

**Verbatim Transcript
Historic Preservation
Commission Meeting
October 19, 2022**

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

CITY OF FORT COLLINS

Held OCTOBER 19, 2022

300 Laporte Avenue

Fort Collins, Colorado

In the Matter of:

825 NORTH COLLEGE – APPEAL OF DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY

Meeting Time: 5:30 PM, October 19, 2022

Board Members Present:

Kurt Knierim, Chair
Jim Rose, Vice Chair
Walter Dunn
Anne Nelsen
Meg Dunn
Eric Guenther
Margo Carlock
Jenna Edwards
Bonnie Gibson

Staff Members Present:

Claire Havelda
Jim Bertolini
Maren Bzdek
Yani Jones
Melissa Matsunaka

1 CHAIR KURT KNIERIM: That takes us to item number six, 825 North College. This is an
2 appeal of a determination of eligibility. And we will begin with public comment...no?

3 MS. CLAIRE HAVELDA: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair...it's not that you are incorrect; we have a
4 procedural matter to clear up before we even get started.

5 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you.

6 MS. HAVELDA: Is Mr...the appellant, Mr. Armstrong here? Mr. Armstrong, would you mind
7 coming down to the podium; I need to ask you a question on the record. Mr. Armstrong, the City made a
8 mistake in part of its procedure, and I want to be very transparent about that and give you an option of
9 what you can do this evening. So, under our City Municipal Code 14-23, we have requirements of what
10 we have to do before this matter is brought before the Commission. The City met all of those
11 requirements under 14-23(B)(1) and (B)(3); where we made a mistake was not publishing notice of this
12 hearing in a newspaper of regional circulation. So, you have two options, you can tell us, I want to put
13 this matter on hold and come back at the next Commission meeting, and City, you need to go publish that,
14 or you can say, I'd like to proceed with this matter as scheduled today and I waive any objection to the
15 City missing that procedural item. It's completely up to you.

16 MR. GREM ARMSTRONG: We'll proceed.

17 MS. HAVELDA: So, you understand you're waiving any...you will not be allowed to argue later
18 that this hearing was unfair because it wasn't published...

19 MR. ARMSTRONG: Correct.

20 MS. HAVELDA: Thank you.

21 MR. ARMSTRONG: My name is Grem Armstrong, and...

22 MS. HAVELDA: I'm so sorry, I totally made this an odd procedural matter...I'm going to let the
23 Chair take it back over and then he will tell you when it's time to talk, but I wanted to make sure we
24 cleared that up before we even got started. Thank you, I appreciate it.

25 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. Alright, that takes us to 825 North College and this appeal of the
26 determination for eligibility, and we will begin with any public comment on this. Seeing none, we will
27 move on to a staff presentation.

28 MR. JIM BERTOLINI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, Jim Bertolini, Senior Historic
29 Preservation Planner. This is an appeal of a staff finding determining that the property at 825 North
30 College was eligible under the City's landmark criteria and qualified as an historic resource for
31 development review. Just to provide a little bit of grounding in location, this is the property here fronting
32 on the west side of College Avenue; it's on the southwest corner of Alpine and College, just north of the
33 Poudre River and Lake Canal. This is a little bit closer of a...kind of a site plan for the property showing
34 three distinct resources. One is a service station, shown here, kind of on the southeast corner of the
35 property. Along the north end is a residence, and then near the southwest corner is a garage that's
36 considered accessory to this service station. Then shown in white is an approximation of the parcel
37 boundary for this property. The role of the Historic Preservation Commission here...this is a de novo
38 hearing, so you are providing a new decision regarding whether this property qualifies under the City's
39 landmark criteria. Your role is to consider evidence regarding significance and integrity of the buildings
40 addressed at 825 North College Avenue. The standards referenced in that are in Municipal Code 14,
41 Article 2. And then your task is to provide a determination of eligibility, whether or not this property

1 qualifies as an historic resource. The purpose for this is development review; there is a development
2 proposal for this property which required determination of whether it qualified as an historic resource or
3 not. Your decision tonight will be subject to the right of appeal to City Council.

4 Just a little bit about the review timeline here...there's three major steps so, as is common when
5 development review...what kicked off the historic survey of this property was the receipt of a
6 development proposal. This was a conceptual review received by the City with the review completed on
7 August 18th. At that time, preservation staff noted that we did not have an updated historic survey for this
8 property, and completed that survey. That survey was ordered on behalf of the developer who is not the
9 same as the property owner who is the appellant this evening. The survey findings were issued to the
10 developer and the property owner on September 7th, finding that the property was eligible, and I'll go over
11 the standards that staff believed it was eligible under a little bit later in the presentation. And then within
12 the two-week period allowed for appeals, the property owner, Mr. Armstrong, appealed that finding,
13 bringing you to tonight's hearing.

14 And just a reminder on process, since this is initiated in the Land Use Code, specifically 3.4.7
15 which covers the preservation of historic resources on development sites, but in determining eligibility,
16 we use the same measurement as we would for a landmark nomination, those standards for eligibility and
17 historic integrity that are outlined in Municipal Code 14, Article 2. Based on your decision this evening,
18 if you find that the property is eligible, then we move back into 3.4.7 and work with the development
19 applicant on preserving any historic resources identified tonight as part of that, or potentially a
20 modification of standards. And if you find that the property is not eligible, then that concludes the
21 process and the development can proceed.

22 So, just as a reminder on eligibility as an historic resource, this is a two-step process and a linear
23 process. It starts with historic significance under the four standards that I have outlined on the left side of
24 this slide. And then historic integrity under seven aspects that specifically relate to the reasons the
25 property is found important. So, this is just a summary of why staff considered the property eligible
26 under three separate standards in Article 2, those standards being one for events and trends, and this
27 pertains to the service station and garage and their historic significance, standard two for persons and
28 groups, and that deals with both Jane and Letha Kraxberger and is...pertains specifically to the residence
29 on the property only, and then standard three for architecture, and that specifically relates to the service
30 station on the front of the property. So, I know there were some questions in the work session about
31 which standards apply to which resources, and so that hopefully clarifies since there is some complexity
32 there. And I'll go through each individual standard.

33 So, specific to events and trends, staff found the property significant as an early and longstanding
34 business on North College Avenue, initially established about 1925 by the Kraxberger family, and then
35 carries through to 1969, that post-dates the Kraxberger period of operation, but corresponds to the general
36 period when North College had kind of been fully built out, during the mid-20th century. This pertains to
37 the service station which was...a service station was originally built in 1925, that was later demolished.
38 The building that's there now was first constructed in 1937 but heavily remodeled in 1960, and so the
39 picture you'll see here was...relates to the 1960 appearance of the building and includes the garage as an
40 accessory structure. And one thing that the Commission would...that staff suggests the Commission
41 consider here is just the evolution of the building in relation to the concept of historic integrity and how
42 well it is or is not reflecting that commercial development story.

43 The second standard that staff found was under persons and groups, and this specifically relates to
44 two separate spouses of Mike Kraxberger. So the service station was operated by Mike Kraxberger as M

1 and K Colon Oil and under various company names under the M and K moniker. At two separate times,
2 he had spouses that made what staff found to be significant contributions to local history. Letha
3 Kraxberger, or I should say, Jane Kraxberger, as first wife of Mike, as a significant contributor to local art
4 and fashion in the early 20th century, and then Letha Kraxberger, in particular, her philanthropic
5 contribution, specifically as a local, state, and national leader in the American War Mothers organization,
6 which is a veteran's welfare organization. This significance, staff would recommend this applies only to
7 the residence, and the property owner did provide some additional information that he will present, and
8 based on that, staff does have some concern that the historic integrity may not be there for this standard.

9 And, lastly, standard three for architecture; this specifically pertains to the service station itself.
10 This was largely based on a 2010 historic survey that was completed by the Colorado Department of
11 Transportation under a review process they were required to go through for the National Historic
12 Preservation Act. That survey form determined that this service station was potentially eligible for the
13 National Register under architecture as an example...an early example of the oblong box type of gas
14 stations, which, in the late '50's and early '60's would have been fairly new. This became very standard
15 for service stations across the country. This significance would pertain to the service station only. In
16 terms of how this relates to an oblong box, what exactly is that? It is this modern style service station that
17 has become fairly ubiquitous. Minimalist design, fairly rectangular floorplan and elevation presenting to
18 the street, usually has a flat roof, it's defined by having a corner office and usually two service bays. So
19 this became a fairly standard footprint and design, although styles, architectural styles, might vary, this
20 one not really having an architectural style. As is common with architectural significance, we do try to
21 compare things within a similar context, and so we have identified a similar service station constructed in
22 1959 just prior to the redevelopment of the 825 North College property. So, we consider the 1420 North
23 College a good comparison property. There are other oblong box service stations along the College
24 Avenue corridor, most of those postdate these two service stations. There was a question from the work
25 session about what the exterior material of the current service station is, and it is...it's concrete block
26 building. The front and the two sides has metal paneling over top and then there's stucco on the rear.

27 This is just a little bit of site history related to this property. Again, the first service station, which
28 is no longer present, shown here. This was built in approximately 1925 as the first M and K Colon Oil
29 service station. In about 1931, that's when the residence that remains on the site was constructed...1933,
30 that accessory garage was built, just the east portion, this was expanded later in 1956. And in 1937, the
31 first version of the existing service station was built; that's shown here in the upper right. As you can see,
32 this was styled as a mission revival style building with the single service bay on the north end. In 1960, it
33 was remodeled into what you see today, and this is a 1977 County Assessor photograph showing that
34 property similar to its current condition.

35 This is just showing some of the individuals that are associated with this. Mike Kraxberger in the
36 middle, this is showing the property in the 1930's along with some of his staff, and then showing both
37 Jane Kraxberger here with one of the advertisements for her shop, which was on West Mountain Avenue,
38 and then an image of Letha Kraxberger shortly after she married Mike as his second spouse.

39 I did add in an arial photograph, so again, the photo here on the bottom right you've already seen;
40 this is the site photograph from a previous slide. Did provide a 1937 arial photograph here showing that
41 the residence was already present, the service station...this would have been just after the new service
42 station was constructed, and it appears that that earlier 1925 service station remained for some time.
43 When it was demolished, we're not sure. And then also showing the eastern portion of that accessory
44 garage.

1 I do have some responses to work session questions here. There was a question about standard
2 two evaluations pertaining to persons and groups and whether or not there is a direct association with the
3 house, and whether or not that's important. And based on the findings that are in the historic survey form
4 in your packet, there is a loose connection between Jane Kraxberger's operation of...kind of contributing
5 to local culture and fashion in the early 20th century, but most of that work was conducted outside the
6 house. The more direct connection with the house specifically is with Letha Kraxberger who did hold
7 some meetings for the American War Mothers in the house. Did want to clarify as well that our
8 interpretation typically of standard two for City landmark designation typically allows for designation of
9 the residence of a person who was important and did their important work elsewhere. We do frequently
10 allow for their private residence to qualify as well assuming it has historic integrity to the period when
11 that important person lived there. So, integrity is a critical component of that.

12 There was a question about the 2010 CDOT finding versus the current finding. The CDOT
13 finding was much more constrained...it considered the service station eligible under National Register
14 criterion C for architecture, did not consider the garage historic based on altered integrity, and then did
15 make mention that the historic...that the residence was a historic property, a contributing property to the
16 service station, although the reasons for that connection other than a general mention of the Kraxberger
17 family was not well established in the survey form, and so that was one of the things that staff revisited
18 when we issued our findings this year. Our finding was that all three resources were eligible under the
19 standards that we've already covered.

20 Again, provided some context already about the oblong box property type, which is recognized
21 by History Colorado as a property type in a roadside architecture. And again, clarified kind of the
22 different types of significance and which properties they relate to, at least in staff's finding. Clarified the
23 exterior materials. And there was a question to provide some comparison on shingle-style architecture
24 since we typically do ask for that, and this is...the residence is considered a shingle-style. While
25 significance might be there, since I'm not aware of any other shingle-style residences in this part of north
26 Fort Collins, the integrity appears significantly disrupted, and I think that will be more clear with the
27 appellant's presentation. So, staff would not recommend this as a significant property for that reason.

28 I do want to note for the record, we have not received any written public comments, but I did
29 receive a verbal public comment over the phone from a Mr. John Meya who is a resident of north Fort
30 Collins...he is opposed to the eligible finding. He did express some general concern about development
31 applications on the North College corridor and the timing of when these findings typically come to light
32 with a development application or when a property sale is pending. And also concerned about some
33 inconsistency with findings related to other service stations...specifically mentioned the property at 949
34 East Prospect, that's the southwest corner of Lemay and Prospect. That did have an intensive survey
35 completed and was determined not eligible, and so demolition will be allowed as part of that development
36 application.

37 So, again, just a reminder that this is a de novo hearing...you're providing a new decision to
38 replace the staff finding considering the evidence as it relates to the significance of the property or any
39 specific resources on the property, and then ensuring that they also have historic integrity to convey that
40 significance. And then your task is to provide a new determination of eligibility for this. That concludes
41 the staff presentation; I'll be available for questions. With that, I believe Mr. Armstrong has a
42 presentation. I have slides from him that I will run for him while he's at the podium.

43 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you, Jim, let's move on to the appellant presentation. Thank you.
44 And do state your name if you would please, and sign in.

1 MR. ARMSTRONG: My name is Grem Armstrong, this is my wife, Robin. Thank you. We
2 came before this Council [*sic*] in 2005 when the City was desperate to have anything done with North
3 College, and way before the King Soopers was built, and we built the Human Bean on North College, at
4 821 North College. This property is directly adjacent to the north. This property, while now I have a
5 little bit of push back about whether or not it can be demolished...the City and the State had no problems
6 pulling the tanks years ago and vacated Alpine Street, so Alpine Street is...which in one of his pictures is
7 gravel, it's an eyesore, it's a problem for the whole neighborhood. And this development that we are
8 proposing would pave that, that's part of the development. So, we had a gentleman approach us that
9 wants to raze all the buildings, and this is the first that we heard about that we wouldn't be able to do that.

10 I do have a few questions...when, so in 2010, Robert Autobee of CDOT determined that this
11 property was historic. What are his qualifications that allows CDOT to get involved with the City of Fort
12 Collins preservation?

13 MR. BERTOLINI: I'll note I'm not specifically familiar with Mr. Autobee since I'm not working
14 for CDOT any more, but they do regularly employ historians that would have a Master's or better in
15 history or related historic preservation field. The main reason that CDOT provided a historic survey form
16 was because there was federal funding being utilized for the redevelopment of the North College Avenue
17 highway, and as part of that, CDOT has responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act to
18 account for their effects on any historic resources, in this case...in that case defined as anything eligible
19 for the National Register of Historic Places, as part of their project...so that's a responsibility that applies
20 to them and they typically provide a historic survey form to document those findings. Those are intended
21 to affect the decisions and project design that CDOT was creating for the highway. In our case, it was
22 available secondary literature that we used to develop our findings that are required under the City's Land
23 Use Code, if that answers your question.

24 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay, thank you. So, this first picture shows you the residence directly
25 north of the gas station in question. And, if you look at the very front of this...let me back up and say that
26 Jim asked me to take some pictures inside the fence because he wasn't able to get anything that was
27 inside the fence of the property. This little tiny A-frame pitched roof addition in the front was most likely
28 the original property. Since then, there's been three to four other additions added on to this...this is a
29 hodge-podge mess. I mean, we just had testimony from an architect that's doing a great job on
30 Remington...he wasn't here...this is a mess inside and it's a mess outside. So, this little piece might have
31 been the first building that everybody is referring to...since then it's been added on to here, and then if
32 you flip over to 829 to the house and apartment...well, this is another good picture of the front, but keep
33 going...pass that one too, pass that one...this is an addition, again, on the back of the house...completely
34 different siding, 1960's asbestos siding. By the way, except for that little piece, all the rest of the house
35 has new windows. One of the inconsistencies in the gentleman that did the report in 2010 is that he said
36 that the...he was saying that the garage does not qualify because of the metal roof. And yet, back in
37 2010, everything that you see here had the same metal roof. The metal roof's been on there for, I don't
38 know, twenty, twenty-five years. So, the house doesn't...is supposed to be considered historical with the
39 metal roof on it, but the garage has a metal roof and yet they say that the garage is not supposed to be
40 considered historical. So, we just need some direction.

41 We're trying to raze this whole corner, pave Alpine, put a nice tenant in there that would be
42 paying sales tax to the City rather than a blighted area. Go ahead and flip through the photos Jim, and
43 we'll let you get an idea of...keep going...of how this looks. It's...we have a constant problem with
44 homeless here as you'll probably see in the next picture, with the bikes sitting around, but we're doing the
45 best we can with this...you can see the Human Bean in the background. This is basically just a project

1 that we thought we were going to move forward with to help us with our retirement, and we were going to
2 come before you guys and propose that we do something else to beautify North College in addition to
3 what we already did back in 2005. As far as the house and that little apartment go, there's no logic to the
4 inside floorplan. All the windows have been resized and replaced...you'll be able to see, like there, if you
5 go back where you just were a couple Jim? Right there, you can see that the windows have been resized
6 and replaced. The stucco is something that wouldn't have been prior to the 1970's I don't believe, the
7 metal roofs. There's no clear indication on this building when it was built or what it was used for.
8 There's some hypotheses, but there's no clear indication, and therefore, I think that that disqualifies that
9 one by itself. But, the 829, the other house with all of the massive...you know, the crazy additions where
10 it's just like a labyrinth when you want inside of it...it's not...I wouldn't call it historical in integrity
11 walking around through it even if I wanted to for some reason come before the panel and compel you to
12 make it historical. If I told you that...if I came up with something, it would be a lie.

13 The developer is willing to, and has talked about potentially putting in some marble stands or
14 some structure similar to like you see at Lake Tahoe where there's a stand and then some photos...a photo
15 in marble and some history about who lived there and what happened...they did propose that, that was an
16 option that they'd be willing to do. But, with what they want to do on this property, they will not be able
17 to do it if any of these buildings stay intact. Initially, we were told that maybe just the front gas station
18 was going to be designated historical, and then later we were told, no, also the house. Even if it was just
19 the gas station, they spent a lot of money with their architect redrawing everything, trying to figure out
20 how to incorporate that initial original gas station into their development plan and they didn't have
21 enough room to do it. So, our request is that we be allowed to move forward with our development and
22 that we can satisfy the City by honoring these people from the 1920's and 1930's in another way on the
23 property designating and touting what they have done. I mean, it talks a lot about the history of what H.
24 Michael did over time, and we're sitting there at home looking at it going, well, we've done all this...the
25 Human Bean wasn't the first thing we did for Fort Collins, and yet...and I don't want my name on a
26 plaque, but I sure don't think that my house should stand where I live just because I did all those tasks.
27 So, our request is that we're able to move forward and do this development.

28 And, I might say...it's hard for us, for somebody that's about to retire to even be faced with this
29 because I'm looking at a house we own on South College, built in 1920, still has all the old antique lights
30 and everything on the inside of it, and nobody wants that to be historical because the City is taking that
31 whole corner from us, eminent domain, and expanding Trilby. So, when it's that way, it's okay if it's not
32 historical. That house isn't going to be historical because you guys have already, you know, Carrie
33 Allison is already trying to get the land from us...I mean, she will, she's working on it. So, then it's
34 okay. As long as you guys need it, no problem, but if we come to you with an idea and a proposal and a
35 developer comes forward with something that's going to give you a tax base, then all of a sudden this crap
36 hole that I own...I mean it's horrible...I don't mean to, you know...you should see the foundation. I
37 don't mean to knock it down, but it's just, you know, it is what it is. It was built a long time ago, and it
38 was built in 1922, and then again in 1937, and then again in 1950-something, and nobody knows when
39 they put the back apartment on that has asbestos shingles on it, nobody even knows when that was built.
40 It was probably not...it was probably done under the radar, we don't know. Nobody knows when it
41 became an apartment. And, we have no clear indication of when the garage came into existence or what
42 it was used for. So, our proposal is based on the fact that the history isn't that clear...is that we be able to
43 move forward and do what we want to do. And, Mr. Sunday might...do you have anything to say for me?
44 Okay...professor of history from CSU...okay, alright, so that's all I have.

1 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you very much. Alright, that takes us to discussion, and if you have
2 questions for Jim or our appellant, let's begin there with any clarifying questions.

3 MEMBER ERIC GUENTHER: Jim, just a clarifying question relative to the CDOT
4 determination in 2010. Was that completed by a commission or by an individual?

5 MR. BERTOLINI: Yes, that would have been completed by an individual that met the federal
6 standards for a preservation-related field. And I might add, those findings would have been concurred
7 with by similarly qualified professionals at the state Historic Preservation office...that's a regular part of
8 those federal project reviews.

9 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you, Jim. Other questions before we get started with our discussion?

10 MEMBER ANNE NELSEN: I have one. You mentioned, Jim, in your presentation about
11 questioning the integrity of the home. Is that based on the photographs that the appellant showed us
12 tonight? Just a clearer picture of the house and its architectural progression?

13 MR. BERTOLINI: Yes, that's correct. And I will also add that while aerial photography and some
14 permit records allow us a little bit better picture of the service station itself, yes, the specific building
15 history of the house and garage is not well documented and so we're making inferences as best we can
16 based on the records available.

17 MEMBER MEG DUNN: So, I have a question about the CDOT report again. So, they said that
18 the house and the service station could be nationally recognized? Is that correct? Or just the service
19 station?

20 MR. BERTOLINI: Correct. So, the CDOT finding from 2010 was that the service station and
21 residence were both potentially eligible for the National Register. I will note that the argument for
22 significance was much clearer for the service station, but was not well supported for the residence itself.

23 MEMBER M. DUNN: Okay, and then another question. I was just wondering about other
24 service stations like this that have been landmarked. So, I was hoping for something added to the report
25 today, but we didn't get that. So, I just did a quick search...the ones I found are all on Route 66 which
26 makes a lot of sense because that fits with Route 66. But I think it would be helpful if we had...I don't
27 know if maybe staff could find something, but if there's some sense of here is an oblong box in such and
28 such a place...hopefully not on Route 66 because we need to have a better sense of that...that was
29 designated, especially if it was nationally, that really gives us a better sense of where the federal level of
30 looking at these properties is...what they're thinking. I think just to have some examples like that. So, I
31 don't know if it's possible to find something like that right now, but...

32 MEMBER JIM ROSE: Mr. Chairman...Meg, there is an article published by History Colorado on
33 the oblong box as a service station, and it gives some very good information about their evolution in
34 terms of influence by the international style, the use of porcelain enamel panels, which this has some of
35 that on it. So, it isn't all inclusive, but it's a pretty good article, and it's fairly contemporary, talking
36 specifically about service stations as the oblong box and the significance as an architectural element, so
37 you might want to look at that one.

38 MEMBER M. DUNN: I couldn't tell...I did see that...I couldn't tell if the examples they showed
39 are ones that have been landmarked because having Colorado say this is significant versus having the
40 Parks Service, or whoever figures out the national level, say it's significant. I mean, if they're saying,
41 here's an example, it's on the register, wow, now we really get...that's the federal standard of this is what

1 this oblong box is significant for, or something. I don't know, just something that's made it past that bar
2 is what I'm looking for.

3 MEMBER ROSE: But it would seem to me, the CDOT review is for Section 106, is that correct?

4 MR. BERTOLINI: That's correct.

5 MEMBER ROSE: That's a fairly strict criteria, and it doesn't just involve a single individual
6 putting forward their opinion, because it has to pass muster with others. And so, I think the statement that
7 it is eligible, that it meets the criteria of the National Historic Preservation Act sets the bar pretty high.
8 And so...and I agree with you, I don't know where we are with other landmarked structures that might
9 serve as some kind of indicator for us in this particular one, but my particular interest is with the oblong
10 box service station because I think that's the one that really stands out to me. The others are another
11 debate, but I think the mere fact that in 2010, that met criteria...criterion C for the National Historic
12 Preservation Act, I think says a lot about the importance of that as a building. The rest are more
13 speculative.

14 MEMBER GUENTHER: I have two questions, one to follow-up on Jim's comment...Jim
15 Bertolini, why are we required to do a package deal here? Why can't we look at each of these structures
16 individually?

17 MR. BERTOLINI: To clarify, you can. You're...as part of a de novo hearing, you are providing
18 a new finding, and if you find that some but not all, or none, or the resources qualify, that's part of your
19 potential outcome.

20 MEMBER GUENTHER: Okay, thank you. And Mr. Armstrong, a question for you...did you
21 own this property, and it's probably in the material here, but did you own the property in 2010?

22 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes.

23 MEMBER GUENTHER: And did you an opportunity to meet with CDOT and to share your
24 point of view at that time?

25 MR. ARMSTRONG: We knew nothing about this designation until in July or August when we
26 finished with the conceptual review for the developer. Nothing...nobody every told me that this
27 was...had...yeah.

28 MEMBER GUENTHER: So a recommendation is made unilaterally by one person from CDOT,
29 approved by other people from CDOT, and the owner of the property was not aware of that determination
30 and never had an opportunity to comment on that finding.

31 MR. ARMSTRONG: Correct, that is correct. I knew nothing about it. And if I could just say,
32 Jim, the oblong box is not porcelain or enamel in this case, it's metal...in this case, just so you know.
33 You were talking about that, they're all porcelain or enamel, and this one is neither.

34 MEMBER ROSE: It's just painted metal?

35 MR. ARMSTRONG: Correct.

36 MEMBER ROSE: Okay. The reason I bring that up is that's part of the article that I mentioned to
37 you, Meg. And that was in the 1960's and a very new innovation for particularly franchise service
38 stations. And that material was developed because it resists acid and a lot of the caustic things that are
39 used in the consequence of service stations. So, whether or not this has one, it has that appearance, but I

1 think more importantly, the overall configuration of it gives you the idea that this is very much true to its
2 period of construction, which would have been when these sorts of facilities were franchised by major oil
3 companies.

4 MEMBER M. DUNN: So, I just want to clarify something Eric said. So, the CDOT report was
5 written by a preservation historian who was trained in that who works for CDOT; he's not a
6 transportation person, he's a historian person but he works for CDOT. And then when it was looked over
7 by other people, they weren't other CDOT people, they were with History Colorado, correct? Our local
8 preservation...our state preservation office.

9 MR. BERTOLINI: That's correct. Under the National Historic Preservation Act, that's the
10 typical process, is that a qualified historian working for the agency in question, CDOT in this case,
11 completes the survey form...sometimes they contract that out to a third-party historian. And then it has to
12 be concurred with...the finding has to be concurred with by the state historic preservation office which
13 also employs qualified historians.

14 MEMBER M. DUNN: So, it's the folks that oversee historic preservation statewide who signed
15 off on the document?

16 MEMBER GUENTHER: And that's still the process that's in place today?

17 MR. BERTOLINI: Specifically for what are called federal undertakings...those are projects that
18 are using federal funding, federal permits, or are direct actions by federal agencies. That is the process
19 for those agencies...being responsible for historic resources in their project areas. So, the responsibility is
20 not on any private owners unless they are using those federal funds or federal permits; the responsibility
21 for project changes is on the agency doing the project, or funding or permitting the project.

22 MEMBER GUENTHER: So there's not even a provision to notify the property owner that there's
23 been a designation or determination made relative to that property that could have some future effect on
24 the value or the marketability of that...project?

25 MR. BERTOLINI: So, specifically for the National Register, I'm not familiar with what CDOT's
26 internal policies are for notifying the public. I know they have kind of a project accountability like all
27 public agencies, but I can't speak to their specific policies. What I can say is that the National Register is
28 an honorary list...its regulatory role is imposed on federal agencies, their actions to either permit or fund
29 projects or do projects themselves. We use that information to support our Land Use Code, but we are
30 not beholden to the findings of CDOT. In effect, the 2010 CDOT finding we used as kind of a secondary
31 piece of literature to support the process we require in our City Code and based on our City standards.
32 Does that answer your question?

33 MEMBER GUENTHER: It does, although I find the CDOT process to be extraordinarily flawed,
34 frankly, if at a minimum, the property owner doesn't have an opportunity, or isn't at a minimum informed
35 that there's some action being taken that affects their property.

36 MEMBER JENNA EDWARDS: Jim, can you clarify the process a little bit? So, you used the
37 CDOT report as kind of auxiliary material, right? You still...the staff still conducted a review of the sites
38 and gave your own finding, right?

39 MR. BERTOLINI: That's correct.

40 MEMBER EDWARDS: Okay, thank you.

1 MEMBER BONNIE EDWARDS: Jim, quick question. Can you clarify for everybody here the
2 difference between eligible, recommended eligible, and listed?

3 MR. BERTOLINI: Certainly. For the development review process, a property that is found
4 eligible is...it's still offered some protection under the Land Use Code. The responsibility of the
5 developer is to incorporate eligible resources into their project, so it's really project driven what the
6 outcome is. However, one of the potential outcomes for eligible resources is still demolition if the
7 developer makes a successful request for a modification of standards...that's typically something that will
8 still come through this Preservation Commission to approve. That's an option that's not available for
9 designated City landmarks, those are protected, and while we do have a variance process for certain
10 alterations, demolition is typically not on the list of things that can be approved for designated City
11 landmarks. So, that's really the main difference between the development review code and 3.4.7 and the
12 protections offered for designated resources is that demolition is still possible for landmark eligible
13 resources.

14 MEMBER MARGO CARLOCK: Jim, one quick point of clarification? I believe you said
15 that...I'm restating this...but I believe you said that the CDOT report is a resource but we are not bound
16 by it.

17 MR. BERTOLINI: That's correct.

18 MEMBER M. DUNN: And I just want to point out for the record...for all of these projects, we
19 don't like these kinds of surprises any more than property owners do, and the best way to avoid these kind
20 of surprises is for City Council to give us a budget item that would help us to get these surveys done in
21 advance so that property owners are notified well before they even consider selling their property to
22 anyone else, and then everyone knows from the get go, and all of that information would be on our
23 website online so developers and prospective buyers would be able to look up that information in advance
24 and know exactly what to expect for the property they are buying. But, because we don't have that
25 funding, we have to rely on this ad hoc system where the development request is what triggers the review,
26 and that's why there are surprises. So, there is a way to stop having surprises, but it's going to take
27 funding. And until we get enough funding and enough staff to get out there, especially with the lack of
28 surveys we've been doing for so long, we are behind. We need to just catch up and then keep working on
29 these new properties coming online as possibly in that historic era. And then we won't have these
30 surprises anymore; that's the key to change this situation. So, in the meantime, we're stuck with this, you
31 know, jack-in-the-box pop up and surprise you scenario where we have to deal with things as they come
32 up, which is unfortunate. It's no fun for anyone.

33 MEMBER NELSEN: I have a potential red herring clarification question, so I apologize. But,
34 Jim Rose, you mentioned Section 106 and I am not familiar with what Section 106 is, in case that comes
35 up later in the conversation, could we have that clarified now?

36 MR. BERTOLINI: Certainly. So that's...while technically the citation is outdated since there's
37 been a renumbering in the U.S. Code. Section 106 refers to Section 106 of the National Historic
38 Preservation Act, and that requires federal agencies to account for their effects on historic resources for
39 their undertakings. That's a fairly broad definition, including anything they fund, permit, or do
40 themselves on their land, or as a direct action, but does require a fairly comprehensive cultural resource
41 review for projects that have a federal connection of some kind, and most CDOT projects involve some
42 degree of federal funding from the Federal Highway Administration.

1 MEMBER ROSE: And just one thing I might add, if that determination of the eligibility of those
2 projects and being register-eligible had then affected the process of the Federal Highway Administration
3 finding any work on North College that would have affected those properties, that would have required
4 mitigation because those being eligible, and impact on those eligible properties would have to be
5 mitigated. So that means they would have had to develop means by which somehow they could satisfy
6 the letter of the law in the Historic Preservation Act to do their best to preserve the property. Now
7 sometimes what that would mean is it would allow the project to continue, and if let's say they were
8 going to widen North College to six lanes, and all that property was going to be in the way, the mitigation
9 might be...documentation and recording of all the structures simply to preserve the historic existence of
10 those structures, but they wouldn't have been saved. As it turns out, I think, there wasn't any mitigation
11 necessary because there wasn't any effect, and so, in that case then, there's no negative effect. And as a
12 consequence then, they still remain eligible, but there isn't any requirement for CDOT to do anything
13 more.

14 MEMBER NELSEN: And then also...thank you both...thank you to the two Jim's. there's also a
15 article, or excuse me, an article that was mentioned and referenced from History Colorado...I've also
16 looked at that. Jim, that was linked in your presentation, I think? Not in our packet, but in tonight's
17 presentation. So, just so that we're all on the same page about the information that we have, would you
18 mind pulling that up again? Maybe those of us with laptops or iPads could look at it, or...I don't know
19 how we handle this sort of information, which I think is potentially useful to our conversation, but
20 everyone may not have had the chance to review.

21 MR. BERTOLINI: Certainly, the short answer I'll give you is that staff did include what we
22 considered relevant material from that article in the survey form that we issued on September 7th. As far
23 as introducing the full article itself into the record, I'll have to refer to the City Attorney as to whether we
24 can do that since this is an appeal.

25 MS. HAVELDA: I love when you promote me to City Attorney. So, just a couple clarifying
26 questions...the link to the article was in the staff report which was part of the packet that was published,
27 correct?

28 MR. BERTOLINI: No, that was a later addition to the staff presentation. It's not in the published
29 packet that's posted online.

30 MS. HAVELDA: Then I think the best thing to do, if you would like to look at that, would be to
31 adjourn this to the next hearing time so that our applicant has time to review that and provide any rebuttal
32 that they would like to, or they can waive that, or you all can simply not rely on it beyond what
33 Commission member Rose, or Nelsen, or our staff, have told you about so far.

34 MR. ARMSTRONG: I will not agree to waive that. It wasn't in the packet; I haven't seen it
35 either. It should be excluded.

36 MS. HAVELDA: So, the portions of it that were in the packet and referenced in the staff report,
37 just to be clear, are fair for you to rely upon. The remainder I would ask that you not consider in your
38 decision-making process.

39 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you for the clarification. Alright, let's get on then to the three issues
40 that we need to chat about and make determination of significance and integrity. The first for the station
41 only is for events and trends, and I'd like to hear some discussions around that. Do we have...does this

1 fit events and trends for 3.4.7? And I would remind everyone that 3.4.7 covers design, materials,
2 workmanship, location, setting, feeling, and association.

3 MEMBER GUENTHER: Mr. Chairman, can you clarify, are we going to address those issues for
4 each individual structure, or are we...?

5 CHAIR KNIERIM: So this one, as Jim talked about, was for the station only for events and
6 trends. The persons and groups, number two, is for the residence only, and then number three, the
7 architecture, is for the station only, is the way I understand it. Is that correct?

8 MEMBER M. DUNN: I think events was the service station and the garage.

9 CHAIR KNIERIM: And the garage, thank you. I amend that.

10 MEMBER M. DUNN: I think I struggle more with the significance of the garage towards events.
11 I think the service station makes a lot more sense...it's a...I mean, it has a name, the style has a name,
12 whereas the storage, used to be a house maybe, thing in the back doesn't...it's kind of a vernacular
13 hodgepodge storage building style. I just don't know that it fits the level of significance for events.

14 MEMBER GUENTHER: I agree.

15 MEMBER M. DUNN: And I suppose, in terms of events, the event is...it's our community
16 moving across the river, which is kind of a big deal because across the river is kind of like across the
17 tracks in some sense, and yet here's a business moving that way. So, that's significant, and I totally get
18 that the service station fits into that because that's the actual center of commerce that we're talking about.
19 Storage in the back doesn't seem to fit into that, you know...I don't know, it just doesn't seem to rise to a
20 level of significance to me in terms of moving north, or change in automobile use, or any of that...it's
21 storage. Or, I mean, unless it was a garage where they worked on cars, but it doesn't...it's got the three
22 bays, but it still doesn't seem as significant as the service center to me.

23 CHAIR KNIERIM: I would agree with that. I mean looking at when...if we look at, like, the
24 historical trajectory of the 1920's into the 1950's with the rise of the automobile and the growth of the
25 city and that sort of thing...you know, by the time that we get to the 1950's, we're a whopping fourteen
26 thousand residents and all that, you know. I think that's much more significant than the storage shed.

27 MEMBER M. DUNN: Well, it's bigger than a shed, but...

28 CHAIR KNIERIM: So, let's keep that in mind and keep moving forward.

29 MEMBER M. DUNN: Mr. Chair, I'd kind of like to hear what other folks think on that. Only a
30 couple of us spoke up.

31 MEMBER NELSEN: I was nodding my head, which doesn't get recorded in the minutes, so I
32 apologize. I'm not sure that I have much to add. I was sort of frantically flipping through the packet one
33 more time to make sure that, Meg, you came up with sort of a guess about, oh, it might have been used for
34 this...the garage that is. But I don't think we've seen evidence that shows that that's the case in that
35 case...it doesn't seem like that building, meaning the garage slash, what are we calling it? The storage
36 shed...is significant for events or trends.

37 MEMBER EDWARDS: I agree.

38 CHAIR KNIERIM: Other Commissioners? Thoughts?

1 MEMBER CARLOCK: Well, I'm not so sure that I agree with the events and trends, even on the
2 gas station, to be honest with you. But definitely the garage I think is just...it's not something that...and
3 the CDOT report didn't include it in the beginning so, I think that one's an easy one to set aside. I'm
4 more concerned about the garage...the service station and the house, so I'll wait, hold my comments until
5 we get to those.

6 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. Let's move on to number two...

7 MEMBER M. DUNN: Walter has something to say.

8 MEMBER WALTER DUNN: It's not very important. I was just going to agree with what Margo
9 was saying. In my mind, the garage I've kind of just put aside as not significant in this kind of
10 discussion, so I would go with the service station in the events and trends as being more important.

11 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you.

12 MEMBER NELSEN: So, sorry to keep this going...Margo, you mentioned that you don't think
13 the service station is significant for events and trends. Are we coming back to that? We are...okay, I
14 apologize for not following the...

15 CHAIR KNIERIM: Yes...no worries...my students can't follow me either.

16 MEMBER NELSEN: I won't comment on that...only as a reflection of my abilities, not of yours.

17 CHAIR KNIERIM: Alright, let's...I'd like to get everything on the table and then we'll make
18 some final decisions. For persons and groups, that's the residence only as I understand it, and that refers
19 to the three people of significance in the residence. Let's chat about that and then we'll circle back
20 around to the architecture of the station and then look at this whole issue as a whole.

21 MEMBER GUENTHER: Mr. Chairman, I know we have some latitude when it comes to whether
22 or not events took place on site or in this specific home; however, I discount that a little bit in this
23 situation. I don't feel that the events and trends were sufficiently established to warrant historic
24 designation, and part of that is due not only to the fact that the events didn't occur on site, but that they
25 don't necessarily represent the history of Fort Collins in my estimation. They may be important aspects
26 in fashion history, or World War II history, in a different context, but I don't think that they
27 represent...what these two women, what they accomplished...don't represent the history of Fort Collins.

28 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you.

29 MEMBER CARLOCK: I would also say that the house, the way it exists now, or shall we say
30 the...conglomeration of structures...I doubt if it has any resemblance to what the house looked like when
31 the event actually took place. It seems to me like the historical significance has been totally blown on that
32 structure.

33 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you.

34 MEMBER M. DUNN: Well, I want to start with the architecture of the house, even though we're
35 not looking at that as significance, but I'm deeply concerned by the number of shingle houses we're
36 losing in Fort Collins. We didn't have many to begin with, and we're losing them quickly. However, I
37 don't think that this house has a level of significance for that even to be considered, and it wasn't even
38 recommended. So, I just wanted to make that statement, that if this house is demolished, it's yet one
39 more shingle house we're losing, which I just find a little sad. And it's a loss of our history.

1 As far as for people, I have no problem with events happening elsewhere because, especially
2 when a woman goes home, she does a lot of her work there anyway. But, I don't see that their...and I
3 believe what they did is a very important part of Fort Collins history in terms of women's history overall,
4 I think all women's contributions are an important part of our local history. I just don't know that these
5 two women, in particular, did anything...I don't know...I'm not convinced. I don't feel like we've had a
6 solid enough argument presented to us that what these two women did was, I don't know, in any way
7 really pivotal, or substantial enough to landmark this house. And that's...there are some women's history
8 stories for Fort Collins, even in terms of fashion and design, and...or I think of Liz Case when I just think
9 of...in terms of getting involved in social issues and community issues, and wow, that's a perfect
10 example right there of a person who's life made a really significant difference in our community, and you
11 know, if she did all her work sitting on her back dog house, I'd say let's landmark that dog house because
12 she, I know right away, was a really, really critical, important part of our history. I'm not convinced of
13 that for these two women. Not to say that...I think it's great that we had local merchants that were
14 women, and we had many of them, and this is some great examples of that, and that were really involved.
15 I just don't know that they rise above the level of the average shop owner, I guess is what I'm saying.

16 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you.

17 MEMBER M. DUNN: Sorry about the rambles.

18 MEMBER NELSEN: No, thank you for putting into words what I've been feeling in my gut, to
19 be honest. I'm not sure that I could put it more clearly than you, but I also haven't seen evidence, to be
20 honest, that these two individuals are so important in our local history that we should save the house that
21 they lived in. And I also share the trepidation about the integrity of the home. I'm not sure that it's intact
22 enough to make it worth the effort.

23 MEMBER ROSE: It just seems to me that if we're really just talking about significance, I think I
24 can give you a pass on that in terms of the importance of these individuals and whether or not their
25 association is vital, but I think it's going to fail miserably in terms of integrity. And so, you know, it has
26 to meet both of those, and in order to satisfy the significance aspect, you know, we can debate that and
27 determine the relative importance of the individuals. I think the integrity aspect that we'll discuss
28 subsequently I think is the place where I have the most concern.

29 CHAIR KNIERIM: Alright, yeah, let's move on to that. I think we've talked a bit about the
30 integrity of the residence. Is there any more discussion around that? Really what we're focusing on for
31 this one is the impact of the two women, and I would agree, I like the word, Meg, that you used: pivotal.
32 I don't...you know, they did important things, but were they pivotal to the history of Fort Collins, and I
33 don't know that it rises to that standard.

34 MEMBER CARLOCK: Mr. Chair, another consideration is that I suspect if we just...if that
35 building stood the way it is now, no one driving by is going to know anything about either of the Mrs.
36 Kraxberger's, but the suggestion of putting up some kind of a plaque or to describe the importance that
37 they held, or the significance that they held, say that there was some significance...I think that that's a
38 far...there's going to be a whole heck of a lot more people in Fort Collins who are going to know who
39 those two ladies were from that than just driving by a dilapidated, cobbled together structure.

40 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you.

41 MEMBER ROSE: Mr. Chairman, I guess I would say, of the sort of seven aspects that we would
42 look at, the only one that I can say really, maybe, is there may be a couple location and setting. But I

1 think to determine the design and how that might have originally appeared versus the...what Mr.
2 Armstrong showed us in terms of this obvious hodgepodge of ad hoc additions. I think it really calls into
3 question the change of materials, the workmanship, and the overall feeling. I don't think the feeling is the
4 same now as it would have been when it was originally constructed as a residence. So, I think there's any
5 number of these aspects that kind of fall short, and so that's where I just don't think it meets the integrity
6 component.

7 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. Let's move on and put the architecture of the station on the
8 table, and then we can begin making...narrowing some decisions and call for a motion. This is for
9 architecture, and again, we're looking at significance and integrity of the station under the architecture,
10 specifically the oblong.

11 MEMBER CARLOCK: Mr. Chair, I have a comment. I think that if we were...let me move this
12 closer...I think if we were looking at the original 1937 structure, I'd have maybe a different though and
13 feeling about this, because to me, that's a fairly unique style. And what they did in the '60 was what
14 happened so much in the '60's with urban renewal, where things with...that I would consider had historic
15 character were torn down or severely modified and redone into something that was, I guess, popular at the
16 time. But, this...the revision to the Aamco station, in order to get there, they had to severely modify and
17 change the original building. So, even if we consider the oblong box structure as a significant
18 architectural style, I don't think this fits that because of the modifications. I think the building was so
19 revised and revamped in order to fit into that mold, that it is not an original example of that style of
20 architecture.

21 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you.

22 MEMBER M. DUNN: I would have to say I completely disagree with that. If we look at the
23 Northern Hotel, it's landmarked because of it's art deco features, which is a substantial modification from
24 the Victorian four-story it was before that, which was a modification from the Victorian three-story it was
25 before that, which was a substantial modification of the two-story, actually first it was a little triangle...it
26 was the big triangle, before that it was a little triangle, before that it was just a rectangular brick box,
27 before that it was a wooden hotel, before that it was in a totally different location, and yet it's landmarked,
28 and it's a beloved site. And so, the building changing over time means we're not going to landmark it for
29 what it was in the beginning, but we would landmark it for what it ended up in the end. And that's what
30 we're looking at here is, it's an oblong box now, and that's...it was historically turned into that, so that's
31 what we would be looking at. We're not looking at what it was before that, although I think this would be
32 a less difficult discussion if it was that earlier version, because it was cute, and an oblong box is an oblong
33 box. So, I can't say it's the most beautiful form of architecture, but boy does it typify our thinking in
34 terms of architecture at that time, and we are still in that era. Just look at all the new boxes going up
35 everywhere. So, in that sense, I would say this fits to a T what the oblong box is. It's got the little office
36 in the corner, it's got the little garage doors on the opposite side, I mean, it's classic. If you dropped me
37 in the middle of nowhere and you stuck that in front of me, I would immediately know it was a service
38 station; it is that clear to me what it is based on its architecture. That's the era when it's telling you, this
39 is for a car, bring your car by, I mean it screams that to me, and so, I think, in terms of architecture, this
40 is...it fits. It is exactly what the description of this type of architecture is. The question for me is, how
41 does Fort Collins view that in terms of significance? I personally am not thrilled with oblong boxes;
42 they're not pretty, they're not Victorian little, you know, gingerbreaded buildings, and yet it still tells our
43 story of who we are as a people, and the fact that we were willing to tear down really those beautiful,
44 pretty, gingerbreaded buildings in order to build these, that says something about us as a people. So, in
45 terms of that, I think that's where the significance would lie.

1 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you, Meg.

2 MEMBER GUENTHER: Mr. Chairman, I absolutely agree with what Margo said, and I tried...I
3 visited this site today and looked at all three structures, and came back and looked at the photographs of
4 the original 1925, I believe, and 1937 building. The 1937 building is essentially the gas station that my
5 grandfather owned in eastern Nebraska and that my mother grew up working in. So, yeah, there's a
6 nostalgic feeling for those structures. However, when I see the current iteration, you know, in the
7 photographs and as I visited it today, I just don't see an architectural statement that resonates. The oblong
8 may be important; it reminds me a bit, frankly, in this case, of a visit that I took to Bratislava shortly after
9 the wall came down and the Soviet Union dissolved, and it's just very functional architecture. Not to
10 suggest that there's not room for function in architecture, but I think these buildings in certain cases, and
11 probably in this case, were designed to be inexpensive, to put up quickly, and to be purely functional
12 without any real resonating or enduring design that suggests that they should be protected at the same
13 level as some other buildings. I recognize that statement will create a lot of controversy among the
14 people sitting at this table, but I don't see that it has the architectural significance to retain it, and in
15 looking in aggregate at those three buildings on the site, listening to the current owner's point of view, I
16 have to agree: it's a blighted site, it's deteriorated, it hasn't been well-maintained, and in addition to
17 looking at the past, I feel compelled to look to the future. So, what's the future of this site in the next
18 twenty-five, or fifty, or seventy-five years? I don't feel that it will be improved; I feel that it will
19 probably stay the same. There won't be another buyer who comes in and wants to purchase it. We know
20 the current owner's point of view on it, so what legacy do we leave for future generations with respect to
21 this whole three structure property if we vote not to move forward with the proposal...or with the owner's
22 proposal?

23 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you.

24 MEMBER ROSE: Mr. Chairman, I guess I would...and I concur with Meg, although I guess I
25 would add, I don't think there's any particular need to concern ourselves with anything that happened
26 before 1950. I mean, the other stations that were on this site are of no relevance because this structure,
27 this station, is relevant and eligible because it was constructed in 1950, and it is constructed and was
28 altered in the 1960's, and it fits exactly, prototypically, the style of that era, and that's exactly what we're
29 trying to demonstrate; that's the story we're trying to tell. That's why it's important to Fort Collins,
30 because Fort Collins was part of that movement. It was all across the country. I mean, Standard Oil
31 franchised hundreds of these stations and they all look just like this. So, I think it's important for Fort
32 Collins' component of that story to be told, and this building tells that story. It doesn't matter what was
33 there before, it's simply this began and is eligible because it's seventy-two years old.

34 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you.

35 MEMBER M. DUNN: I just want to point out that the Linden Hotel was so dilapidated that it had
36 six inches deep of pigeon poop on the second and third story, and the back wall fell out when they started
37 rehabilitating it, and yet they continued to rehabilitate it, and just a portion of the second story recently
38 sold for over two million dollars. So, the fact that something is dilapidated now doesn't mean we have
39 any sense of what is going to happen to it in the future.

40 MEMBER GUENTHER: Meg, I agree with that, and I appreciate the historic significance of all
41 of these properties. But, for every example you give like that, and I don't have a specific one, we can
42 look around the community and find another half dozen examples of places that haven't been renovated
43 and haven't been maintained. So, that's a great example of one that has, but I bet if we got in the car and

1 took a drive just around North College, we could find, like a said, for every one example of something
2 that has been cared for and renovated, a half dozen that haven't been, and probably won't be, sadly.

3 MEMBER M. DUNN: I'm just saying that that's not a reason that we use for designating or not
4 designating, and that even important buildings...if a building is important, even if it's dilapidated, we
5 have in the past landmarked them, and it's just that the dilapidation is not a reason not to landmark
6 something; that's not one of our criteria we use. If the dilapidation has somehow affected the integrity,
7 then that would be part of the issue. But, just something falling apart and not being maintained, well,
8 perhaps if it's landmarked then they'll start taking advantage of the tax credits and the other incentives
9 that help rehabilitate. But the dilapidation itself is just not part of our criteria.

10 CHAIR KNIERIM: I appreciate the conversation, and as I've been looking at all of this, I come
11 down on the side of story, and I'm kind of with Meg and Jim with this, that this does tell a story, and it's a
12 very prototypical example of the story of these gas stations and of the development of Fort Collins and
13 the larger United States in the 1960's and that sort of thing. So, I come down leaning toward eligibility
14 for the gas station. The garage, the house, I'm okay with not doing that with, but the station I'm leaning
15 toward looking at eligibility. That's where I am.

16 MEMBER M. DUNN: I think part of what we need to be thinking about as a community, not just
17 the Commission, is what is our story and when does the story end. And I think when it comes to historic
18 preservation, we often think that that story ended around right before World War II, and the rest of the
19 story, well, that's just when I grew up, that's not really part of our story. You know, it's so close to us,
20 we don't think about the value of preserving that history, and yet for our kids, our growing up is ancient
21 history, and that's the history that we kind of want them to understand and know so that when they're
22 looking back on the overall history of Fort Collins, they understand it better and they have the artifacts to
23 get it. And, cars and the change that that made to Fort Collins is incredibly significant, and it really is part
24 of the story that, especially as we become a more bike-friendly, pedestrian-friendly city, that car time
25 period is an important part of our history. And, as we are redoing our streets and improving, basically
26 kind of going back to the way people used to build where you could walk places and bike places...we
27 want to remember that there was that time period where we went car crazy, and we shot south mostly, and
28 the fact that we shot north is kind of particularly interesting because most of our growth has been to the
29 south, and yet...I mean if you drive up North College, it's almost all car businesses. So, there's
30 something to that...there's something to that story, there's something about who we have been as a
31 people in terms of using our cars. The very fact that teenagers for fun would get in their car and drive for
32 hours on a Friday night...that's a story my kids would not understand; they can't even imagine growing
33 up that way. That's the kind of story we need to make sure somehow we're saving tangible artifacts so
34 that someday, they look back and go, really, you did that? Do you have proof? Yeah, well here's, that's
35 the A&W we stopped at, there's the center parking we would park at, and I mean, those are the things we
36 need to help tell that story. And for us, it's not that important of a story, it's just kind of the how things
37 have been, but for our kids, that's an important part of their history.

38 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thoughts from other Commissioners? At this point, I would maybe
39 recommend if there's no more discussion, and I would love to hear more discussion, that perhaps we put a
40 motion on the table. I'd like to take a short recess at eight o'clock, maybe just a ten-minute recess to
41 stretch our legs a little bit, but maybe we could get a motion on the table. There will be no discussion
42 during the recess, but just to move this forward. If there's more...and then once we have the motion on
43 the table, then there will be discussion around the motion. But, certainly just a reminder, we don't need to
44 have a unanimous decision.

1 MS. HAVELDA: Mr. Chair, if I might make a suggestion because I feel like this is going to be a
2 little bit tricky with the motions. If someone would like to make a motion, and I'm not suggesting that
3 they do or they don't, but if someone would like to put a motion on the table regarding the eligibility of
4 the home and the garage as one unit, and perhaps separate out the station, because that is what I'm
5 sensing will have more of a discussion on the motion. That might be the most efficient way to handle this
6 matter.

7 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you.

8 MEMBER GUENTHER: So, point of clarification, so that would be two separate motions, or
9 everything contained in one motion?

10 MS. HAVELDA: I think the easiest way to do it would be two separate motions.

11 MEMBER GUENTHER: Thanks.

12 CHAIR KNIERIM: Because it seems we have some level of consensus around the house and the
13 garage, so let's perhaps make a motion there, and then recess, and then dig into the station some more.
14 So, I would entertain a motion for...well, any motion, but perhaps taking the advice of counsel.

15 MEMBER M. DUNN: I'm willing to give it a stab, but I might need a little help near the end with
16 the findings of fact. I move that the Historic Preservation Commission find the residential house and the
17 accessory garage located at 825 North College Avenue do not meet the eligibility standards outlined in
18 Section 14-22 of the Fort Collins Municipal Code, and are not historic resources for the purpose of
19 project review under Land Use Code 3.4.7 based on the following findings of fact: that they lack the level
20 of significance and integrity that we would expect to see.

21 MS. HAVELDA: I think that's sufficient, Meg.

22 MEMBER M. DUNN: Okay, thank you.

23 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you, Meg.

24 MEMBER ROSE: Second.

25 CHAIR KNIERIM: And a second from Jim Rose. So, this is a motion to say that the residence
26 and the accessory garage at 825 North College do not meet the standards of significance and integrity in
27 14-22 and 3.4.7. This was put forward by Meg and seconded by Jim Rose. Is there discussion on this
28 motion? Hearing none, let's call for a roll call vote on this motion.

29 MS. MELISSA MATSUNAKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Eric Guenther?

30 MEMBER GUENTHER: Yes.

31 MS. MATSUNAKA: Anne Nelsen?

32 MEMBER NELSEN: Yes.

33 MS. MATSUNAKA: Walter Dunn?

34 MEMBER W. DUNN: Yes.

35 MS. MATSUNAKA: Jenna Edwards?

36 MEMBER EDWARDS: Yes.

1 MS. MATSUNAKA: Meg Dunn?
2 MEMBER M. DUNN: Yes.
3 MS. MATSUNAKA: Jim Rose?
4 MEMBER ROSE: Yes.
5 MS. MATSUNAKA: Bonnie Gibson?
6 MEMBER BONNIE GIBSON: Yes.
7 MS. MATSUNAKA: Margo Carlock?
8 MEMBER CARLOCK: Yes.
9 MS. MATSUNAKA: Kurt Knierim?
10 CHAIR KNIERIM: Yes.
11 MS. MATSUNAKA: Mr. Chair, the ayes have it, the motion carries.
12 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. At this point, it is nearing eight o'clock and I would call for a
13 ten- minute recess and then we will come back and finish discussion agenda item number six. It is now
14 eight o'clock; let's adjourn back here at eight ten P.M.
15 (**Secretary's Note: The Commission took a brief recess at this point in the meeting.)
16 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. Roll call please?
17 MS. MATSUNAKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Margo Carlock?
18 MEMBER CARLOCK: Here.
19 MS. MATSUNAKA: Meg Dunn?
20 MEMBER M. DUNN: Here.
21 MS. MATSUNAKA: Walter Dunn?
22 MEMBER W. DUNN: Here.
23 MS. MATSUNAKA: Jenna Edwards?
24 MEMBER EDWARDS: Here.
25 MS. MATSUNAKA: Bonnie Gibson?
26 MEMBER GIBSON: Here.
27 MS. MATSUNAKA: Eric Guenther?
28 MEMBER GUENTHER: Here.
29 MS. MATSUNAKA: Anne Nelsen?
30 MEMBER NELSEN: Here.
31 MS. MATSUNAKA: Jim Rose?

1 MEMBER ROSE: Here.

2 MS. MATSUNAKA: Kurt Knierim?

3 CHAIR KNIERIM: Here.

4 MS. MATSUNAKA: Mr. Chair, you have all nine present.

5 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. Alright, let's resume our discussion around the gas station, and
6 we are talking about its significance and integrity around events and trends and architecture, and I'd like
7 to hear more comment about that, and then we will consider a motion.

8 MEMBER ROSE: Mr. Chairman, I guess from the aspect of events and trends, and I think Meg
9 mentioned this earlier, I think there's a commercial aspect to this kind of a facility that weaves itself into
10 the history by virtue of the development and evolution of commerce in Fort Collins and the whole, kind
11 of, progress that was made in terms of improvement of highways and transportation, and all of those
12 elements, that I think this is a part and piece of that. And I think it's a part that's particular to Fort Collins
13 because, as has been documented in the background material, it's the first station really north of the river.
14 And I think that says something about how Fort Collins was evolving in the era of transportation and
15 growth. And so, as a consequence, I think, from an integrity standpoint, we can talk about all kinds of
16 other things, but from a significance standpoint, I think it does meet the criteria that suggest it has to have
17 contributed in some way to our understanding of how things were developing and that history we're
18 talking about. I would also agree, I don't think it's the most significant component in terms of making it
19 eligible, I think by far the architecture has, to me, unquestionably a very significant aspect, but I think
20 because of its association with the growth and development of Fort Collins, I think it meets that criteria,
21 so I would suggest that it is eligible from that standpoint.

22 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you.

23 MEMBER GUENTHER: I clearly struggle with this one. I think probably nobody at the table
24 has a better appreciation for how the automobile revolutionized American transportation than me having
25 worked for Ford Motor Company and the Ford family for thirty-one years. I'm actually just looking back
26 at some old Henry Ford advertising from the '20's when they talked about making places that were
27 previously inaccessible to people now accessible, whether that's the mountains and the valleys, or north
28 of the river here in Fort Collins. You know, I liken it to some of my experience with helping Ford
29 develop dealerships over time, and we traditionally, in that capacity, and again, we all speak from
30 experience, try to find enhancements or improvements for facilities, and so a little bit of my point of view
31 is informed by that experience. I just really struggle with this particular oblong box being a very
32 important architectural style. I'm not an architect, but to me, as I mentioned earlier, it seems like a lot of
33 these buildings were developed with a dispensable mindset. The builders, the owners wanted to put them
34 up cheaply so that they could get the fastest possible return on their investment. They didn't put the
35 buildings up with any concern for the architecture or the beauty, they wanted to make them functional so
36 they could make money, and that's the sad reality of it. So, when I look at a very functional space like
37 this, I tend to see just that, something that doesn't really make a statement; it's very nondescript. I have a
38 hard time seeing how it really tells a story, or connects south Fort Collins to north Fort Collins, or really
39 defines the history of our community. To me, it's a very generic structure.

40 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you.

41 MEMBER CARLOCK: Mr. Chair, I think addressing the events and trends part, I am absolutely
42 in agreement that the introduction of the automobile and the mobility that it gave to citizens and people to

1 be able to travel, the importance that it played in the development of society, I think all of that is a very
2 legitimate. To me, if we were looking at the original structures, that was more around the time when that
3 trend happened. I think by the '60's, that was a well-established pattern of life, and I don't see that as a
4 significant as an event and trend at that point, particularly considering what it might become now, or if we
5 do uphold eligibility, it will just end up staying the same, staying there, there won't be an ability to
6 redevelop that area. I just don't see it as meeting the significance required to obviate the interests of the
7 owner.

8 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. Counsel?

9 MS. HAVELDA: Mr. Chair, if I might, I think all the comments are well taken, I just want to
10 remind the Commission that in this forum, the policy regarding what happens with the future
11 development is not relevant to your consideration. So, when you are deciding...when you are articulating
12 reasons for that decision, I would just caution against having that as part of your rationale.

13 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you.

14 MEMBER CARLOCK: My apologies.

15 MEMBER GUENTHER: Can I ask just a question about that? And I probably should know this,
16 but is that stated somewhere, Claire? Because I have a hard time really separating decisions that we
17 make...generally a decision that we make, you have to consider implications for the future as difficult as
18 that may be. But, is that stated somewhere?

19 MS. HAVELDA: So, what I would say is that what is stated is the Code provisions that you are
20 allowed to rely upon and use as the criteria for your decision. That the legislative body of City Council
21 did not see fit to put future considerations of development within the purview of the Historic Preservation
22 Society [*sic*] is certainly something that this Commission could address with Council, but at this time, it's
23 not within the purview. And so, what we see is that this Commission has...it's strict purview is historic
24 preservation, but when or if this were to go and be appealed before City Council, City Council has the
25 ability to take into account other policy considerations because that is within their purview. I completely
26 understand the frustration...I think Council themselves have been...recently expressed some frustration
27 that this Commission is so limited in what they consider, but as the Code stands now, that is the
28 parameters of your consideration.

29 MR. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chairman, can I make a comment?

30 CHAIR KNIERIM: Certainly.

31 MR. ARMSTRONG: I understand the City Attorney's position, but I want to bring up to the
32 council that none of this would have happened if we hadn't have made a development request. And so,
33 while the historic preservation wants to keep everything separate, we get blindsided by it when we
34 submit...we pay money for a conceptual review, we lay out a lot of work to other people that are drawing
35 everything up, and then we find...and so, I understand what she is saying, but it doesn't make any sense at
36 all because by us not developing this, we wouldn't be here tonight. And this also includes a vacant,
37 blighted lot behind the property with a bunch of foundations that was in the arial photos earlier. So,
38 future development does matter because that's why we...that's why you brought me here today...because
39 I asked for future development.

40 MS. HAVELDA: And Mr. Armstrong, you're pointing out exactly the frustration with the Code
41 that I believe chair member [*sic*] Dunn had pointed out. What I would suggest, sir, is that you make

1 public comment at City Council meetings, because that is how City Council will precipitate the change to
2 the Code.

3 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. That being said, is there other discussion around this, or would
4 someone like to push forward a motion on the station only? And then we can have more discussion
5 around that before a vote.

6 MEMBER M. DUNN: I can make an attempt.

7 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you.

8 MEMBER M. DUNN: I move that the Historic Preservation Commission find the service station
9 at 825 North College Avenue meets the eligibility standards outlined in Section 14-22 of the Fort Collins
10 Municipal Code, and is an historic resource for the purposes of project review under Land Use Code
11 3.4.7, based on the fact that it embodies an important evolution in commerce and transportation in Fort
12 Collins as businesses began to move north of the Poudre River, in part enabled by the growing use of
13 motorized transportation, and on the fact that the architecture is a classic example of the utterly unornate
14 oblong box style of garage architecture.

15 MS. HAVELDA: Commission member Dunn, may I make a clarification? The second point you
16 made, was that a point that speaks to the integrity? The first point surely spoke to the significance, but I
17 just want to make sure we also have a factual basis for integrity.

18 MEMBER M. DUNN: So, my first point spoke to events, the second spoke to architecture. I
19 didn't even include integrity. So, and finding that it had integrity to support both aspects of significance.

20 MS. HAVELDA: Thank you.

21 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. Is there a second?

22 MEMBER ROSE: I second.

23 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. Alright, the motion has been put forward by Commissioner
24 Dunn and seconded by Commissioner Rose that the service station at 825 North Fort Collins *[sic]* meets
25 the standards for eligibility under 3.4.7 for significance and integrity. Is there discussion on the motion?

26 MEMBER M. DUNN: I just want to point out that I added the 'utterly unornate' on purpose
27 because, as we move to post World War II architecture, we will more often start to see forms of
28 architecture, such as Brutalist, that people don't necessarily take to. We don't want to run up and hug it;
29 it's not pretty, it's not quaint, it's not...it's not something we're drawn to. It's really...I mean that's part
30 of the international style is boxes and glass and things that we're very used to now, but we don't
31 necessarily feel like we get attached to, and yet, it still tells our story, and that's what historic preservation
32 is about, is not saving the pretty things, but saving the important things that tell our story.

33 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. Other discussion on the motion? Hearing none, let's have a roll
34 call vote on the motion on the table regarding the service station at 825 North College Avenue.

35 MS. MATSUNAKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Eric Guenther?

36 MEMBER GUENTHER: Nay.

37 MS. MATSUNAKA: Anne Nelsen?

38 MEMBER NELSEN: Yes.

1 MS. MATSUNAKA: Walter Dunn?
2 MEMBER W. DUNN: Yes.
3 MS. MATSUNAKA: Jenna Edwards?
4 MEMBER EDWARDS: No.
5 MS. MATSUNAKA: Meg Dunn?
6 MEMBER M. DUNN: Yes.
7 MS. MATSUNAKA: Jim Rose?
8 MEMBER ROSE: Yes.
9 MS. MATSUNAKA: Bonnie Gibson?
10 MEMBER GIBSON: Yes.
11 MS. MATSUNAKA: Margo Carlock?
12 MEMBER CARLOCK: No.
13 MS. MATSUNAKA: Kurt Knierim?
14 CHAIR KNIERIM: Yes.
15 MS. MATSUNAKA: Mr. Chair, six yes, three no, the motion passes.
16 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. And with that, that concludes number six with the appeal of the
17 determination of eligibility at 825 North College.