

**Additional Documents
Provided per
City Attorney's Office**

Historic Preservation
Commission Meeting
February 16, 2022

- Minutes
- Decision Letter



Kurt Knierim, Chair
Margo Carlock
Meg Dunn
Walter Dunn
Eric Guenther
Anne Nelsen
Jim Rose
Vacant Seat
Vacant Seat

This meeting was held remotely

Regular Meeting February 16, 2022 Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Knierim called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

- **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Margo Carlock, Walter Dunn, Eric Guenther, Kurt Knierim, Anne Nelsen, Jim Rose

ABSENT: Meg Dunn

STAFF: Maren Bzdek, Jim Bertolini, Claire Havelda, Aubrie Brennan

Chair Knierim read the following legal statement:

“We are holding a remote meeting today in light of the continuing prevalence of COVID-19 and for the sake of the health of the Commission, City Staff, applicants and the general public. Our determination to hold this meeting remotely was made in compliance with City Council Ordinance 79 2020.”

- **AGENDA REVIEW**

Ms. Bzdek stated she will be providing a staff report on the Linden Street project improvements prior to consideration of the Consent Agenda. There were no other changes to the posted agenda.

- **CONSENT AGENDA REVIEW**

Member Rose withdrew Item No. 2, *741 Lindenmeier Road – Single Family Demolition Notification*, from the Consent Agenda.

- **STAFF REPORTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

Ms. Bzdek stated the phase two improvements on Linden Street have recently begun and she provided a brief history of the project noting the Commission reviewed the full project and provided a certificate of appropriateness in December of 2019. She discussed the project to reconfigure Linden Street into a convertible street with parallel parking. She stated the project should be complete by July of 2022 and pedestrian access is being maintained during construction.

- **PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

None.

- **CONSENT AGENDA**

[Timestamp: 5:40 p.m.]

1. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 19, 2022

The purpose of this item is to approve the minutes from the January 19, 2022 regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission.

Member Rose moved that the Historic Preservation Commission approve the minutes of the January 19, 2022 regular meeting as presented.

Member Carlock seconded. The motion passed 6-0.

[Timestamp: 5:43 p.m.]

- **DISCUSSION AGENDA**

2. 741 LINDENMEIER RD – SINGLE-FAMILY DEMOLITION NOTIFICATION

The purpose of this item is to notify and inform residents of the possible demolition of a single family property over 50 years of age and to identify potentially important historic, architectural, and cultural resources, pursuant to [Section 14-6](#) of Municipal Code.

Member Rose questioned whether there are alternatives to the immediate approval and subsequent demolition. He stated the materials provided indicate the home has a significant place in early Fort Collins history; however, he acknowledged the property is in derelict condition without much chance for rehabilitation. He stated he would like the record to more accurately reflect the status of the property as an historical artifact.

Mr. Bertolini stated there is no Code structure for mitigation and nothing that would require that of the property owner. He stated demolition permits have yet to be requested and the owner could be asked for additional site access for documentation purposes. He stated securing funding for additional documentation could be an issue.

Member Rose stated he would like to see interior photo documentation if possible, but stated he is not attempting to create undue hardship for the owner. Mr. Bertolini replied interior photos are available.

3. STAFF DESIGN REVIEW DECISIONS ON DESIGNATED PROPERTIES

Staff is tasked with reviewing projects and, in cases where the project can be approved without submitting to the Historic Preservation Commission, with issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness or a SHPO report under Chapter 14, Article IV of the City's Municipal Code. This item is a report of all such review decisions since the last regular meeting of the Commission.

4. 1306 WEST MOUNTAIN AVENUE - FINAL DESIGN REVIEW

DESCRIPTION: This item is a final design review of the applicants' project, to assess how well it meets the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, and to issue, with or without conditions, or to deny, a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant is proposing an addition onto the rear elevation of the main building, demolition of a non-historic accessory structure, and construction of a new garage building.

APPLICANT: Brian and Barbara Berkhausen (property owners), Alexandra Haggarty (legal counsel)
Jeff Schneider, Armstead Construction (contractor)

(**Secretary's Note: Member Guenther withdrew from the discussion of this item due to a conflict of interest as he lives in the home adjacent to the subject property and has submitted comments as a private citizen.)

Staff Report

Mr. Bertolini presented the staff report. He discussed the proposed project and noted the homeowner opted not to make alterations to the proposed plan following the conceptual review meeting in January. Mr. Bertolini outlined the role of the Commission as a decision maker for this item and detailed the historic designation of the property.

Mr. Bertolini showed photos of the property, renderings of the proposed project, and discussed the proposal. He outlined the staff analysis which indicates the project does not meet all applicable rehabilitation standards, which he detailed. He noted the City is required to utilize the Secretary of Interior standards as its basis for review because they are adopted in the Municipal Code and having the design review based in those standards is a condition of a federal certification for the City's Historic Preservation program.

Mr. Bertolini outlined the public input received on the project and stated staff is recommending the Commission approve two of the proposals, for the egress windows and for the demolition of the non-historic garage and construction of the new two-car garage. He stated staff is recommending denial of the proposed addition.

Applicant Presentation

Alexandra Haggarty, counsel for the applicant, stated the proposal provides a good balance between historic preservation and promoting and encouraging the continued private ownership and use of historic sites.

Brian Berkhausen, owner, discussed the history of his ownership of the property and detailed the proposed project which would retain the front-facing elements of the home while providing a rear addition to accommodate his needs moving forward. He stated the proposal retains 100% of the historic fabric of the house while making appropriate improvements that will sustain and maintain the viability and livability of the home for the next century.

Jeff Schneider, Armstead Construction, provided additional details on the proposal and commented on the importance of preserving the open space on the lot between the home and the accessory structures. He also noted aspects of the plan promote City climate-related goals. He outlined the ways in which the proposal meets the applicable Secretary of Interior standards, including noting the reversibility of the addition. He noted the project has received signatures of support from several neighbors in the area.

Ms. Haggarty noted the Code does not clarify how many standards must be met, or to what degree, in order to justify approval. She stated staff has found that eight of the ten standards are fully met or not applicable, and the other two are partially met. Regarding standard two, Ms. Haggarty stated the historic character of the property is retained and preserved with the addition and the proposal fully complies with zoning and Land Use Code requirements. Regarding standard nine, Ms. Haggarty stated the new addition is compatible with, distinguishable from, and subordinate to the existing building. She also noted the applicant will agree to a condition of approval that all landscaping remain in place and be replaced in kind if damaged.

Ms. Haggarty discussed the ways in which the proposal meets other City goals while still retaining the historic significance of the home.

Public Input

Michelle Haefele requested the Commission deny the proposed addition as historic resources are irreplaceable. She suggested setback variances could be requested to ensure an addition is not visible from the front of the property.

Laura Bailey, daughter of the previous homeowner, requested the Commission deny the proposed addition as its designation should mean the City will protect the home from significant changes in perpetuity. She also suggested the large front tree that will block the proposed addition could not be adequately replaced if it dies and stated the house would not have been designated if such an addition existed at the time. She commented on the number of comments received in opposition to the proposal.

Gina Janett requested the Commission deny the addition and stated the house would not have been designated if the addition existed at the time. She stated the proposed addition would dramatically change the character of the home.

Kevin Cook discussed Mr. Bailey's desire to have the house designated so as to ensure the historic value of the structure would be preserved indefinitely. He questioned why the buyers purchased the home with the knowledge of the designation and questioned what credibility the Commission has if landmark status for a property is granted and then it becomes reversible or modifiable with the next owner.

Loretta Bailey stated issues for the current owners could be easily solved without needing to make an addition. She also expressed concern the large tree in the front could not be adequately replaced if it dies.

Karen McWilliams, former Historic Preservation Manager, stated she worked with Mr. Bailey to get this property designated and requested the Commission deny the proposed alterations to the home as they do a disservice to the memory of Mr. Bailey and to all other owners who have chosen to protect their homes through landmark designation. She commented on historic preservation being a city-wide value recognized by Codes and Council policies. She also disagreed with Ms. Haggarty stating all applicable standards must be met in order for this type of alteration to be approved.

William Whitley requested the Commission deny the request for the addition stating the current plan significantly weakens the City's designation standards, calls into question the City's commitment to historic preservation, and sets a dangerous precedent.

Shelly Terry requested the Commission deny the request for the addition stating it should remain as it was when it was landmarked in order to represent history for future generations. She commented on her experience landmarking her home and stated allowing this would set a precedent.

Asma Henry opposed the proposed project and disagreed with comments by the applicant team that the project promotes equitability and sustainability.

Frederick Snyder discussed his experience in landmarking his home and stated landmarking properties is valuable for history. He questioned why buyers would purchase a landmarked home if they wanted to change it.

Staff Rebuttal

Mr. Bertolini clarified the Code requirement in Chapter 14, Article 4 of the Municipal Code, adopts the full set of standards, all of which need to be met or determined by staff to not be applicable. Regarding precedent, Mr. Bertolini noted the Code clearly states decisions on one property do not affect decisions on other properties.

Applicant Rebuttal

Ms. Haggarty reiterated the property is not on a state registry and the Code only calls for the Commissioners to analyze the standards, not to analyze anything related to the City's status as a certified local government. She also reiterated the Code does not explicitly state how many or how fully the standards must be met to approve an alteration and the applicant team believes all are met. She also noted any decision would not set a precedent per Code and stated this process exists to ensure that landmarked properties make changes in a reasonable way, not so that they do not change at all.

(**Secretary's Note: The Commission took a brief recess at this point in the meeting and all five members were present upon returning.)

Commission Questions and Discussion

Member Nelsen requested clarification regarding the Secretary of Interior standards and City Code provisions. Mr. Yatabe replied the Code states a proposal must meet the standards in order to be approved and, if a proposal does not meet the standards, it is denied.

Member Nelsen asked if both chimneys are being retained in the proposal. Mr. Schneider replied in the affirmative and stated both are brick down to the basement level, which will remain.

Member Nelsen asked about the bump out to the east and if it was added to emphasize standard nine. Mr. Schneider replied the design aimed to keep the simplistic rectangular design while meeting the setbacks on the west side and meeting Land Use Code standards related to differentiation. Additionally, the design aims to ensure the addition is differentiated. He noted it is not uncommon for additions to occur on the side of a property to meet Code requirements.

Member Nelsen asked about the possibility of hyphening. Mr. Schneider replied that was considered; however, the design seemed to be a detriment to the existing structure.

Member Nelsen asked if retaining the open space on the lot is more important than the massing as viewed from the front of the property. Mr. Schneider replied the design does not disrespect the existing structure and the preservation of the open space on the lot is more valuable than having the entire addition behind the home. He stated a narrow row house design would not be aesthetically pleasing and would require a number of Land Use Code variances. Mr. Berkhausen noted they are attempting to create a livable floor plan.

Commission Deliberation

Chair Knierim suggested limiting the discussion to the standards in question, particularly two and nine.

Member Nelsen questioned whether the treatment of the addition is substantial enough that standard three would not apply. Member Carlock suggested that standard may not apply as the proposal does not attempt to add anything that one would perceive as historic. She stated the addition is clearly differentiated and is clearly not part of the original structure.

Member Rose stated adding anything to this home takes away from the nature of the home being a bungalow and the applicant team has done as much as possible to try to accommodate a larger program of use into a space that is not appropriate.

Chair Knierim stated character-defining features of the property include its small size and rectangular shape, and the proposal changes those features.

Member Nelsen noted standard two states that the historic character of a property will be retained and preserved.

Member Carlock stated the size of the addition is outside of the standards. Member Nelsen concurred and stated the simplicity of form and symmetry of the structure will be altered with the proposed addition.

Member Dunn concurred and stated the proposed addition detracts from the original structure.

Member Carlock stated she is supportive of the garage replacement proposal and would also support the staff recommendation regarding the egress windows. Member Rose concurred and stated those changes do not modify the character to an extent that the standard is not met. Member Nelsen also concurred and noted the garage that is proposed to be demolished was not part of the historic designation. She also concurred the windows that are planned to be replaced are not character-defining features and their replacement would not negatively affect the historic integrity of the structure. Chair Knierim also concurred.

Member Nelsen suggested the Commission may want to further discuss standard nine. She stated massing, size, and scale have been determined to not be met and also stated the roof lines do not seem compatible. She noted the roof plate height is the same height all around which does not feel subordinate to the existing landmarked home.

Member Carlock stated she believes the size of the addition is the main concern and that violates standard nine.

Members discussed the proper way to make a motion or multiple motions.

Member Carlock made a motion that the Historic Preservation Commission approve the plans and specifications for proposed item two, installation of an egress window and modification of bathroom windows, and for proposed item three, demolition of the non-historic garage and construction of a new garage, at the Jackson Property at 1306 W. Mountain Avenue as presented, finding that these items meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and that the Commission deny approval for item number one, the addition to the home, because it does not meet the following Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation: two and nine.

The Commission further finds that other than the stated standard(s) not met, the denied alteration(s) meet all other applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

This decision is based upon the agenda materials, the information and materials presented at this hearing and from the preceding conceptual review and work session, and the Commission discussion on this item.

Member Rose seconded.

Member Rose asked if the items stated by Member Carlock were sufficiently clear. Member Carlock replied the items are numbered per the Staff Report. Member Rose requested the motion include a reference to the items as being in the Staff Report. Member Carlock suggested listing the items by descriptions rather than with numbers.

Assistant City Attorney Yatabe stated the motion was fine either way, as part of the motion involves the discussion on it.

Member Nelsen reiterated that part of the Land Use Code and City Code involves the Commission assessing whether or not an alteration meets all of the Secretary of the Interior standards for rehabilitation. She stated the property was landmarked for design and construction and the Commission agrees the distinctive aspect of the home is the integrity of its form and its small size, and that the proposed alteration so significantly alters that key defining characteristic, that it cannot be supported and therefore the Code is not met.

The motion passed 5-0.

[Timestamp: 8:38 p.m.]

- **OTHER BUSINESS**

- ELECTION OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Member Rose nominated Chair Knierim for Chair. The nomination was accepted unanimously. Chair Knierim commended Meg Dunn's work as Chair.

Member Nelsen nominated Member Rose for Vice Chair. The nomination was accepted unanimously.

- **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Knierim adjourned the meeting at 8:47 p.m.

Minutes prepared by TriPoint Data and respectfully submitted by Aubrie Brennan.

Minutes approved by a vote of the Commission on March 16, 2022.

DocuSigned by:

Kurt Knierim, Chair

0DETC132693E4CB
Kurt Knierim, Chair



Historic Preservation Services

Community Development & Neighborhood Services

281 North College Avenue
P.O. Box 580
Fort Collins, CO 80522.0580

970.416.4250

preservation@fcgov.com

fcgov.com/historicpreservation

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

ISSUED: February 17, 2022

EXPIRATION: February 17, 2023

Brian and Barbara Berkhausen
1306 W. Mountain Avenue
Fort Collins, CO 80521

Dear Property Owners:

As you are aware, last evening the Historic Preservation Commission gave a Final Design Review decision for the work you are proposing for the Jackson-Bailey House & Garage at 1306 W Mountain Ave.

More specifically, the Commission **denied**:

1. Construction of an 887 square foot addition onto the existing 1,097 square foot home (*Note: 1,097 includes the approximately 76 square-foot rear mud porch slated for demolition*).
 - a. The Commission found this project component did not meet the *Standards for Rehabilitation*, specifically Standards 2 and 9.

The Commission **approved**:

2. Replacement of all historic basement windows with egress-compliant window units and infill of west-facing main floor window and replacement with two small one-over-one windows.
3. Demolition of non-historic garage, and construction of a new 630-square foot garage at the rear of the lot.

An analysis is included below.

Applicable Code Standard	Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation: Summary of Code Requirement and Analysis	Standard Met (Y/N)
SOI #1	<p><i>A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships;</i></p> <p>The property will remain in residential use. However, staff notes that the size and scale of the addition inclines toward inconsistency with this Standard. National Park Service "Interpreting the Standards Bulletin 37: Rear Additions</p>	Y

	<p><i>to Historic Houses,</i>” notes that “in cases where an overly large addition is required in order to accommodate an owner’s programmatic needs, a more suitable building should be identified.”</p>	
<p>SOI #2</p>	<p><i>The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.</i></p> <p>Designated as a significant example of a Craftsman Cottage, the building is characterized by its small size and compact massing compared to larger Victorian and modern homes. Its simple rectangular form under the front-gabled roof, and other Craftsman-style features including exposed rafter tails, the styled brick exterior, wood sash windows, and prominent brick chimneys together characterize the property.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of an 887 square foot addition onto the existing 1,097 square foot home – As Bulletin 37 notes, the expansion of modest scale houses can be particularly challenging in order to create an addition that is compatible with the historic building’s size, scale, massing, and design. The addition, as proposed, would alter the massing of the building as viewed from Mountain Avenue. While the addition is on the rear, and is at a lower height than the historic roof line, the visible east bump-out at the rear and significant additional space makes it difficult for the project to meet this Standard, as it would change a small cottage with a larger open yard into a larger house with significantly less surrounding open space on the lot, and would alter the building’s characteristic simple, rectangular massing into an irregularly-massed building more typical of Modern-style Ranch homes or earlier Victorian-era homes. 2. Replacement of all basement windows with egress-compliant window units, removal of a window on the east wall, and infill of west-facing main floor window, and replacement with two small one-over-one windows – Some of the exterior doors and most of the windows appear historic, although the storm windows were new (restored in the early 2000s by the previous owner). Treatment of the basement windows is common in this context and appears to meet this Standard (the basement windows are not a character defining feature). The modification of the west bathroom window from one historic unit to two non-historic is not ideal, but by itself may be considered consistent with this Standard due to its location on a side elevation, the reduced visibility of this window, and considering the context of the proposed preservation and rehabilitation of most of the remaining windows on the historic building. 3. Demolition of non-historic garage, and construction of a new 630-square foot garage at the rear of the lot – The 1968 two-car garage is not a contributing historic resource for this City Landmark and could be demolished without compromising the property’s significance. The design of the proposed new garage seems generally compatible with the property’s historic character. The roof orientation along a north-south axis is in keeping with the overall character and spatial organization of the site. 	<p>N</p>

SOI #3	<p><i>Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.</i></p> <p>While the Commission agreed with the Staff analysis that this Standard did not apply to this particular project, members did express concern that the design of the addition could create a false sense of history, but that this concern was best articulated under Standard 9 relating to the property being adequately compatible but distinguishable from the historic building section.</p>	N/A
SOI #4	<p><i>Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.</i></p> <p>The primary historic feature proposed for removal is the rear porch. While this feature appears to date from the property’s historic period and represents a common adaptation to historic residences in Fort Collins, staff does not believe the porch is a character-defining feature based on the significance of the property for Design/Construction as a significant example of a Craftsman Cottage. While staff generally encourages retention of rear porches whenever possible, in this case retaining it is not required in order to meet this Standard.</p>	Y
SOI #5	<p><i>Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.</i></p> <p>The project as proposed in the current (February 2022) version, meets this Standard. The plan has been modified from previous iterations to avoid demolition of the primary exterior wall of the house at its northeast corner.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of an 887 square foot addition onto the existing 1,097 square foot home – While the size, location, and design of the addition remains problematic because it alters the character-defining rectangular design of the cottage, its installation does not appear to require the removal of any character-defining elements of the property. Therefore, this project component meets this Standard. 2. Replacement of all basement windows with egress-compliant window units, removal of a window on the east wall, and infill of west-facing main floor window and replacement with two small one-over-one windows – While the historic status of doors on the property is mixed, the windows appear to be historic with new (c.2000s) matching wood storm windows and appear to be in sound shape for repair. Replacement of basement windows in bedroom areas for egress compliance is a regular part of building rehabilitation and meets the Standard. While the modification of the bathroom window on the west elevation is not recommended, it does not appear to conflict with this Standard. 3. Demolition of non-historic garage, and construction of a new 630-square foot garage at the rear of the lot – While the 1968 two-car garage does not characterize the property, the 1942 one-car garage does as noted in the Landmark nomination. As noted previously, the overall design and massing of this garage is generally compatible with the overall property. 	Y

SOI #6	<p><i>Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of an 887 square foot addition onto the existing 1,097 square foot home – N/A 2. Replacement of all basement windows with egress-compliant window units, removal of a window on the east wall, and infill of west-facing main floor window and replacement with two small one-over-one windows – While some of the doors on the residence are original and some are later alterations, the windows appear to be original with new (c.2000s) matching wood storm windows and appear to be in sound shape for repair, which is proposed. Replacement of basement windows in bedroom areas for egress compliance is a typical component of building rehabilitation and meets the Standard. While the modification of the bathroom window on the west elevation and loss of the rear-most east window is not recommended, the overall plan for windows on the residence appears to meet this Standard. 3. Demolition of non-historic garage, and construction of a new 630-square foot garage at the rear of the lot – N/A 	Y
SOI #7	<p><i>Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.</i></p>	N/A
SOI #8	<p><i>Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.</i></p> <p>The proposal includes excavation for the foundation and crawlspace under sections of the addition. Based on the construction date of the property, the disturbed nature of the soil, and distance away from natural waterways (beyond 200 ft), it is unlikely that excavation would uncover significant archaeological materials from the pre-contact or Euro-American settlement periods.</p>	Y
SOI #9	<p><i>New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.</i></p> <p>Generally, this Standard calls for additions to meet three main requirements: to be <i>compatible, distinguishable, and subordinate</i>. While components of the addition’s design meet these requirements, some conflicts remain under this Standard.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of an 887 square foot addition onto the existing 1,097 square foot home – The addition as proposed has elements that meet some of the requirements noted above. The roof height of the addition is below the historic roofline, helping to subordinate the massing of the addition to the historic building. The siding of the addition is proposed as lapboard which helps differentiate the addition from the historic building without disrupting the compatibility. The window selection for the addition are simplified versions of the historic windows. 	N

	<p>However, the new addition adds significant square footage to the existing house, making meeting the “subordinate” requirement difficult without the use of offsetting design features such as a hyphen that are typically used to allow for larger additions that retain the original building’s characteristic form, massing, and scale. The size of the addition disrupts the defining, symmetrical massing of the property, and is large for a property of this type (a small residential cottage). The bump-out of the addition by 7.75 ft on the east is significant for a home and lot of this size and disrupts the historic massing and orientation of the main house, creating further compatibility conflicts. Additions, especially onto small historic homes, should be at, or inset from, the historic sidewalls of the historic building. Where this is not possible, using a hyphen, courtyard, or other interrupting feature is recommended to connect the new construction to the original building and clearly differentiate the new construction. While the current design is close to meeting this Standard, necessary modifications remain to offset the new construction from the old in order to meet this Standard and retain the character-defining features of the building.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Replacement of all basement windows with egress-compliant window units, removal of a window on the east wall, and infill of west-facing main floor window and replacement with two small one-over-one windows – The removal/replacement of the basement windows should not conflict with this Standard. The removal of the window near the northeast corner as part of the addition, and the modification of the bathroom window on the west elevation is not recommended, but the minimal impact on the property’s overall historic character and character-defining features, does not appear to conflict with this Standard. 3. Demolition of non-historic garage, and construction of a new 630-square foot garage at the rear of the lot – The proposed new garage is generally compatible with, distinguishable from, and subordinate to, the existing property and appears to meet this Standard. 	
<p>SOI #10</p>	<p><i>New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.</i></p> <p>In these revised plans, this Standard appears to be met.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of an 887 square foot addition onto the existing 1,097 square foot home – While the addition conflicts with Standard 9 in significant ways, it appears compliant with Standard 10 as no demolition of character-defining exterior walls is proposed in the revised plans. 2. Replacement of all basement windows with egress-compliant window units, removal of a window on the east wall, and infill of west-facing main floor window and replacement with two small one-over-one windows – Replacement of basement windows in bedroom areas for egress compliance is a regular part of building rehabilitation and while not strictly reversible, is not altering the essential form and integrity of the property and meets the Standard. While the modification of the bathroom window on the west elevation is not recommended, it does appear to meet this Standard for the same reasons as the basement window modifications. 	<p>Y</p>

	3. Demolition of non-historic garage, and construction of a new 630-square foot garage at the rear of the lot – No historic resources appear to be affected by this aspect of the project.	
--	---	--

The Commission found that Item 1, the proposed addition to the historic house, the criteria and standards in Chapter 14, [Article IV](#) of the Fort Collins Municipal Code and was not approved.

The Commission found that the proposed Item 2, to modify basement windows and the west bathroom window, and Item 3, to demolish the 1968 two-car garage and construct a new garage based on provided plans, meets the criteria and standards in Chapter 14, [Article IV](#) of the Fort Collins Municipal Code.

Notice of the decision regarding this application has been forwarded to building and zoning staff to facilitate the processing of any permits that are needed for the work.


Please note that all approved work must conform to the approved plans. Any non-conforming alterations are subject to stop-work orders, denial of Certificate of Occupancy, and restoration requirements and penalties.

If the approved work is not completed prior to the expiration date noted above, you may apply for an extension by contacting staff at least 30 days prior to expiration. Extensions may be granted for up to 12 additional months, based on a satisfactory staff review of the extension request.

You may appeal this decision within two weeks by submitting a written notice of appeal to the City Clerk within fourteen (14) calendar days of this decision. Grounds and process for appeals are enumerated in Chapter 2, [Division 3](#) of the Fort Collins Municipal Code.

If you have any questions regarding this approval, or if I may be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to contact staff at preservation@fcgov.com or at (970) 416-4250.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

DD742B4AF8F445E...

Kurt Knierim, Vice-Chair
Historic Preservation Commission