

**Verbatim Transcript
Historic Preservation
Commission
December 14, 2022**

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

CITY OF FORT COLLINS

Held DECEMBER 14, 2022

300 Laporte Avenue

Fort Collins, Colorado

In the Matter of:

1901 & 1925 HULL STREET – APPEAL OF DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY

Meeting Time: 5:30 PM, December 14, 2022

Board Members Present:

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

Staff Members Present:

Brad Yatabe
Jim Bertolini
Maren Bzdek
Yani Jones
Melissa Matsunaka

1 CHAIR KURT KNIERIM: Alright, welcome back to the December 14th, 2022 hearing of the
2 Historic Preservation Commission. Before we move on to discussion agenda item number eight, are there
3 any recusals on the Commission? Seeing none, we will move on to discussion agenda item eight, 1901
4 and 1925 Hull Street, an appeal of determination of eligibility, and we will begin with a staff presentation.

5 MR. JIM BERTOLINI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Jim Bertolini, Senior Historic Preservation
6 Planner. I'll be giving the staff report for this item. As mentioned, this is an appeal of staff
7 determinations of eligibility for the properties at 1901 and 1925 Hull Street. Just showing the location of
8 this property. This is effectively at the west terminus of Swallow Road, in between that and Taft Hill
9 Road south of Drake. This is an assemblage...this is in response to a development application and
10 identification of historic resources on that site.

11 Zooming in a little bit farther, this shows the two properties in question that are subject to this
12 appeal this evening, 1901 and 1925 Hull Street. To interpret this aerial photograph just a little bit, the
13 structures in blue, these are the historic resources that were determined landmark eligible by staff. The
14 other structures outlined in red are surviving accessory structures based on the significance under standard
15 three for design and construction. Those outbuildings were not considered part of that eligibility finding.
16 And then some of the other resources you see on the aerial photograph have been demolished since this
17 photograph was taken so they are no longer present on the site.

18 When appeals are brought forward for staff findings of determination, the Commission provides
19 a...this is a de novo hearing, so the Commission provides a new decision on the eligibility of these
20 properties. In...just as a procedural recommendation from staff, we are suggesting that you separate your
21 motions and adopt separate motions for each property; you're not required to find both eligible or both
22 not eligible. Your role this evening is to consider evidence regarding significance and integrity of both of
23 the properties. Those standards are under Municipal Code Chapter 14, Article 2, specifically 14-22.
24 Your task this evening is to provide a determination of eligibility as an historic resource for the purposes
25 of Land Use Code 3.4.7, that would...whether you find them eligible or not eligible, that would have an
26 effect on the development application that precipitated this finding. Your final decision this evening will
27 be subject to the right of appeal to City Council.

28 Just a bit about the review timeline. The applicants contacted...or I should say, appellant, in this
29 circumstance, contacted our office for historic survey on July 12th of this year, and over the course of the
30 summer and early fall, we completed the historic survey and on October 14th transmitted those findings to
31 the applicant. In this case, we found that the southernmost property, 1839 Hyline Drive, was not eligible,
32 and that finding is not being appealed this evening. We also found that 1901 and 1925 Hull Street were
33 eligible, and those findings are being appealed. And that appeal was received on October 28th by the
34 developer. This is just a note about where we are in the process for the Land Use Code review of the
35 development application, since we've received a preliminary development review, which is basically an
36 advance look at the project. We are at the stage where we are identifying eligible properties on site, and
37 whether or not there's a responsibility under the Land Use Code to retain and adaptively reuse them. That
38 process takes us over to the Municipal Code, because that's where the standards for landmark eligibility
39 live, and if you find these eligible, then we go back to the development application and the application is
40 required to retain and incorporate those resources. If they're found not eligible, that effectively ends
41 consideration for this project...historic preservation considerations for this project.

42 Specifically here, as with all determinations of eligibility, we require two standards...two sets of
43 standards be met in a linear fashion. So first, is the property significant. In this case, staff found that
44 these two buildings were significant under design and construction. And, do they have sufficient historic

1 integrity to convey that significance. 1901 Hull Street, which is the easternmost property...this was a
2 farm residence found eligible under standard three for architecture as a significant intact example of an
3 agricultural related farmhouse in...that should read North Fossil Creek. I do want to note that the historic
4 survey form that was produced, the contracted historian did recommend this property under standard one
5 for agriculture. Staff disagreed with that in our determination, and our reasons for that are contained in
6 the...in your packet. The western farmhouse at 1925 Hull Street had a similar determination of eligibility
7 as a significant and intact example of a farmhouse on the North Fossil Creek, Upper Spring Creek area.

8 This just elaborates a little bit more on the history of both of these sites. 1901 Hull Street was
9 constructed by 1925 by...well, not constructed by Ruth and John Hull...they lived at and farmed on the
10 site...they are the namesakes for Hull Street. The western property, also known as the Shankula/Hodges
11 Farm was active through the 1920's up to the '50's as an agricultural property, mostly as a cherry orchard
12 production.

13 And just a little bit about the background history here. There was some interesting history related
14 to the Hull family farming on that site; however, based on staff's judgements, and the historic context for
15 agriculture produced in 1994, staff found that interesting but not significant to local agricultural history,
16 both for lack of significance, and also the loss of a lot of the outbuildings that were there during the
17 farm's operation, including the main barn that you see in that photograph.

18 So, one of the things staff added to the context for our finding here is just an aerial photograph
19 from 1950. And there, this is the same photograph on both sides of the image, just different scales. So,
20 here on the left is zoomed out a little bit more...or I should say zoomed in a little bit more, just showing
21 these three properties that are part of this development application, these two being subject to the appeal.
22 On the right, this is just zoomed out a little bit, so this is the same area that's shown on the left just
23 showing a larger context of agriculture in this part of town in 1950.

24 We did have a couple of questions from the work session last week. The notice of appeal
25 mentioned four properties that do have findings of eligibility. We did add those survey forms, a total of
26 five survey forms, to your packet for your consideration. Those were for 6824 South College, which had
27 an intensive survey form, 2500 South Shields that had an intensive survey form, and 2318 Laporte. The
28 1108 and 1038 West Vine Drive properties were surveyed under a previous version of the Code, so you
29 have the demolition alteration review correspondence added to your packet. As you can see, there's
30 really not a lot of historical information or assessment that was involved in those decisions.

31 There was also a request to clarify the difference between architectural significance of a
32 farmhouse versus historical importance for agricultural operations. Again, staff did not find that either
33 property had particularly significant agricultural history, and fairly typical history of producing locally
34 important goods for market, nothing that was particularly significant compared to what we would
35 normally see, nor do they have a particularly intact farmstead. And so, for that reason, staff did not really
36 find them significant under standard one; however, we did find that both were particularly significant
37 examples of a farmhouse for this section of Fort Collins. And I would note that, typically, that is what we
38 ask our historians that do these surveys for us, or when staff does these ourselves, we do tend to localize
39 the comparative research to either a neighborhood or a more local geographic area than the full geography
40 of Fort Collins, the entire city.

41 We have not received any public comments for this project, or for this appeal. I did have an
42 email exchange with a neighbor in the area just interested in the outcome, but no specific weighing in
43 either direction on the appeal. So, again, just a reminder on your role here. You're replacing staff's
44 decision with your own this evening as a de novo hearing, and considering evidence about significance

1 and integrity, whether this meets...whether either or both properties meet those requirements, and
2 providing a new determination of eligibility. That concludes the staff presentation. I will note, I will be
3 here to answer questions. We do also have the historian that completed the survey forms, Ms. Becca
4 Shields from Metcalf Archeology; she's also present and can answer questions specific to her research
5 process and methodology for review. With that, that concludes the staff presentation and I will hand
6 things over to the appellant.

7 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you, Jim. And welcome.

8 MR. ZELL CANTRELL: Thank you. In the interest of time, I did already sign in.

9 CHAIR KNIERIM: Very good.

10 MR. CANTRELL: So, good evening, Chairman and members of the Historic Preservation
11 Commission. My name is Zell Cantrell; I'm with the True Life Companies, we're located down in
12 Denver at 1601 19th Street. Before we get too deep into the presentation, I wanted to thank Jim and the
13 Historic Preservation staff. Although the result of the surveys aren't quite what we were hoping for,
14 they've been truly professional in their efforts to convey information to us and help us work through some
15 decisions and bring us to this point, so I wanted to thank him for that.

16 Just real quickly, the True Life Companies is a real estate investment firm. We're really focused
17 on delivering housing in what we'd consider maybe underserved, high barrier to entry, or infill sites
18 throughout the country. As I mentioned before, we're located here in Colorado. We have multiple
19 offices in northern and southern California, and we just recently opened an office in Austin, Texas and
20 one out in the mid-Atlantic region. We've currently got five projects in the entitlement phase here in
21 Colorado, multiple sites in California, and we're hoping to have four or five more sites, even though the
22 economy doesn't seem to be blowing any tailwinds right now, we still think there's some great
23 opportunity here in Colorado, and we hope to have four or five more sites, even maybe some more sites,
24 here in Colorado or in Fort Collins, underway later this year.

25 So, I think Jim did a really great job of describing the location, so maybe in the interest of time,
26 unless there's some questions about where the sites are located, maybe I can skip that part of the
27 presentation? Alright. So, as Jim indicated, we're appealing the determination of eligibility for Fort
28 Collins landmark designation for the properties at 1901 and 1925 Hull Street. While we're respectful of
29 the report and the efforts by the third-party consultant to make those determinations, we do question
30 whether the standards are being applied consistently to all potential eligible structures, and therefore
31 appreciate this opportunity to appeal the determination to you.

32 Jim, we could probably skip the location slides, maybe go right to 1901. Yeah. Jim already
33 shared these photos with you, but I think this is probably a good place to start. You know, this is 1901
34 Hull; it's located on the eastern portion of the overall property. It was determined to be eligible under
35 standard number three, distinguished design and construction, since the structure represents a rare,
36 remaining example of 1920's farmhouse vernacular in a semi-rural setting. While we understand that a
37 specific architectural style does not necessarily need to be associated with the structure to indicate
38 eligibility, in this case, really, it seems like the simplicity, opposite of the discussions we had in the
39 previous hearing, the simplicity is really what is at issue here, and whether or not that constitutes
40 eligibility.

41 And then we had a couple other photos...Jim, I don't remember if you shared kind of the back
42 and the side. I think it's worth noting that these structures may have been modified. I don't think there

1 were any records in the permitting process, or the historical review, indicating additions to these homes,
2 but based on the change in the roof angle and then also some changes in the siding, there's some vertical
3 elements there. We question whether or not these buildings are, maybe as original, as maybe that we
4 thought. And I think the same is true of 1925 Hull. Again, maybe move to the next slide Jim. Again,
5 we've got kind of a change in the roof angle at the back. It looks like maybe there was an addition, and
6 so we kind of question whether or not the original integrity here is applicable or not.

7 And then, moving on to some of the...there was actually, there was four or five reports I think the
8 Commission requested that Jim provided. We got copies of those as well, and those were all pertaining to
9 sites that had, we thought may have similar characteristics, but were deemed ineligible. Only two of the
10 three, or two of the five, we thought were really applicable to this situation. This one at 2318 Laporte was
11 determined not eligible largely based on the fact that it had been relocated and the original context was no
12 longer in place. We don't really have a good feel for what the original context was, but I think it could be
13 argued that it still exhibits some context because it is in a semi-rural setting, which we understand may be
14 to be the original location of the building. And then the other one was the Humar Farm, located at 6824
15 South College. Again, another example of a very simple farmhouse, vernacular, which, in our opinion, if
16 you go to the next slide, Jim, retains several outbuildings including a barn, a hay shed, it's our
17 understanding there may even still be some livestock paddocks on the site. Really retains a lot of that
18 rural farmhouse, or semi-rural setting, with accessory buildings, and so there's a large, or a high level of
19 context in place. But yet, this was deemed not eligible. And then furthermore, there was properties noted
20 in the determination letter that appear to represent a high level of integrity as agricultural complexes,
21 although these haven't been surveyed, I want to make sure that's clear, but they're examples of other
22 properties in the area that we feel represent a high level of rural farmhouse contextual integrity just based
23 on the fact that there are still standing barns, the houses appear to be in good shape, there's other
24 outbuildings as well. And then this...the next slide...similar situation although this one wasn't very
25 visible; this one is located on South Shields. Again, we wonder if the same standards would apply here
26 given the context, and...I've kind of lost my place here...oh, where I was going was, from our
27 perspective, there are much better examples that represent a better farmhouse context, or a farm operation
28 setting with better integrity that should be preserved rather than the two buildings on our site.

29 And then, I think the one other thing that, I'm not sure if it's in your purview or not, but I think
30 it's worth mentioning, is just what the anticipated future context of this area is going to look like, because
31 the semi-rural context came up in several of the notes. But, I think it should be noted, per the existing
32 zoning plan, all three properties as well as several surrounding properties, are all designated, currently, for
33 low-density mixed-use neighborhood, LMN, which would allow up to nine dwelling units per acre in the
34 future. And then the property directly north, which is shown here in kind of a pinkish color, is actually
35 designated for what is called medium-density mixed-use neighborhood, which would allow up to twelve
36 dwelling units per acre, and even multi-family development at some time.

37 Furthermore, the City Plan identifies this entire quadrant of Taft Hill and Drake as a, what they
38 call mixed neighborhood, which is intended to encourage a variety of housing types as needed to support
39 higher densities. I think one can argue that the semi-rural nature of the properties, if it hasn't already
40 been eroded by the encroachment of neighborhoods from the east, and to a certain degree, the
41 neighborhoods from the south, that the existing zoning and City plans for the area will eventually
42 eliminate any remaining rural nature to the point that the two structures are going to look out of place
43 leaving future people asking, why are these still here?

44 And then the next slide. In addition to the zoning, the City Master Transportation Plan calls for
45 the extension of Swallow through to Taft Hill, it's also designated as a collector, it's going to be relatively

1 high traffic. While it doesn't directly impact these two properties, I think it's just one more indicator of
2 what the City envisions for this area in the future and the future erosion of that rural context. And then,
3 this is a site plan in the works, and hopefully people can kind of recognize this in the context of the aerial,
4 but in the middle, the upper third of the site, you can see where Swallow will be extended from its
5 existing dead end on the east side of the property, it will be extended through the property, and eventually
6 connected to Taft Hill; that is part of the City Master Transportation Plan. Hull Road to the north will be
7 connected. Hull also dead ends at the eastern edge of the property; the difference is there's a dirt road
8 there that continues all the way over to Taft. That will eventually be improved and form another
9 connection to Taft Hill. We're currently planning 54 single-family residences on this property, and not
10 only does Hull and Swallow need to be connected through to Taft, but the City is also looking to us based
11 on our PDR comments, to create a street grid here, and that's what you see with the north/south, with
12 different block designations. So, this is going to turn into a much different neighborhood than what exists
13 out there today. And then maybe just one last time with the aerial image...the future context of this area
14 will look nothing like it does today based on both existing and planned conditions. Encroachment from
15 the east and to the south have already eliminated much of the former rural context and existing zoning
16 designations combined with guidance from the City Plan supports a greater density in this entire quadrant,
17 which is further reinforced by the street grid.

18 So, I just want to thank you again for your time. As much as we understand the need for historic
19 preservation, and respect the hard work done by the preservation staff and the Commission, we just
20 question the consistency in the application of the standards to these two particular examples; we question
21 whether or not these are the best examples of this type of vernacular. And, would the community be
22 better served...there was discussion in the reports about the quantity being reduced as Fort Collins
23 expands, and the need to save some of these...or save as many of them as we can. Our question is, do we
24 want to focus on the quality ones, or maybe the not so quality ones, in our opinion, that these represent?
25 So, thank you in advance for your consideration. I'm here to answer any questions.

26 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you very much. We will have public comment and then move on to
27 questions. Is there any public comment? Hearing none, we will move on to Commission questions for
28 staff and for the appellant.

29 COMMISSIONER ERIC GUENTHER: Jim, could you clarify what the implications are if the
30 Commission upholds the eligibility designation. Does the applicant then have to wait, was it three years
31 or something like that? I recall from previous situations where they have to wait three years until they
32 can come back for another eligibility discussion, if during that three-year period nothing is done to
33 actually designate the properties.

34 MR. BERTOLINI: Sure, so I think the question is how long these findings are good for, and the
35 Code specifies five years from the date of issuance. And, at that point, yes, we can consider any changes
36 that have happened to the property, and differences in how we are interpreting history, any new evidence
37 that might be relevant. At that point, we can reconsider the finding.

38 COMMISSIONER GUENTHER: So, no one...no other party comes forward to actually pursue
39 historic designation, then essentially the properties sit dormant for five years unless the applicants decide
40 to sell them or submit a different plan?

41 MR. BERTOLINI: Again, with...our goal, and the intent of the Land Use Code pertaining to
42 historic resources, and this is designed to tie into the policies and purposes in Municipal Code 14-1 and
43 14-2, is that they not sit empty. The intent of requiring historic resources to be incorporated on a
44 development site is that they still have a use, whether that's housing units, or a commercial unit, or office,

1 or something like that. So, ideally, they're not sitting vacant. Ideally, they're being used for something
2 else. But, that is a possibility, of course.

3 COMMISSIONER GUENTHER: And so, just a follow-up question for the applicants then, if I
4 may. Have you considered...and maybe I missed something here...it wouldn't be the first time...but,
5 have you considered any opportunities to incorporate these buildings into your design plans?

6 MR. CANTRELL: We have. I don't know, Jim, if you can go back to that site plan? And I know
7 it's a work in progress, and if you have any questions about it...I probably didn't clarify that very well.
8 But, we did indicate the two buildings in red on that plan there at the northern edge of the site. You
9 know, based on the requirements for a park and also for detention, there's a fairly large area...it's pretty
10 close to the end of the presentation...there's a large area there that we'll do both with, and that
11 would...we could potentially locate, or leave 1901 Hull in its current position, although it does encroach
12 into the future Hull right-of-way. I know that's not very clear, but it's the L-shaped building, and it
13 would encroach. So, either we're going to have to do a modified right-of-way, or we're going to have to
14 relocate the building. And, you know, the question is whether or not it's feasible to do that. And then the
15 1925, which is the building a little bit further west...it sits a little bit out of the right-of-way. We're still
16 going to have to make some modifications. In theory, that could be incorporated into the development as
17 well. I think our concern is more of just, once these newer houses are built, knowing that we have to
18 demonstrate some historical compatibility within 200 feet, I think the question is still going to be raised,
19 why are these here? And I think it could be detrimental to what we expect to be a very successful project
20 in an area of Fort Collins that doesn't have a lot of building going on right now.

21 COMMISSIONER MEG DUNN: I have a question for Jim. Jim, so this is considered part of the
22 Fossil Creek community? Or, I don't know what that's called...Fossil community? Is that right?

23 MR. BERTOLINI: Yeah, so in terms of defining a localized geography, which, admittedly with
24 agriculture is difficult; usually it's defined by watersheds, especially in the west. And this area is kind of
25 in what we might consider the upper end of Fossil Creek, but most of the water is diverted off of Spring
26 Creek or the Poudre River. So, that was the motivation behind using that as our localized geography was
27 just trying to define this as kind of the upper portions of those drainages, but it's certainly a little bit far to
28 the northwest to be sort of part of the core Fossil Creek community, or Harmony, farther to the east.

29 COMMISSIONER DUNN: It seems like we often define those communities mostly based on
30 what school the kids get sent to, and that's why it's named Fossil Creek, because that was the name of the
31 school I believe. This is...I should have asked this last week, but I didn't think about it until I saw that
32 slide of talking about localized areas, but of the top of your head, maybe, you can answer this. Do you
33 know if we have any landmarked properties related to the Fossil Creek community? I know we have
34 some for Harmony, but I can't think of any related to Fossil Creek.

35 MR. BERTOLINI: In this part of Fort Collins, off the top of my head, I don't believe so. I
36 can...if you'll give me a minute to look that up while maybe other questions come in, I can see...I don't
37 believe we actually have many landmarks at all in this part of the city, but I can look that up on our
38 historic resources map.

39 COMMISSIONER DUNN: Okay, thanks.

40 CHAIR KNIERIM: While Jim is looking that up, are there other questions from Commissioners,
41 clarifying questions? Or otherwise we can move into discussion and as Jim pulls that up...

42 COMMISSIONER DUNN: I do have another question.

1 CHAIR KNIERIM: Yeah?

2 COMMISSIONER DUNN: This can either be Jim or maybe Becca, but I would just like to hear
3 more about the outbuildings and why they were determined not to be eligible.

4 MR. BERTOLINI: Certainly. I can speak to that. So, with the finding that these two properties
5 were significant for their architecture, specifically as examples of a vernacular farmhouse, that's really
6 focused on the architecture of the houses themselves. We could...about the only time you're going to see
7 outbuildings considered architecturally significant is if there's an assemblage of outbuildings that are all,
8 like specifically designed as similar style, or with similar materials, or things like that. That's not the case
9 here; most of what's there is a pretty generic set of either loafing sheds, chicken coops, things like that
10 that are just fairly generic, don't have any specific architectural connection to the main farmhouse. So,
11 that's the reason that they weren't considered eligible here. Normally, when you see outbuildings
12 considered historic, it's under standard one, the area's agriculture, and they're part of the historic context
13 and historic landscape for that working farm.

14 COMMISSIONER DUNN: Okay. So, then in that regard, the setting of all of that land, open
15 space around it, is less significant if we're looking based on architecture than if we were looking based on
16 a farmstead, right?

17 MR. BERTOLINI: Typically, when we are evaluating for architecture, setting is less important.
18 It's not a non-factor, but we tend to emphasize the integrity aspects of design, workmanship, and
19 materials in these cases.

20 COMMISSIONER DUNN: Alright, thank you.

21 MR. BERTOLINI: And returning to the previous question just about identifying historic
22 resources in this area, we don't have very good survey, so what I'm showing on the screen is our historic
23 resources map that's online and available to the public, and shows all of our up-to-date designations and
24 historic survey results that are active and certified. And we don't really have a lot of current survey
25 records at all for this part of town. In fact, this is some of our first survey work, recent survey work, in
26 this. We have some legacy data that's not reflected here, but most of that is well over ten years old.

27 COMMISSIONER DUNN: So this is just indicating surveys, not landmark?

28 MR. BERTOLINI: It does also indicate landmarks. We don't have any landmarks in this
29 quadrant of the city.

30 COMMISSIONER DUNN: Okay.

31 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. Other questions? If not, let's move into discussion on these
32 items. And, if it makes sense to do this...these two...to talk about these two separately, for separate
33 motions, I would entertain that. If it's...if the discussion moves toward, kind of a more global idea, then I
34 think that a single motion would be just fine. And we're looking at significance and integrity under 14-
35 22.

36 COMMISSIONER DUNN: Before we start with that, I'd like to say, I feel like the Code and the
37 plans are at odds with each other in this one. And it's happened before; it hasn't happened recently, but I
38 think it makes the whole situation much more difficult. And I'd also say, much as Eric hates the two-step
39 process, I feel like I really wish we had the two-step process here to differentiate between, are they
40 eligible, and is it worth keeping them here? So, just throwing that out for whenever 3.4.7 gets looked at
41 again, it's possible the two-step process would be helpful in a scenario like this.

1 MR. BERTOLINI: If I may offer some clarification Mr. Chairman...I know we're out of that.
2 Actually, that is technically the case here. The intent tonight is that you consider significance and
3 integrity and just replace the finding. The considerations of value of preservation compared to the project
4 and things like that, that typically comes into play when you would be commenting on a development
5 application, and providing your comment for the decision maker, and perhaps entertaining a modification
6 of standards. So, that...there is a two-step process here, it just looks a little different when we're
7 processing a development application.

8 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you, Jim.

9 COMMISSIONER ANNE NELSEN: So just to clarify, because it's almost a quarter after nine,
10 we're in step one tonight?

11 MR. BERTOLINI: That's correct. So, the task before you this evening is to determine if these
12 properties meet the standards for significance and integrity.

13 COMMISSIONER NELSEN: And we would have the opportunity at a later date to weigh that
14 against the values component that we were discussing earlier?

15 MR. BERTOLINI: Yes; that depends on your decision.

16 COMMISSIONER NELSEN: Of course.

17 MR. BERTOLINI: But, yes, assuming either or both properties are determined eligible, you
18 would be commenting on the development application later.

19 COMMISSIONER GUENTHER: Jim, would you mind commenting just on the integrity issue
20 relative to the rather large additions that are on both of those properties that the applicant mentioned? It
21 did look like with the change in roof line and the scale of the, what appears to be additions, that that
22 would have an impact on integrity. But, staff still found that they do meet integrity requirements?

23 MR. BERTOLINI: Yes. So, yes, that is typically something we measure, especially with
24 architectural significance. There is a heavy emphasis on the original construction. There is some
25 allowance for that, and that is included in standard three, the language of standard three, in the City Code,
26 that sometimes alterations that are significant in their own right can be considered part of that. In this
27 case, since additions, especially rear additions for kitchens, extra bedrooms, storage cellars, things like
28 that, are a pretty common addition to a farmhouse, that's the reason staff, at least, found that those
29 modifications did not detract from integrity. But again, whether that's an appropriate course is something
30 the Commission can consider.

31 COMMISSIONER NELSEN: Just to clarify, again, you found that they didn't detract from the
32 integrity or that they were significant in their own right? I apologize if that's in the packet.

33 MR. BERTOLINI: That's okay; I'm not sure if I'm that specific in your packet. I'd say they
34 don't detract from significance.

35 CHAIR KNIERIM: Yeah, it's interesting under design and construction for significance...just
36 looking at the Code...it says a resource can be significant not only in the way it was originally
37 constructed or crafted, but also the way it was adapted for a later period, or the way it illustrates changing
38 tastes, attitudes, and/or uses over a period of time. So, that seems to be in the purview of eligibility. I
39 understand time is marching, but I would like to hear from some of the other Commissioners...thoughts
40 around this. And again, we have a rather narrow charge of eligibility for this.

1 COMMISSIONER NELSEN: So, we're moving into the discussion section now?

2 CHAIR KNIERIM: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER NELSEN: I'll kick it off by saying that I am not sure that I have a clear...after
4 everything that we've looked at tonight, I'm not sure. I would love to hear from anyone on the
5 Commission that feels a little bit more sure one way or the other, just to start the conversation, please.

6 COMMISSIONER DUNN: Go ahead, Bonnie.

7 COMMISSIONER BONNIE GIBSON: I don't know...I don't know.

8 COMMISSIONER DUNN: I can tell a story. Once upon a time, the Chair of this Commission
9 came once a week down to the City offices and looked at all the buildings that were slated for demolition,
10 that had asked for a permit. And we would go through it...it was me and Tom...let's see...CDNS
11 Director, at the time, and we would go through and figure out, does it have significance? If no, they got
12 their permit. If we felt it had significance, then does it have integrity? If no, then they got their permit. If
13 we felt like it was eligible, then they got a sign, and then they got their permit. So, there were several
14 times when we would get a house...it was usually houses we got, although we got some commercial
15 properties...that I felt really contributed to the history of the city, but, we didn't feel like our argument
16 was strong enough that it was a hill we were willing to die on, and we would let those houses move on
17 through the system. And I feel like this is one of those scenarios today, and I agree with Zell on a lot of
18 what he said. My biggest concern is that we have an entire community's history that is being wiped out,
19 and that does concern me. We have zero landmarks for Fossil Creek, and because Fort Collins has lobbed
20 and rolled over onto that community, just like we did with Harmony, there is some sense where we need
21 to take their history into consideration and preserve it. At the same time, as Zell pointed out quite well, I
22 think there are other properties that convey this better. So, if somebody was bringing this property to us
23 for landmarking, I think we'd probably go with that; I think we would find it to be eligible. This is why I
24 struggle with this decision for this particular one; it's not even...we're not talking about landmarking it at
25 all, we're just talking about whether it's eligible. And I find it...I struggle with this one. I struggle with
26 whether it really has the level of significance we would want. And yet, I struggle again in the other
27 direction about the whole Fossil Creek and we're just wiping Fossil Creek out, and we're not preserving
28 the important places. It almost makes me wish for some kind of context and a few surveys for Fossil
29 Creek so that we have a better sense of what do we really need to stand on that hill that we'd be willing to
30 die for. And which ones...I don't even know how connected these people were to Fossil Creek, if their
31 kids went to the Fossil Creek school. So...and obviously those things don't matter for architecture, but
32 that's where I'm really struggling. And we kind of had a way to not die on the hill before, and we don't
33 have that anymore.

34 COMMISSIONER GUENTHER: My god, I agree with Meg. Sorry, but...

35 COMMISSIONER NELSEN: You don't have to apologize for that.

36 COMMISSIONER GUENTHER: No, I agree with Meg's comments entirely. When I look at
37 significance and integrity of both of these structures, I'm kind of like, hum, is the community well-served
38 by preserving these properties? And I tend to say, not so much. But, there is an important history in that
39 part of town where there may not be any properties that are going to tell the story. And so you struggle a
40 little bit with, you know, the whole concept of what we're trying to accomplish here. Do we want to
41 preserve these properties just to preserve them, or is there a bigger story to tell somewhere, somehow, that
42 we could facilitate it? Obviously, we don't have resources and funds to go pursue that. Clearly, there's

1 not consensus around any other properties or locations where we might find a more suitable
2 representation of the historic aspects of the community, but I have a hard time looking at these two
3 buildings and say they really tell a significant story.

4 COMMISSIONER JENNA EDWARDS: Do both of these properties have the same level of
5 significance? Like, is there a difference between them, or are we kind of considering them the same?
6 And that's a question to the Commissioners. I'm just curious. I think we're kind of considering them
7 together, but is one more significant than the other?

8 CHAIR KNIERIM: That was kind of what I was thinking as well. Is one...can we...you know,
9 for the sake of our discussion, is there one of them that's in better shape, that's more representative? So
10 we could say, okay, the other one we could make a motion on and take that one off the table, and then talk
11 about the other one.

12 COMMISSIONER EDWARDS: Or if perhaps one is more significant or in better condition, or
13 has more integrity, perhaps that is the one that can represent the story, right, and save that history, and
14 then the other one maybe not. If there's one that's better representative than the other.

15 COMMISSIONER DUNN: I'd also point out that even if we do find them eligible, there is a
16 process the developer can still go through to demolish the houses, and then it's a matter, like Jim said,
17 when it comes back to us for development review, which, at that point, it might not, if there's no historic
18 resources left, but I would assume there would still be some kind of contact where we'd talk about how
19 is that mitigated? What can be done to still speak to that history? I mean, is that accurate, Jim? That
20 that's still a possibility?

21 MR. BERTOLINI: Sure, so to just discuss the modification of standards process, there are several
22 criteria that an applicant can use to...and this is true of any standard in the Land Use Code, this is not
23 specific to historic preservation...but they can apply for a modification of standard that says they're not
24 going to meet the standard, but they're going to do something else, either based on...typically it's either a
25 hardship, or if they can come up with an as good or better than equivalent. I don't have direct experience
26 with us recommending any modifications of standards that would include demolition. We've done a few
27 that include alterations that are not typically allowed. I think one of the more recent examples is the
28 Alpine Bank development at Prospect and College where we allowed the relocation of a historic building;
29 that did get a modification of standards to allow for the relocation of that structure. So, that's the only
30 one I have direct experience with, but yes, there is a process to meet the Code in a different way and still
31 make a positive recommendation to Planning and Zoning, in this case...the Planning and Zoning
32 Commission, for approval of something that modifies or demolishes a historic resource.

33 COMMISSIONER JIM ROSE: I think I'm of similar mind to most of the discussion so far. I
34 have real concerns about how this...these two...I know we're supposed to bifurcate and talk individually,
35 but I think Jenna, to your comment, I think it's interesting that these are sort of, of a piece. I think they're
36 very similar. We don't know very much about either one. There's speculation, even, about who lived
37 there. I...you know, I don't see the significance in terms of standard for design and architecture because I
38 think they are so prosaic, so simple, and we have in our packet examples of houses that were proposed for
39 demolition that were approved that are not a great deal different. Their context is different because
40 they're in town. But, I don't think by virtue of just being located out in what's quickly becoming no
41 longer rural, that context is even going to be evident for very long. And I think these are not a good
42 example, and I only wish we could find some better examples, because I think these are...it's difficult to
43 know if they were modified, and obviously there have been some things done to change them, I think it's
44 mostly speculation. So, I have...I guess I have similar thoughts. It's hard for me to think that, as Meg

1 said, that this is one of those hills that we would be willing to die on. I don't think there's sufficient
2 significance for these to warrant being made eligible.

3 COMMISSIONER GIBSON: I struggle with western vernacular architecture, because when they
4 were built, it was what they could build, right? It was just a farmhouse, put it up with no expectation that,
5 in a hundred years, we would be having this conversation. And the fact that we're even having the
6 conversation of, well, can we just get rid of one so we can maybe talk about the other, kind of indicates
7 that this isn't the hill we want to die on. And it is unfortunate that, kind of that feeling of the agricultural
8 life ways of Fort Collins on that side of town have just been eliminated. I'm just not sure that these are
9 the structures to say, hey, this really shows what it was like and why this was important. I just don't think
10 these two structures are the ones we want to go after, for lack of a better word.

11 CHAIR KNIERIM: Well, I think at this point, if there's no more discussion on this, we could
12 entertain a motion, and whoever is putting the motion together could either choose to bifurcate these or
13 put them in the same motion. The sample motion is on page 387.

14 COMMISSIONER ROSE: Mr. Chairman, I can try one of these. I move that the Historic
15 Preservation Commission find that 1901 Hull Street does not meet the eligibility standards outlined in
16 Section 14-22 of the Fort Collins Municipal Code and are not historic resources for the purposes of
17 project review under Land Use Code 3.4.7 based upon the following findings of fact, which we have
18 determined they do not either possess either significance or integrity.

19 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. And, to clarify, you said just 1901?

20 COMMISSIONER ROSE: Yes.

21 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. That was the suggestion, yes. Is there a second to the motion?

22 COMMISSIONER GUENTHER: Mr. Chairman, is it possible to amend that motion to include
23 both properties?

24 CHAIR KNIERIM: I think it would be cleaner, since we have a motion on the table, to second the
25 motion, discuss the motion and vote, and then have another motion.

26 COMMISSIONER GUENTHER: I second the motion.

27 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. Commissioner Guenther seconds.

28 COMMISSIONER DUNN: So, Jim, I'm curious on your thoughts on the integrity since we
29 haven't really talked about that yet.

30 COMMISSIONER ROSE: Well, first of all, I think so much of it is not known. I mean, we don't
31 know if, for example, it possesses anything of extraordinary value in terms of workmanship. It certainly
32 has been modified in a pretty clumsy way. And I chose this one because that's where I think it's maybe
33 most apparent, but, you know, I think any of the issues of integrity...yes, location, it has location. It does
34 possess some of those things, but the other part that really kills it for me is significance, because I think, if
35 you read through 14-22, it just doesn't have anything that says it's of quality because of the craftsman, or
36 of a particular style or period, or anything. So, that's...the integrity is, to me, less of value. It's one of
37 those things where, if it doesn't have significance, then integrity doesn't play into it anyway, so...

38 COMMISSIONER DUNN: That's why I was intrigued that you included integrity instead of just
39 saying significance, so I thought maybe there was something else there.

1 COMMISSIONER ROSE: Well, I said significance and integrity because I think it doesn't
2 possess a sufficient number of those seven aspects. It could say location and setting, but then when you
3 go to the rest of it...I mean, feeling is going to be virtually lost easily within our lifetime. So, you know,
4 a lot of those other things I think aren't carried forward in terms of integrity, so that's my rationale.

5 CHAIR KNIERIM: Other discussion on the motion? Hearing none, let's call for a vote...I will
6 call for a vote.

7 MS. MELISSA MATSUNAKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Dunn?

8 COMMISSIONER DUNN: Yes.

9 MS. MATSUNAKA: Guenther?

10 COMMISSIONER GUENTER: Yes.

11 MS. MATSUNAKA: Gibson?

12 COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Yes.

13 MS. MATSUNAKA: Rose?

14 COMMISSIONER ROSE: Yes.

15 MS. MATSUNAKA: Nelsen?

16 COMMISSIONER NELSEN: Yes.

17 MS. MATSUNAKA: Edwards?

18 COMMISSIONER EDWARDS: Yes.

19 MS. MATSUNAKA: Knierim?

20 CHAIR KNIERIM: Yes.

21 MS. MATSUNAKA: The motion carries.

22 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. Alright, that leaves us with 1925 Hull Street, and a continuation
23 of our discussion around this. My thought is, you know like we've talked about, are there better examples
24 of this? And I think there have to be, I mean...

25 COMMISSIONER DUNN: That can't be our criteria.

26 CHAIR KNIERIM: Right, absolutely.

27 COMMISSIONER GIBSON: I just don't find one objectionably different than the other.

28 CHAIR KNIERIM: Yeah, I think the wording of 14-22 in integrity is really interesting. It says
29 integrity is the ability of a site, structure, object, or district to be able to convey its significance. So, if we
30 say that this property does not have significance, can it convey that significance through integrity? I
31 mean I think it just kind of cascades down.

32 COMMISSIONER DUNN: Yeah, integrity doesn't really matter unless there's significance.

33 CHAIR KNIERIM: Right.

1 COMMISSIONER NELSEN: I think our agricultural history is important, but I don't think this is
2 the house to tell the story.

3 COMMISSIONER EDWARDS: I like the little decorative thing over the door on the original
4 photograph, and it's a bummer it's not there anymore.

5 CHAIR KNIERIM: As folks are looking over the pictures and that sort of thing, if you have other
6 things to say, that's fantastic. If you would like to make a motion, that would be fine too.

7 COMMISSIONER GUENTHER: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a motion. I move that the Historic
8 Preservation Commission find 1925 Hull Street does not meet the eligibility standards outlined in Section
9 14-22 of the Fort Collins Municipal Code and is not an historic resource for the purposes of project
10 review under Land Use Code 3.4.7 based on the fact that the property does not meet requirements for
11 historic significance and integrity.

12 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you Commissioner Guenther. Is there a second?

13 COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Second.

14 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you. Discussion on the motion?

15 COMMISSIONER DUNN: I struggle with this one a little more. It looks more intact to me. Still
16 not high style or anything, but I think it does convey the sense of the simple farmhouse. So, I'm open to
17 people's thoughts on that.

18 COMMISSIONER NELSEN: So, it conveys a sense of a simple farmhouse because right now it's
19 on a farm, right? I mean, I think the context matters significantly. And we're looking at it...

20 COMMISSIONER DUNN: Right, true.

21 COMMISSIONER NELSEN: ...as a building. If this were on, let's say North McKinley Avenue,
22 or Laporte...I mean, in the context of a neighborhood, would you look at that and say, ah yes, this
23 demonstrates the vernacular farmhouse style?

24 COMMISSIONER DUNN: What if it was moved to the open space to the east where 1901 is? It
25 would have that open space around it, it would have the agricultural feel, it's something we allowed on
26 that South College scenario. It needs to be moved anyway because it's going to have a street right off the
27 front door. Jim Rose, what do you think?

28 COMMISSIONER ROSE: I still don't think we know enough, and I think the addition that's on
29 the rear portion I think is an intrusion. It has a modern door, it has modern windows, it has different
30 siding. So, what it suggests to me...and it's a significant addition. So, if you wanted to say this is really
31 a good vernacular example of an early 1924...which I think, still, it says exact date, but I still think that
32 may be speculative. But, then you have this addition with, you know, horizontal windows, and a different
33 metal door, and all the stuff that doesn't fit at all with the original fabric. And who knows when it was
34 done, but it just...it's what I would call an intrusion, and it's a significant enough intrusion that it affects
35 the overall integrity of the house to really convey a simple, gabled structure that maybe had four rooms,
36 or five rooms. This doesn't have that, and who knows when it was added, but I just think that's a
37 sufficient detriment to it's overall condition, and I just don't think it possesses what it needs to possess.

1 COMMISSIONER GUENTHER: I think everything Jim just said is confirmed in slide 430, if
2 you take a look at that, if you're not already. That basically sums up the concerns that he expressed and
3 that I would agree with.

4 COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Can we get clarification from staff on why...because earlier, you
5 said additions like this don't detract from significance. Why, in this particular case, was the thought
6 process behind that?

7 MR. BERTOLINI: Certainly. So, staff's finding relative to 1925 Hull Street was that the rear
8 addition used similar siding, similar window materials, similar window pattern, so it was fairly consistent
9 with the front of the house, and consistent with what we'd expect to see on a vernacular farmhouse. That
10 was really the justification behind it as not being a detraction. But again, if the Commission has a
11 different finding, that's what we're here for.

12 COMMISSIONER DUNN: Mr. Chair, would you mind if I ask Becca a question?

13 CHAIR KNIERIM: Certainly.

14 COMMISSIONER DUNN: I don't know if you want to come and speak to this Becca, but you were
15 on the property I assume. I'd be interested in hearing what your thoughts are in terms of significance
16 and...I mean, you've written it here, but...you've heard our concerns, and maybe you can help us think it
17 through better.

18 MS. REBECCA SHIELDS: Sure, I can do my best I guess...I didn't bring a pen with me. My
19 name is Rebecca Shields; I am the architectural historian that completed these site forms. I guess, as far
20 as significance, it is gratifying to see you all struggle with that a little bit as well, because I honestly...I
21 struggled with this for several days while I was working on these site forms, and my main reason for
22 recommending them and saying that they're significant...recommending them eligible and saying they
23 are significant, is because they are so rare, and there is not landmarked properties in this part of the town.
24 There is...there are probably better sites that represent agriculture in Fort Collins, but the rarity was one
25 of the really strong things that I considered. As far as integrity for this property, in my understanding, it's
26 pretty common for vernacular properties to be added upon, and so I don't see that as a detraction,
27 especially if that addition was made in the historic period, if it was made with sympathetic materials, if
28 it's mostly to the rear of the property so it's not, you know, extending to either side, or overshadowing the
29 original building. So, that was my rationale for that.

30 COMMISSIONER DUNN: Thank you, I think that's helpful.

31 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you very much. Other discussion about this motion? Hearing none,
32 the Chair calls for a vote.

33 MS. MATSUNAKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nelsen?

34 COMMISSIONER NELSEN: Yes.

35 MS. MATSUNAKA: Rose?

36 COMMISSIONER ROSE: I'm sorry, yes. I thought you said Dunn.

37 MS. MATSUNAKA: Gibson?

38 COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Yes.

1 MS. MATSUNAKA: Guenther?
2 COMMISSIONER GUENTHER: Yes.
3 MS. MATSUNAKA: Meg Dunn?
4 COMMISSIONER DUNN: Yes.
5 MS. MATSUNAKA: Edwards?
6 COMMISSIONER EDWARDS: Yes.
7 MS. MATSUNAKA: Knierim?
8 CHAIR KNIERIM: Yes.
9 MS. MATSUNAKA: The motion carries.
10 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you.
11 COMMISSIONER DUNN: Mr. Chair?
12 CHAIR KNIERIM: Yes?
13 COMMISSIONER DUNN: I'd like to address Zell...
14 CHAIR KNIERIM: Certainly.
15 COMMISSIONER DUNN: ...briefly. I know there's...I mean, it's not in our motion, and none
16 of that, but just a friendly request is if there's some way you can somehow weave in farming community
17 history in this project...and I don't know how and what it would look like. Obviously you're not...I
18 mean, I guess...I don't know if you would come back for the development review if there's no historic
19 buildings nearby.
20 MR. BERTOLINI: With this finding, that is correct. They would not come back to the
21 Commission.
22 COMMISSIONER DUNN: So, you're not going to see us again. But, you're in our community
23 and you're adding these homes, which we desperately need, and if there's any way you can do a hat tip
24 toward the history, I would be really grateful.
25 MR. CANTRELL: Yeah, so we've already started designing, conceptually, the houses. I don't
26 know if everybody is aware, but the Code requires we have to have three unique footprints with three
27 different architectural features, and it's really easy at this point in this industry, because farmhouse style is
28 relatively popular. And so, we've already pursued that knowing that we may have to have some
29 compatibility with these existing homes. Although I'll tell you the elevations look a lot nicer than what
30 we just talked about. But anyway, as you would expect. But, you know I think there's an opportunity
31 with that park, and as we did review some of the documentation, we found...we saw some great examples
32 of other really nice homes and farmsteads that have been preserved and incorporated into developments
33 as either a gateway feature or something else. We didn't have quite that same opportunity here, we
34 struggled with that. But, yeah, I think there's a great opportunity to do that here. And so, I appreciate all
35 your thoughts, and your comments, and your consideration. So, thanks again. We really do appreciate it
36 and look forward to being part of the community.

1 COMMISSIONER DUNN: Thank you.

2 CHAIR KNIERIM: Thank you, Zell, and thanks for the question, Meg.