and they are in no way remarkable for the period. Indeed, you can go down the street and see
11 several of the same things in ineligible buildings; it was a common type. So, what is still existent we see
12 common pieces, and I think there's another slide that will show that.

13 It's true, as staff points out in the staff report, that there's no regularly deployed ranking system
14 of the design value, but for me, it's a good way to illustrate my opinions by using a one to ten category.
15 So, this is not typical, they're correct, in national standards, but how do we discuss it? For me, most
16 people understand one to ten, ten being the highest value, and in my experience, this would fall into the
17 lowest values, and I put in your packet a one to a one point five. My research on the architects, Moore,
18 Combs, and Burch, the architectural firm that designed the original buildings on the property, show no
19 buildings listed on the state or local registers designed by the firm. The architects are not listed
20 individually or as a firm in the list of important architects of any period, mid-century or otherwise, in the
21 History Colorado archives. And, just to be clear, I did research from Fort Collins, CU Norlin Library,
22 City of Denver, and also the archives at the state.

23 This slide...I'm sorry, next slide for construction please? This slide compares the property with
24 excellent examples of modern architecture, and in your packet, I went a little extreme on this, but I really
25 wanted to show you that mid-century modern covers a very wide variety of styles, it is not specific to just
26 the parts that staff had listed. So, in this slide here, you'll see on the right-hand side, three different
27 examples that are tens at the international level. So, the first one is done by Corbusier in France, the
28 second one by Niemeyer in Brazil, and the third one by Louis Kahn in India. Next slide please.

29 So, this slide I wanted to show what's at a national level of importance, we have the Guggenheim
30 on the top, we have the Phillip Johnson's...I'm sorry, Frank Lloyd Wright's Guggenheim museum on the
31 top, we have Phillip Johnson's Metropolitan Opera in the middle, and then the Eames House in L.A. on
32 the bottom. Next slide please.

33 And so here are three local examples of local mid-century modern designations, we have...the
34 top is in Denver, this middle one is from Fort Collins from the historic district on Sheely Drive, and the
35 bottom is a gas station in Beverly Hills. I'll just note in your packet, I tried to include some gas stations
36 because this is often one that is designated because they get very extreme in the architecture style trying
37 to draw people in to buy gas from them versus the person down the street. It's a little different when
38 we're talking about mid-century modern auto dealerships. We're talking about a standardization so that
39 the cars that they're selling is the focus, not the architecture. Next slide for integrity please. Thank you.

40 As a reminder, integrity is the availability of a site to convey its significance. There are seven
41 criteria for integrity in the Code, as Angela has described. In general, the property is not...does not meet
42 these criteria. The criteria for the location and setting are not met because of the significant changes in
43 the property and the area. As for the location itself, multiple elements on the site and structure have
44 changed over time, this includes the changes in the roof materials, the extension of the roof overhang on

1 the east elevation. I believe in your packets is from the 2017 findings, you have both pictures, the original
2 construction, and then when the overhang is extended. I did...multiple requests from the staff to see if I
3 could find the original documents, the original plans for the building to see what was intended, and they
4 are lost, there's no way to find them. So, we can't corroborate what was the original intent of the
5 architects, and when that extension happened. There was an article that said that it happened some
6 months after the original construction, and I can't find the article to corroborate that date. Other items
7 was the loss of the upper windows in the east elevation, enclosure of the connection between the
8 showroom and the service area, a change of the door of the body shop at the west end of the service area,
9 and a replacement of the majority of the garage doors, significant loss of landscaping, and the addition of
10 fencing, and the loss of the carwash and the gas station. Next slide for location, thank you.

11 As for the setting, although there's several blocks with additional car dealerships, all have kept up
12 to date with the dealership requirements for modifications, thus losing any correlation to the mid-century
13 period of significance. All other existing buildings from the period of significance are widely dispersed;
14 they don't have a concentration needed for the historic district, for a historic district, and they are not
15 related to the car industry. The area has lost significant integrity for the mid-century period. Although
16 the site's original materials can no longer be used as a car dealership, as modern dealerships require
17 remodeling that would change all aspects to be current and contemporary, this site cannot be used as it is
18 in its current form, and it would require further loss of integrity. Materials is the next slide. Thank you.

19 In 2018, the LPC found that this site did not retain integrity of materials, and it still does not.
20 Many elements show significant deterioration indicating the end-of-life cycle as the original materials
21 were inexpensive and made to be replaced often. This is a common quality of mid-century modern
22 construction; it's one that we struggle with, all conservators from this period struggle with. It ends up
23 costing much more to conserve what you have versus being able to rebuild. The site issues that I found
24 included deterioration of drainage and surfacing requiring the removal of the asphalt regrading and repair
25 to foundations. Next slide for design. Thank you.

26 As I described in my survey, the design and details are very common and not excellent examples
27 of design of the mid-century period. These buildings do not represent the work of a master, nor high
28 artistic value, nor distinguishable entity; therefore, the improvements do not retain integrity of design and
29 workmanship. Next slide. Thank you.

30 This property also does not meet the criteria for feeling and association for all the reasons that
31 I've described throughout my presentation. Without retaining integrity of location and setting, materials,
32 or design and workmanship, it fails to retain the feeling of association of the post-war era and the mid-
33 century period. It does not clearly convey its significance to the viewer; therefore, the property does not
34 meet the criteria in your Code for significance. Next slide. Thank you.

35 On one note, I do want to say that it's really great that we have two of these houses that are under
36 consideration for preservation by the City that are related both to Frank and to Dwight. I think if there is
37 any further recognition, it would be best to locate it at the existent landmarks and not try to displace it
38 onto this property. Final slide please. Thank you.

39 The final point I'd like to make is that being selective about what is eligible for historic
40 designation preserves the designation process. While I proudly wear the moniker of a building hugger, I
41 don't believe all buildings should be saved. From my personal experience, I've found that when marginal
42 structures are landmarked, the buildings that would constitute a three or less being my concern, the
43 community loses faith in the process. This means that when the ten comes up for designation, there's no
44 community support, and the staff has to go to extreme lengths to come up with incentives to landmark.

1 This significantly erodes the preservation process. Fort Collins has an excellent preservation program,
2 and a long-running history of great work with the community. I believe this designation is not in keeping
3 with that excellence, and I'd like to support a robust and healthy preservation program versus
4 undermining it with an overreach of the use of this criteria. Thank you for your attention; I'd like to bring
5 Angela back up please.

6 ANGELA HYGH: Can we skip ahead a few slides please? Next slide, next slide, and one more.
7 Thank you. Commissioners, I'd like to just make some conclusory remarks. Based on the information
8 that we have presented this evening and that is included in your packet, you can see that there have been
9 no significant changes, no new discoveries about the property or about the Ghent's since 2018 when the
10 original determination was made by City Council, and there have not been significant changes in the
11 criteria, not to an extent that would warrant a different determination in this case, and we would like you
12 to keep that in mind as you deliberate. We thank you for listening to this presentation this evening, and
13 we will remain available for questions. Thank you.

14 CHAIR ROSE: Thank you. Okay, Commissioners, we'll give you an opportunity to ask
15 questions of staff or the appellants, and then we'll open it up for public comments. No one has questions
16 at this point? You will have other opportunities, but, okay, then I'll open it up for input and testimony
17 from members of the public. Please just identify yourselves and come to the podium. Well, I don't see
18 anyone rushing to the podium, so I'll ask Melissa, do we have people online who would like to provide
19 input and comments?

20 MELISSA MATSUNAKA: No, we do not, Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIR ROSE: Okay, now I will give our staff an opportunity to comment on any of the
22 presentation made by the appellant. And since we have had no additional public comment, I'll ask staff if
23 they have comments or questions of the appellant after...in light of the appellant's presentation. Jim?

24 JIM BERTOLINI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the two main comments that we'd just seek
25 to add to the record. One more minor issue is just with our own historian's research...Rebecca Shields
26 who's there with you in the room...is just a correction that there are properties listed in the National
27 Register of Historic Places that are mid-century modern auto dealerships, at least two that she found in
28 her comparative research. One in Eugene, Oregon, and one in Florence, South Carolina. Both of those
29 are listed under the National Register criterion A and C which correspond to our standards one and three
30 at the local level. That's really a minor issue, though, I think more substantively, I think we would just
31 emphasize that how we apply these standards is really based on local history and based on what we have
32 in the Municipal Code, and so our interpretation of that is typically to assess local trends, you know, local
33 examples of architecture, what we have here in Fort Collins. And so, in most cases, when we're
34 comparing things under, for example, standard three, we're comparing to local examples and whether or
35 not they are significant local examples of a particular style or trend. I think, specifically for myself, that's
36 all I have. I would invite our manager, Marin Bzdek, or our historian, Rebecca Shields, to weigh in with
37 anything else they'd like to offer before we hand things over to the appellant.

38 CHAIR ROSE: Okay, in light of those comments, I would give the appellant opportunity for any
39 clarifications or desire to address those comments of staff.

40 ANGELA HYGH: Thank you, we do not have further comments at this time.

41 CHAIR ROSE: Thank you. Okay, now I will ask Commissioners to address staff or the appellant
42 with any questions that you have prior to closing the part of the meeting which will then require that the

1 Commission reserve their comments simply to Commissioner discussion, and only if you have specific
2 questions for staff or the appellant, we will make this portion of the meeting closed to public or appellant,
3 staff input, unless at your request you would wish to have additional information or a question answered.
4 So, before I do that, I'll ask one final time, does anyone have questions of the appellant or of staff before
5 we begin our own discussion? Margo?

6 COMMISSIONER MARGO CARLOCK: I'm curious if you have considered repurposing the
7 building for a use other than a car dealership, but maintaining the primary building, but repurposing it.
8 Would that fit into the overall plan for the redevelopment of the site? Or could it? Could it be amended?
9 I'm looking at a schematic which implies that the...looks like a hotel...the vast majority, or like about
10 three-fourths of the site would be open for redevelopment if you could perhaps repurpose that as a
11 banquet center, or you know, some other purpose, but actually retain the structure.

12 ANGELA HYGH: Thank you for your question, Commissioner Carlock. Angela Hygh, land use
13 counsel for the appellant. The first thing that I would say to that is that we acknowledge and agree with
14 staff that adaptive reuse is not one of the criteria for eligibility; however, I can say that, in connection
15 with proposed redevelopment of the site, adaptive reuse was considered in other ways of incorporating the
16 property, but due to a number of factors, due to the materials, and the site layout, and that building
17 configuration, as well as other civil engineering concerns, we did not identify any possibilities for
18 adaptive reuse at this time. However, to the extent that there were to be a finding of historic eligibility,
19 then any future development would comply with any requirements for adaptive reuse in the Land Use
20 Code.

21 COMMISSIONER CARLOCK: Thank you, I appreciate that.

22 CHAIR ROSE: Other questions from Commissioners? Tom?

23 COMMISSIONER TOM WILSON: I'd like to ask staff...I just want to confirm that this was
24 ineligible up until...in 2018 it was ineligible, correct Jim? And then in '23 it lapsed, and now it is eligible
25 for landmark status, or what we're discussing here in terms of protecting it?

26 JIM BERTOLINI: Certainly, I can kind of clarify that administrative record. So, yes, under the
27 previous determination, once Council made their decision at their April 2018 meeting, that was good for
28 five years, as all of our eligibility decisions are under the Code. And so, with that expiring in April of last
29 year, before that development application came in last August, and with the Code process changing
30 significantly since that time, staff went ahead and ran it through our survey process again, and that's
31 where we came up with the eligibility finding, at least from our staff historian.

32 COMMISSIONER WILSON: Thank you.

33 CHAIR ROSE: Other questions from Commissioners? Okay, then we will not take any
34 additional input from public or appellant, and we'll just reserve it for discussion amongst the
35 Commission, and we can begin with consideration of a motion or we can begin with your expression of
36 concerns or support for staff recommendations, wherever you want to begin a discussion, and we'll
37 proceed then to whatever point we're ready for a motion.

38 VICE CHAIR BONNIE GIBSON: Mr. Chair, if I may, for the record, for everybody's process of
39 this, and for our linear process of this, I suggest we go through each standard, discuss those in order first,
40 and then if we get to we meet one of those, go through the aspects of integrity then, so we're just in a
41 linear fashion.

1 CHAIR ROSE: If that's agreeable to everyone, we'll begin with the standards, and the first, of
2 course, are events. We'll look at significance first, of course you have to have significance in order to
3 have integrity, so we'll consider...the staff's recommendation is for all three...standards one, two, and
4 three. And so, you've seen the voluminous material presented both by staff and by appellants, and so, I'll
5 just ask for everyone's comments about standard one which has to do with events. Bonnie?

6 VICE CHAIR GIBSON: And I'll just...if you're not looking at it, I'm looking at page 107 of the
7 packet, so we'd have staff and appellant next to each other. We've talked about this several times in
8 meetings of post-war movements going further south and going further north up College. It changed the
9 way that the city worked, it changed the pattern of how life worked in the city, so I would generally say I
10 support standard one. We'll get to it...I think I support architecture more, but this definitely does speak
11 to the way that the daily pattern of life shifted post-war along the corridor in Fort Collins.

12 CHAIR ROSE: Okay, Jeff?

13 COMMISSIONER JEFF GAINES: I agree. I think that reading the materials in our packet, it's
14 clear that this was quite a significant move in the development of the city, this large dealership being
15 developed on what was farmland to the south of town, being the first business of that size to relocate and
16 build on that corridor at a time where other business leaders were surprised by the move. I think it's clear
17 that this was kind of a visionary and future-looking leap that did contribute to the pattern of the
18 development of the city.

19 I would also say, I think both sides made excellent cases on each of the items that we're talking
20 about. Thinking about the appellant argument, it seemed like a key point was around contribution.
21 Can...I guess is this dealership making a contribution to a pattern, or it a reflection of a pattern? Is Ford
22 Motor Company significant driving the growth of the automobile? While a dealership, the point cars are
23 sold is not significant, and in broad terms, I don't see the rationale of that argument in assessing historic
24 significance...that we can only recognize, especially in the more modern era, factories and
25 corporations...I guess the engines of things...like, we can only recognize their significance, but the
26 storefront, the local manifestation is not significant. So, ultimately, I don't buy that rationale here, and I
27 think that there is a case to be made around the contribution of this kind of first large car dealership on an
28 open lot, outside of town, in the development of the city.

29 CHAIR ROSE: Okay, thank you. Chris, did you have...?

30 COMMISSIONER CHRIS CONWAY: Yeah, I guess it's one of the ways I think about
31 significance...like when I was being trained as a historian in graduate school, is through this idea of
32 contingency. So, when I was looking through historical records to determine whether something was
33 important or not, one thing I would ask myself is, was the event that took place...was the event
34 contingent, or was it...did it hold contingency, or was it part of a larger historical process? So, I guess,
35 for example, if tobacco crops were starting to come into Virginia in the early colonial period, or something
36 like that, if this one farmer hadn't have grown tobacco, would tobacco not have been grown in the
37 American south? You can say, probably either way, you know, this trend would have occurred. And so,
38 when I'm thinking about the importance of somebody like the Ghent's or the motor dealership, I'm
39 thinking about, would the town have expanded southwards and become automobile dependent if these
40 people or this business hadn't existed? And I guess to me, the answer is that that expansion was probably
41 not contingent, it was probably going to happen one way or another because of larger, broader trends in
42 the United States. So, I think whether or not the Ghent's opened up this specific car dealership on the
43 south side of town, I do think there would have been other car dealerships. If they hadn't sold as many
44 cars as they did, would there have been less cars in Fort Collins? Probably somebody else would have

1 sold them. And so, to my mind, I think while certainly the Ghent's are very, you know, important people
2 in some ways in Fort Collins, it seems like if there had been different businessmen doing what they had
3 done, their contributions largely would have been similar in the sense that, would they have been on
4 boards like the First National Bank board if it had been a different businessman, probably. Would they
5 have participated in veteran's organizations, probably, right, and so, while everybody has a unique and
6 beautiful life, you know, that they live, and they have many contributions, I think some of these trends are
7 things that were going to happen to Fort Collins anyway, like if you go to Loveland, or Greeley, or
8 Longmont, you'll see the same patterns. And so, I guess while that event did happen, I don't see it as
9 significant in the historical sense. Like for the Ghent family, certainly, but for Fort Collins in general, I'm
10 not sure. I think Fort Collins would look the same whether or not the Ghent's had opened up their
11 dealership in 1966 on the south side of town, whereas other events truly shape the future, right? Like
12 having...if some great ag professor comes to CSU and starts a program, that like starts a path to
13 dependent, kind of, process, which attracts other people who are interested in that kind of agricultural
14 research and things like that, and that really changes what will happen going forward, whereas one car
15 dealership or another doesn't seem to affect the trajectory in the same way. So, to me, it doesn't meet that
16 standard of significance in historical terms.

17 CHAIR ROSE: Okay, thank you. Tom?

18 COMMISSIONER WILSON: I think some of the provenance is lost as well. The first location I
19 think would be more significant seeing as...seeing how it's been modified and changed throughout the
20 years. The first location, that resonates with me, and this being the second location...I appreciate a little
21 bit, the architectural aspects, and I know we're talking about events right now, but it's hard for me to just
22 look at very specifically...I'm having a hard problem just lumping it all together, because I've driven by
23 the location a couple of times now, and the bar is pretty low here, to me. And I appreciate all of staff's
24 work on this, and I'm sharing a personal opinion, and I just think that the bar is pretty low here.

25 CHAIR ROSE: Other Commissioners? Margo?

26 COMMISSIONER CARLOCK: I'm somewhat torn. I was absolutely convinced by Jeff's
27 argument until I heard Chris'. So, I do think it does represent an expansion of the city, and to Chris'
28 point, yes, it would have happened eventually, and then there would have been another site, maybe it was
29 a car dealership, maybe it was some kind of commercial, other commercial enterprise that would have
30 marked that passing, but in fact it was this. So, I do tend to see the significance of it as far as a trend, and
31 a trend for Fort Collins.

32 CHAIR ROSE: Okay, Bonnie?

33 VICE CHAIR GIBSON: Just looking at the definition of standard one and events...be a pattern
34 of events or a historic trend that made a recognizable contribution to the development of the community.
35 So, I think it is that trend that helped stretch. I mean...yes, the car dealerships did not drive the trend, but
36 they were part of it; it helped build Fort Collins into what it is today.

37 CHAIR ROSE: I would say that, first of all, this is a local phenomenon, we're not talking about
38 something being placed on the National Register of Historic Places. This has to do with the evolution and
39 the community importance of this particular site, and I guess I would say I agree that it's evident that this
40 evolution would have occurred anyway. The fact that this was one of the first facilities to move south and
41 to do this was part of what was probably an inevitable progress toward a larger city, but I guess the
42 importance for me in historical terms, is this is still a remnant of that; it still exists, whereas so much of
43 that evolution that did move south has been changed. Prior constructions have been demolished. And the

1 thing we're looking at here is it's significance still exists because it's still there, and that's what would
2 take me to a point of saying, well, of course it's not important at the state level, or the national level, in
3 the sense that it shows us some extraordinary trend of events, but it does give us an indication of how
4 things in Fort Collins evolved and grew, and it's still there to demonstrate that. So, that's why I guess I
5 would say I think it does bear that...enough significance to say it is something we should be considering.
6 And, you know, this in the entire context of all the other standards, and the integrity and all that yet, we
7 have to discuss. Chris?

8 COMMISSIONER CONWAY: I guess, to me, it almost feels like more of a national trend than a
9 local trend, because when I look at the building, I don't think, this could only be in Fort Collins. I think it
10 could be in Longmont, or I think it could be in Kansas, or wherever that might be, you know? Whereas
11 when I look at the old firehouse downtown, or the Northern Hotel, I kind of know where I am
12 immediately, and I just don't get that exact same feeling. So, I guess I get the sense that I am in a
13 suburban part of the United States...or a commercial corridor in the suburban part of the United States
14 when I see the building, but not a particularly Fort Collins suburban place, you know? I know I'm in a
15 Fort Collins suburban place because I know where I am, but not because of anything I'm seeing in the
16 building, I guess it what I'd say.

17 CHAIR ROSE: Okay. Shall we move on to standard number two? That's people, persons.

18 COMMISSIONER CONWAY: I would just say all the same things that I talked about the events
19 apply to the people, to me, as well.

20 CHAIR ROSE: Any other Commissioners want to chime in on that one? Jeff?

21 COMMISSIONER GAINES: Yeah, I think I struggle with this one the most. I think, Chris, you
22 summed it up pretty well, that, to some extent, while Frank Ghent made some great civic contributions to
23 the community and state, that is not uncommon to somebody at his station. At the same time, reading
24 through the packet, he led a pretty incredible life. He was born to sharecroppers in South Carolina, fought
25 in World War I, got tuberculosis, sent to Colorado for treatment, was a homesteader in Craig, moved to
26 Fort Collins, became this successful businessperson. On that level, I think that's a pretty compelling
27 figure. For me, I think the uncertainty is around what makes this figure significant to our community. I
28 do think that the dealership is connected to his life. I think that link was questioned...like, this wasn't his
29 first business, his success came from another location. I do think that opening this dealership, which...the
30 first big car dealership, proto-modern car dealership on an open lot that was built from the ground up, not
31 a stable turned into a car dealership. I think, to me, that's a pretty big deal, and is significant. So, I don't
32 think I question the link to his life, I just question whether he kind of rises to the level of a significant
33 enough figure in our community that we should be preserving the building on his behalf.

34 CHAIR ROSE: Others? Bonnie?

35 VICE CHAIR GIBSON: I'm torn as well, and that was very well said. But, it's a name we all
36 know...I mean, pretty much if you ask anyone in Fort Collins if they've heard that name, they'd say yes.
37 Is it, at least from our generation, because of that location? More than likely. Not the location over here
38 across the street. And the fact that it is the second location shows that furthering success. So, yeah, I
39 would...I mean, who makes the rules of who's important and who's not? But, I would say this person did
40 lead a significant life, it was pretty impressive of what he accomplished, and is well-known in town. So, I
41 would uphold standard two.

1 COMMISSIONER CARLOCK: I certainly understand both Chris and Jeff. Again, they seem to
2 be, like, in my head. What I have learned since moving to Fort Collins is that a lot of this town was based
3 on the foresight and the gumption of people who made businesses, who decided to, when Camp Collins
4 folded, you know, they literally pulled up stakes and moved away. And, there were some people, like of
5 course Auntie Stone and all the names of the streets, the people who stayed and decided to build a
6 community. And, they're the reasons why Fort Collins is here, not Colonel Collins. So, I do realize that
7 the businesspeople in this town, in addition to all the other groups that added to the community in
8 different ways, but the town wouldn't be here except for those people who took risks to build the
9 community. And so, even though this comes much later than the departure of Colonel Collins, it still is
10 emblematic of that progression and that commitment to the community by the business sector. I live two
11 doors down from Mr. Ghent's house, and I live in the house of another prominent businessman, a Mr.
12 Joseph Alpert, and so I'm a little bit...I feel almost a little bit like I shouldn't talk about this one, but
13 that's why I think I have a strong enough feeling that it is important to recognize the contributions that
14 people have made over the years to contribute to this community. According to the information that we
15 were given, Mr. Ghent was a considerable influence, and was a social and community leader, in addition
16 to just being a businessman, and did operate in the furtherance of expanding and growing the town, and it
17 was the foresight of those individuals that I think made Fort Collins what it is today. So, I think I do
18 support this.

19 CHAIR ROSE: Go ahead, Chris.

20 COMMISSIONER CONWAY: Yeah, I guess for me, too, one of my biases would be to
21 preference businesspeople who start local businesses rather than like franchises, you know? So, like
22 when...no disrespect...I mean, it's funny, when you were saying the Ghent name, because I've never
23 heard the Ghent name, and I did grow up here. I know the Spradley Barr name, actually, as the name.
24 But, I have a little bias myself, because like my mom opening this store downtown called Clothes Pony,
25 and you know, to me, that is more of something that doesn't exist anywhere else, rather than, and no
26 disrespect, rather than franchising a business that exists in most cities, you know? And so, I would
27 have...not that those other kinds of businesspeople aren't really important, but that the kind of unique
28 contributions to make the character of a town tend to be the ones that are more idiosyncratic, you know?
29 Like, I don't think there's another Silver Grill, or like, there's not another Clothes Pony, for sure. But, I
30 do think there are other, like...I guess the other people used the example of the Walgreens, and so, like,
31 they're enterprising and endeavoring people who run those Walgreens, but to me, they're not as important
32 to the city...to the character of the city, I should say...they might be important to the city...as somebody
33 who does something more unique I guess.

34 VICE CHAIR GIBSON: I think we have to remember that recent history is just as valuable as not
35 recent history. I can't pull out of my head when franchising first started, but it wasn't that much earlier
36 than the '60's, and so this was a new trend, and so, at that point in time, maybe it wasn't very different
37 from being a sole proprietor of a new business, and you know, we'll get to architecture, but just because
38 something is newer and historic, doesn't make it any less historic. And, just because somebody was
39 significant in whatever way more recently...you brought up Colonel Collins...doesn't lessen that
40 significance at all.

41 COMMISSIONER CARLOCK: I also don't think there were a whole lot of people selling their
42 own cars...I mean, most of them were national automakers, so, it seems to me like that kind of a franchise
43 is almost necessary.

1 COMMISSIONER CONWAY: Sorry, maybe this would be a question for the staff or the
2 appellants, but I guess I was...were they selling their own cars that they made?

3 COMMISSIONER CARLOCK: No, what I meant was, like there wasn't a Ghent-mobile. So,
4 you know, maybe Fords or something were what they could sell.

5 CHAIR ROSE: You know, the difficulty I have with this, and I think some of you have expressed
6 it, you know Frank and Dwight Ghent might have been Fort Collins men of the year, they had an
7 important role to play, but their connection to this building I think is really tenuous because their real
8 contribution was where we now have a pizza parlor. And so, you know, I can't discount the importance
9 of those kinds of people in the evolution and development of Fort Collins, but to associate them with this
10 building and say it's significant because of who they are, I have more of a problem with. I have trouble
11 saying there's such a strong association. I know their picture was in the newspaper in front of the
12 building when it was opening up and all that, but I think that's a lesser part of their history, and as a
13 consequence, a lesser contribution in overall significance. So, I guess that's where I find it a little
14 strained to say standard two is really strong enough to say its relevant.

15 COMMISSIONER GAINES: Jim, I agree with you. And the fact that Spradley-Barr, they've
16 been in possession of the property longer than the Ghent's were, it's complicated. And for me, I've got
17 some conflict with that as well. And what the current owners may have contributed is not relevant here; I
18 know we're looking at the Ghent's, but at the same time, I think it's tenuous too.

19 CHAIR ROSE: So, are you ready for workmanship?

20 VICE CHAIR GIBSON: Alright, standard three, nobody else is saying anything. You drive by
21 there and you know it's from...you know it's mid-century modern, I mean there's no if's, and's, or but's,
22 it's a mid-century modern structure. It...you know, without getting into integrity yet, you look at those
23 original pictures when they...six months after they built it, they put on that front part, it looks exactly the
24 same. You know, again, what I just said is, newer history doesn't make it any less historic. If you were
25 to drive around Fort Collins in a buggy in the late 1800's, a lot of things would look the same and you
26 wouldn't care because they were all newish. Now, people of a certain age, we go, well, this new history,
27 does it matter? But it does matter, you can look at it, you can know what it is, when it came from, what
28 the style is. Yeah, not a work of a master, not a great architect, but you can look at it and go, this is the
29 period it is from. There's no question about that.

30 CHAIR ROSE: Jeff?

31 COMMISSIONER GAINES: Yeah, I think it's kind of a lengthy standard, and it's easy to start
32 thinking about this standard as, well, it has to meet everything that's contained in this paragraph. But,
33 these are 'or' statements, and to me, resources may be determined to be significant if they embody the
34 identifiable characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. I think the building absolutely
35 does. I think that what we're kind of facing is this, like, low bar argument that it's not a masterpiece, or
36 outstanding work of architecture. But, that's not what this standard is about. It represents its time
37 perfectly, it embodies it. And, I think that as a piece of the fabric of our community, it has a lot to add,
38 more than being wiped away. So, yeah, for me, this is the one that it's not in a lot of doubt.

39 CHAIR ROSE: Okay, other comments?

40 COMMISSIONER CONWAY: I guess the only thing I would say is, I think if you look closely at
41 the building, it does have that character, but as somebody who drives by it, you know, and just sees a lot
42 of car dealerships on South College, I actually had never noticed that it was anything different from any

1 of the other care dealerships on South College. That might be because I'm not the most observant person
2 in the world, but I think it's partially because I'm going forty-five miles an hour when I'm doing it, you
3 know? And so, yeah, I think looking more closely, it's interesting, but I also think there is a way in which
4 I don't...because the purpose of the building...the building is always blocked by cars and by a big sign
5 that says Mazda, so I don't actually automatically associate it with historical buildings, because it's got
6 the new sign and the cars in front, so I just think of it as a very workmanlike place. But, I do think it does
7 embody the characteristics of that time, for sure.

8 COMMISSIONER GAINES: The speed limit is forty.

9 COMMISSIONER CONWAY: Can we amend the record...?

10 COMMISSIONER GAINES: I think you bring up a good point about just the current...the
11 current state of the building, the signage on the building. For me, it's pretty powerful to see the images
12 from the '60's, the newspaper photographs of the building as built, it's pretty compelling. And I think
13 that some of the things that feel like subtleties as we're looking at it, like the signage in front of the
14 breezeway, actually have a pretty big impact on the way that we kind of read the building as we're driving
15 by it, and do make it kind of blend in with the rest of the dealerships. But, I think it's very unique.

16 CHAIR ROSE: I guess I'd lump this together, and I said workmanship, not from the integrity
17 standpoint, but because I think this is really about work. It's the work of someone who designed it, and
18 it's the work of someone who envisioned it, and occupied it, and paid for it, and put it in place, and now
19 it's still there. And I think for me, this standard is the strongest of the three, because I think it's
20 still...remove some of the kind of later day signage and that kind of thing, and you could literally hold up
21 the 1966 photo and say, that's that building, we know that. Whether you're going forty-five or forty,
22 whatever you're going, I think it's really in the sense that we are called upon to look at it, a local icon.
23 It's the kind of building you could find in Longmont, you could find anywhere in Kansas, but it's here,
24 and it comes associated with the time and an evolution, and an unimportant architect, and no particular
25 craftsman that we know of. And so, you know, it's design and it's construction only speak in it's totality
26 to what it is in Fort Collins at that site and representative of that time. And so, I guess to me, that's why
27 it's important, because it's really pretty good architecture for 1966; it's pretty progressive. I mean, that
28 wasn't common in 1966 throughout the country and certainly not in Fort Collins. So, it set a tone, and
29 that's where I guess I think it's most significant. When I think of all three standards, that's the one, to
30 me, that holds up the best.

31 COMMISSIONER CARLOCK: I agree that it's the strongest. I think for me, also, one of the
32 reasons why it's strong is...and compelling...is that it's so rare in Fort Collins. We've lost so much of
33 our early commercial buildings. Luckily the downtown was somewhat spared. But, out that direction,
34 there's not too many things that are still around from that particular period of our history.

35 VICE CHAIR GIBSON: So it kind of sounds like we're generally agreed on standard three, but
36 maybe not so much on one and two. So, maybe we should move forward with integrity only on standard
37 three.

38 CHAIR ROSE: Well said, Bonnie, but what I was going to do as the privilege of the
39 Chair...we've been at this for three hours, so I want to, in deference to people that need to get up and
40 stretch, to take about a five-minute break. So, we're going to recess here at 8:21 and we will reconvene at
41 8:26.

1 Everyone back, and we will reconvene. We have all of our Commissioners back in place, so we
2 continue to have a quorum. And now, we'll move into discussion of the seven aspects of integrity. I
3 think it's probably important to recognize that we don't need to be redundant. Some of this that we may
4 have said need not be said again, but feel free, and please be free to bring to our collective attention things
5 that you feel about each of the individual items, and we'll just go through each one and give everyone
6 opportunity to comment. And then at the conclusion of that, I think then what we will do is see if we
7 have had sufficient discussion to consider a motion, and at that point, we'll decide if we have. If we
8 haven't, we'll continue to discuss and move as need be. So, with respect to integrity, there are seven
9 items, and the first, of course, is location. So, anyone want to begin discussion about location? Margo?

10 COMMISSIONER CARLOCK: It is in its original location, and my only comment about the
11 rebuttal from the applicant is that I don't think that the setting, the surrounding area, needed to remain
12 exactly the same for the location to still be valid.

13 CHAIR ROSE: Other comments?

14 VICE CHAIR GIBSON: Agreed, it's in its original location, hasn't been moved.

15 CHAIR ROSE: Okay. The second consideration is design. That one perhaps is a little more
16 subjective in terms of how you feel it conforms to the overall aspects and elements that create the
17 building's form and how it expresses it's importance in terms of the overall design and style, and
18 structure.

19 VICE CHAIR GIBSON: We heard discussion of the changes it's been through, the additions that
20 it's had since it was originally built, but like we said a few minutes ago, put it up to that 1966 picture, and
21 that front façade is exactly the same, so I would say design is intact.

22 CHAIR ROSE: Chris?

23 COMMISSIONER CONWAY: The only thing I would say is the back garage area seems like it's
24 significantly different in the sense that I think if it was an eligible property, and they came before us and
25 asked us, can we change the windows to be like this, I think my understanding is that historic preservation
26 cares a lot about windows from the presentation yesterday, so to me, that shows that at least that back area
27 for sure has changed, I don't know about the rest of it. But, the front looks mostly the same I would say.

28 COMMISSIONER GAINES: Yeah, I think looking at that back area, this overlaps a little bit with
29 materials to me...it's a big change not having the original glass garage doors along the shop area. At the
30 same time, I think the overall design of that area is very well retained. It's pretty much unaltered except
31 for the replacement of those doors.

32 CHAIR ROSE: I guess I would also say, with respect to what you mentioned, Chris, about the
33 doors and the entire garage addition. If that's all we had to look at, I think we'd have a different overall
34 view of how this whole thing fits into any kind of context of historical importance. Because the garage is
35 so prosaic; it's so normal, and we see them all over. Were it left to that component, I think it wouldn't
36 stand the test. And so, you know, as this thing moves forward, and you know, we have this time of
37 consideration of how it's to be developed or not, or whatever further decisions are made, to me that's the
38 most expendable part of the whole property, because we have two other structures that really are very
39 good examples of a novel, contemporary 1966 architecture. Whether you have the original garage doors
40 in place or not, those still are pretty mundane, pretty standard. And so, I think the thing that holds this up
41 in terms of this piece of integrity are those, as you said, Bonnie, and as I said, I think, earlier, this is
42 almost unaltered from what you see in that newspaper article. And that's why I think it's, as a design, it

1 bears importance. Okay, anything else? Setting. And of course, this is different than location, of course,
2 location is, yeah, it is where it is, and it hasn't moved. This has to do with the character of the location
3 where it is in terms of its condition now versus what might have been more representative of it's time in
4 importance of history. Jeff?

5 COMMISSIONER GAINES: I think in a sense, the setting has changed in that the surroundings
6 have changed and continue to change, K-Mart was torn down, King Soopers is being built. But, I think
7 the building has...well, the setting has grown into the building. I think the building was there, and the
8 setting around it...major traffic corridors, College, Drake, you know, car destinations, have all filled in
9 around it. So, I think it's lot, it's relationship to the roads, visibility, are all there. I don't think there's
10 really anything about the setting that detracts from this integrity standard.

11 CHAIR ROSE: Other comments? Okay, materials. Oh, Margo?

12 COMMISSIONER CARLOCK: I would like to say that I absolutely got the point of the
13 appellant's argument that it's in an area that, while it has been exactly what you said, Jeff, that it is
14 changing, and that the desire of the community is to produce more and more high-density housing and
15 other uses for that area, so I do understand that while, right now, it's in a period of transition, going
16 forward, we should recognize it probably will...the setting probably will change.

17 CHAIR ROSE: Okay, materials? Bonnie?

18 VICE CHAIR GIBSON: You know, the roof has changed, the garage doors have changed. With
19 the idea that integrity does not equal condition, which somebody recently told us, there are a lot of things
20 that are...according to this, you know, deteriorating. And there have been some detractors. I am stuck on
21 that front façade with the glass, with the stone. I kind of wish feature one wasn't an entire structure, and
22 we could focus simply on the showroom, but that's not the case. So, with agreeing that some materials
23 have changed, and some are in deterioration, the integrity of the original materials, not condition of, but
24 integrity of, generally is intact.

25 CHAIR ROSE: Okay. Workmanship? This is the one I bundled all together when I talked about
26 the standard number three, so I don't have anything more to say. Okay, we'll just move right along.
27 Feeling? And we can actually talk about feeling and association together if you like because they are
28 pretty...they kind of meld together, but however you choose, if you have comments about either or both, I
29 think either is appropriate.

30 COMMISSIONER CONWAY: I guess for me, and obviously these are the most subjective
31 criteria probably. To me, and I think this is probably true...I think this probably represents the general
32 public, I think when people drive by there, they have zero idea that it's an old building. I think they just
33 see it as a car dealership. And I have a hard time seeing...well, I guess part of what Jim's presentation
34 was, which was an excellent presentation, he talks a lot about being able to tell the story of Fort Collins.
35 And to me, I feel like, again, the location of the building on a major intersection that's, you know, car-
36 oriented, makes it hard as a place to tell a story in the sense that when you're walking around Old Town,
37 you can take a minute and pause because you're walking, and you can, you know take that second look
38 that's really going to tell you the story. I have doubts about how much the people of Fort Collins are
39 going to get out of this story, unless particularly directed to it in some way. It almost makes me feel like
40 you'd get more people knowing about this story of the Ghent's if you renamed the intersection Ghent's
41 Corner or something, you know, rather...more than the building itself, right? So, to me, part of the
42 feeling and association is that, to me, it doesn't...the building itself doesn't tell a story I guess. It could
43 tell a story if you tell somebody the story, but it's not going to be able to be told very well from that

1 location, you know, which makes me feel like...since I had never heard of the Ghent's before, you know,
2 maybe renaming wherever Beau Jo's corner is, or the new building, they could name it Ghent's Place or
3 something, I don't know, something like that, I'm not really sure. So, anyway, to me, it doesn't give me
4 like a strong feeling, as when I'm walking through a mid-century modern neighborhood. I actually grew
5 up in a mid-century modern house in Fort Collins from this time period, it has a lot of these features, and
6 it doesn't give me that feeling.

7 CHAIR ROSE: Jeff?

8 COMMISSIOENR GAINES: I would just say that, in kind of looking ahead at the future, College
9 is going to be redeveloped, a lot of what's there is going to change and be replaced, and I do think
10 that...with all that change, this building as a remnant of its time, I think that you do get a feel of its
11 original time and place, and I think that will continue to be there. It's tricky because it is a place that we,
12 by nature, drive by. As much as I'm sure they'd love to chat with us, we just...hang out at the
13 dealership...it's not a place that we necessarily, you know, hang out, or spend time, or contemplate the
14 way we do with buildings in Old Town, somewhere that you slow down and spend time. But, I think that
15 looking at the future of the city and the changes that will take place along College, I think that it could be
16 that kind of place.

17 COMMISSIONER CONWAY: I guess I just, yeah, I totally agree. I mean, well, I guess not
18 totally agree, but I guess feeling and association is one of those things you can't really...it's hard to go
19 back and forth on, right? You're either going to feel it or you're not? I guess I would say part of it to me
20 is I am kind of convinced by the argument that the Historic Preservation Commission, like, needs to keep
21 its powder dry in a sense, and really spend its resources saving, like really special buildings. And that
22 sometimes decisions about things like car dealerships that can be hard to explain to the general public do
23 make people kind of question what the Commission is all about, you know, and like what exactly...and so
24 I am kind of persuaded by that argument that it's...it can hurt you in preserving even the most important
25 things if you're preserving things that the average citizen is not going to understand as super important, or
26 it's hard to explain the story to them, is what I would say.

27 CHAIR ROSE: Yeah, I think that's one of the reasons I have the most trouble with this one in
28 terms of association. Because I think, in terms of significance, the persons are the lease important, events
29 probably next to the least, and if you don't have associations with either of those, associations really don't
30 raise to the level of really having significance. That doesn't discount all the other six elements of
31 integrity, but association for me has to be telling us a story about something that happened, or a person
32 that is important and significant in the sense of its history, and those two are the weaker parts of this
33 whole argument. So, association to me is really not the strong piece that some of the other elements of
34 integrity in the standard are.

35 COMMISSIONER WILSON: Yeah, I think there are two arguments being made about
36 association. The staff argument is around the building again, and the appellants talking about, well, is
37 there an association with a person or event. And I agree, I think that there's not a clear and obvious
38 important association there with a person or event. I don't think that piece of integrity exists, and that
39 does seem like the correct way to interpret that standard.

40 CHAIR ROSE: Okay. Margo?

41 COMMISSIONER CARLOCK: I actually think that the association part is stronger than the
42 feeling, because I agree with Chris that you...unless you are looking for it, you drive by it and you should
43 be concentrating on driving, at whatever speed, and you're not really focusing on the buildings around

1 you. So, you're not associating any individual building with any event, or significance, or design, or
2 anything else. But, the association, I think, is a stronger argument because it is worthy of...the
3 event...what we're talking about happened there, and it's still there, and it's still what its
4 original purpose was. Of course, it won't be much longer. I think that at that point, it's the only...it's one
5 of the few remaining...I keep going back to, it's one of the very few, only one of two, I think Jim said,
6 remaining commercial buildings from that era in Fort Collins in that area, and that weighs heavy on my
7 mind.

8 CHAIR ROSE: Alright, final thoughts? Do you want to try for a motion? Do you want to...I
9 think it's going to be difficult for you to express how you're going to vote if you don't know what you're
10 voting on. So, I think the logical step here would be to first have a motion and a second, and then we can
11 discuss how to proceed. Packet page 113.

12 COMMISSIONER GAINES: I move that the Historic Preservation Commission find the
13 commercial property at 2601 South College Avenue eligible as a Fort Collins landmark according to the
14 standards outlined in Section 14-22 of the Fort Collins Municipal Code based on the evidence in the staff
15 report, City survey form, and appellants' documentation, and based on the following findings of fact: the
16 property meets standards one and three for significance because of its association with the expansion of
17 Fort Collins south along College Avenue and as an early dealership along College Avenue, and standard
18 three as a building embodying identifiable characteristics of modern contemporary design. Further, the
19 property at 2601 South College Avenue meets the following aspects of integrity: location, as it is in the
20 original place where it was constructed, design, as it maintains the overall aesthetics of its original
21 construction, setting, as the surrounding neighborhood does not detract from the original setting of the
22 building, materials, as only minor elements have been removed or altered and, in general, the original
23 building remains intact, and workmanship, as it maintains original materials and construction techniques
24 of its time. And, I'll leave it there.

25 CHAIR ROSE: Thank you, Jeff. Well said. Okay, is there a second to the motion?

26 VICE CHAIR GIBSON: Second.

27 CHAIR ROSE: Thank you, Bonnie. Okay, you have the motion, and just to clarify, it's deemed
28 eligible under standard one and three, and the elements of integrity that Jeff articulated, which are not all
29 inclusive, but as we have noted, in order to be designated, a site does not have to possess all the elements
30 of integrity, or all the standards of significance. So, are we ready to vote? I think we are. Melissa, I
31 would like you to call the roll.

32 MS. MATSUNAKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Carlock?

33 COMMISSIONER CARLOCK: Yes.

34 MS. MATSUNAKA: Conway?

35 COMMISSIONER CONWAY: No.

36 MS. MATSUNAKA: Gaines?

37 COMMISSIONER GAINES: Yes.

38 MS. MATSUNAKA: Gibson?

39 VICE CHAIR GIBSON: Yes.

1 MS. MATSUNAKA: Wilson?

2 COMMISSIONER WILSON: No.

3 MS. MATSUNAKA: Rose?

4 CHAIR ROSE: Yes.

5 MS. MATSUNAKA: Four in favor, two opposed.

6 CHAIR ROSE: Okay. Now we will take a very brief moment to let everyone explain their vote,
7 just for the record so that future historians can dig back through all of this discussion and figure out how
8 we came to what we've just done. Bonnie?

9 VICE CHAIR GIBSON: Not everything can be the Avery House, we want it to, but it can't.
10 Recent history is as important as other history; you know, the mid-century modern, it's kind of a
11 diminishing resource out there, but the newer generations think it's pretty cool, and this building in
12 particular, you look at it, and you think of the '60's. And so, based on architecture and the fact that car
13 dealerships helped...they didn't drive it, but they helped extend the city, and based on yes, those five
14 aspects of integrity, that's why I voted yes.

15 CHAIR ROSE: Margo?

16 COMMISSIONER CARLOCK: This one was a little difficult, but I voted yes because, partially
17 what Bonnie said, that not everything that is historically valuable is a giant Victorian, or you know,
18 plantation house, or a Mies van der Rohe, or...they're not...that shouldn't be our criteria. It should be
19 what tells the story of the city, of the town, and reflects the character of the town. And, I hate to see
20 portions of that story disappear, and that's why I voted yes.

21 CHAIR ROSE: Chris?

22 COMMISSIONER CONWAY: Yeah, so I voted no because I don't think the story of Fort
23 Collins is going to be told very well by the building itself. I think you could include this thing in the story
24 of Fort Collins, you know, with photographs and many other tools that historians use all the time. I
25 find...I think criteria one and two of significance didn't move me, and in terms of standard three, I have
26 trouble with that criteria because it says that anything significant, if it embodies identifiable
27 characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, and I struggle to think of any building that
28 wouldn't fit that criteria. And so, yeah, so I feel like it's going to be hard to use this as a historic resource
29 for the community.

30 CHAIR ROSE: Jeff?

31 COMMISSIONER GAINES: This was a difficult decision on this property. I think that, big
32 picture, there's an overwhelming interest that we all see. The city property owners in seeing this corridor
33 redeveloped, seeing housing added. At the same time, I do think that those things can take place without
34 wiping out what's there, and I hope that happens. That's really outside of our purview today. I'm
35 concerned that if we don't preserve the rare buildings that we have of this era, we'll have...we'll kind of
36 have a city that's locked in...well, we go from what, the 1930's to whatever the present day is at any
37 time. And, any kind of touchstones that are in between that point in history, that cutoff in history, and
38 whatever point we're at, are lost. So, even though this building is kind of a challenge to want to preserve,
39 I think it's also actually a very important building to preserve because buildings of that era that are intact,
40 still there, are so rare. And that's why I voted yes.

1 CHAIR ROSE: Tom?

2 COMMISSIONER WILSON: When we last touched on the association, that's...I thought
3 through all the different criteria that it touched upon, and having again driven by the property a few times,
4 that the bar just...it's hard to define, as we've touched upon, this is difficult, this is very difficult, and I
5 simply thought that the bar was a little low for this property. And I appreciate it, but I don't...I want to
6 balance what the potential of this location and some of the other needs it could meet within the
7 community. Yeah, that's my opinion.

8 COMMISSIONER CONWAY: I guess if I was just going to add one thing to touch upon aspects
9 that go outside the purview of just determining eligibility. I do think that preventing the development of
10 housing along a transit corridor goes against some of the goals that are outlined by the Historic
11 Preservation Commission...the four goals that...including equity and sustainability. So, it seems to me
12 that housing around transit has to be part of thinking about historic preservation being an ally for
13 sustainability rather than pulling back from it. And also that, you know, we don't...historic preservation
14 doesn't become, you know, associated with, you know, blocking much needed housing for people who do
15 need it, right? So there are probably hundreds of families who might live on that site, and their opinion
16 doesn't come into play in this decision, but I do think they are important as we think about the role of
17 historic preservation going forward.

18 COMMISSIONER CARLOCK: And I absolutely agree. One of the things that I've learned over
19 the last three years is that, particularly with the hard decisions that we make, we are bound by our
20 commitment and the rules of the game I guess you'd say, the standards...the Secretary of the Interior
21 standards, and our role as part of the certified local government as volunteers is to go over this
22 information and do the best job we can in trying to make sure that we can answer these questions. And if
23 we answer the questions in a certain way, then we have to rule a certain way, and we are not supposed to
24 factor into that potential uses, potential, you know, what if's...it's just a fairly...we're admonished
25 constantly. You look at the standards, and you determine if they apply, and that's your role. And that is
26 often the hardest part of our job, is doing that.

27 CHAIR ROSE: I, first of all, would like to thank the Commissioners for your time and your
28 thoughtful comments. I think you've given due and necessary consideration to what I think is a
29 perplexing situation. And I'd also like to commend the appellant and our staff for having formulated
30 excellent materials. I think we come to these decisions with different points of view. I think one of the
31 important aspects of our role, however, is that it is circumscribed by the Land Use Code and by the
32 Municipal Code. We are told by what criteria we are to make our judgements. Now, there will be other
33 voices in this discussion after we've made our choices and voted on our preferences. And, it wasn't
34 unanimous, so I think that speaks to the complexity of the issue.

35 I supported this because of a lot of the remarks I made earlier, and I think that as vexing and as
36 difficult as it is, my hope is that this will not be a deterrent to the ultimate successful development of this
37 property, because it's far too important as one of the most important intersections in Fort Collins. I mean,
38 if you look at the traffic report, and how many accidents there are, look at Drake and College. There
39 is...there is very significant importance to this place, and that's why I think the remnants of this era that
40 we all spoke of is so important, and I hope that it can be developed in such a way that that can be
41 honored. And that ultimately is not our charge. So, I wish the appellant and all the property owners the
42 best in terms of how this may progress or evolve, and I thank everyone for their participation.