

Weston Burrer
Chair

Richard Cherry
Vice Chair

Deborah Espinosa
Secretary

PUEBLO



Historic Preservation Commission

Janie Anderson Craven

Tanya Jones

Chris Markuson

David Webb

Historic Preservation Commission

City of Pueblo, Colorado

Thursday, June 9, 2011 – 12:00 p.m.

Interim City Council Chambers – 301 West B. Street

Minutes

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 12:00 p.m. with Chairperson Weston Burrer presiding.

Commissioners Present: Richard Cherry, Deborah Espinosa, Chris Markuson, Tanya Jones, and David Webb.

Commissioners Absent: Janie Anderson Craven (vacant commission position)

Staff Members Present: Jeff Bailey, Assistant City Manager for Development Services, Paul Willumstad, Board Attorney, and Wade Broadhead, Planner.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes for the Historic Preservation Public Hearing held on May 12, 2011 by Webb, second by Jones.

Motion passed 5-0 (Espinosa not available to vote).

PUBLIC HEARING

A. Certificate of Appropriateness: HPC 011-2011, 311 S. Union Avenue

Application to paint, alter storefront and roofline (**Continued from May 12, 2011 Meeting**)

BACKGROUND

Staff Report by Wade Broadhead

Synopsis

According to Section 17-4-51-12(1) (d) any building in the HB requires approval prior to the commencement of any work. 311 S. Union Avenue is listed as a contributing building in the Union Avenue Historic District. The owner is conducting exterior work to the vacant storefronts to repair them for new tenants. The owner proposes to repaint the exterior, add new sign panels, and add two new elements to the cornice and one triangle shaped parapet extension above the cornice/roof line. The applicant has already

completed minor repair and alteration to the storefront cladding by adding two new sign plates below the cornice above the transom windows. Work was also completed that added new wood element to the walls that would bracket the new color scheme. The most noticeable proposed alteration is the addition of a hardiboard triangular parapet extension that will extend five feet tall above the roof line and bring the building height to 21 feet, four inches.

Analysis

311 S. Union Avenue building appears to have been erected in 1890 and housed an insurance agent although the National Register nomination states the date of construction to be 1903. Leaded glass transom, and the entries in the Polk Directories, suggest a date of construction to 1890. No pictures were submitted to verify the original look of 311 S. Union Avenue. The building does have elements of common 1890 single story businesses with recessed entries, large display windows, and decorative transom windows. The exterior rehabilitation utilizes a single Victorian Era paint scheme of green and brown from the Benjamin Moore Historical Collection to add visual interest to the building face, and the sign panels below the cornice are a simple version of a 20th century storefront. The parapet extension however is a new modern element, and there is no documentation that such a parapet ever existed on 311 S. Union. Triangular decorative parapet extensions are uncommon on simple 1890-1910 one story commercial buildings on Union Avenue. Buildings on Union generally had a simple corbelled cornice extension and a flat roof, or a small 1-2 foot tall masonry parapet wall. Nonfunctional cornice extensions are generally found on earlier 1880-1886 multistory building such as can be observed on the 200 block of Union Avenue.

Unfortunately, the area between the roofline and transom windows (general frieze area) was obscured by stucco and the proposed sign panel rehabilitation brings the design closer to conformance with the guidelines as shown on page 11 of the Historic Business Guidelines. With respect to the parapet extension, according to the Secretary on Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation of Storefronts they state, "Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced storefront is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation," and that "Introducing a new design that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color", is not recommended. When insufficient evidence exists, preservation practice states that owners design simplified versions of storefronts that are likely to have existed at the time of the building's construction. There is no evidence that the proposed parapet style existed, on this building or was even popular on 1890 or later single story commercial buildings on Union Avenue. Furthermore, the Standards of Appropriateness (Section 3.1.8) section on Roof Forms state, "Many historic commercial buildings have flat roofs with masonry parapets. This is a very important visual characteristics..." Altering the roof style alters the proportions and profile of the building." Guideline Number one under Roof Forms (Section 3.1.8(1)), states "Preserve the flat roof and parapet".

The Historic Business District Guidelines also discuss missing architectural details. Under guidelines *Replace decoration where it is known to have existed, if feasible*, it states that "In a renovation scheme, attempting to replace missing details is of special concern. In some cases, a portion of the ornamentation remains from which copies can be made. In other situations, all is missing. Use the remaining proportions of details as models if they exist. Also refer to old photographs for information. *If you can't find what existed originally, simplify the original details*". The Historic Businesses district guidelines mirror the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines.

Staff recommends the applicant examine the possibility of conducting a rehabilitation or restoration of the storefront front via either a tax credit project or a State Historical Fund grant. Short of a rehabilitation plan,

the new sign panels are an appropriate design that meets the Historic Businesses Guidelines. Although the parapet extension adds a false sense of history to the 1890 building, the current building roof is not historic, and architecturally incompatible. The date stamped element will not fool viewers and help eliminate a violation of preservation guidelines. Although the pediment addition is not an optimal alteration it would meet the guidelines, until a more historic rehabilitation can be conducted.

RECOMMENDED MOTION

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** for colors and façade alterations, and cornice roof line/parapet extension with the following conditions:

Staff Conditions:

1. Façade alterations, sign panels, and color scheme are conducted according to submitted plans.
2. The pediment is date stamped “2011” so it can be easily seen from sidewalk.
3. The owner adds a small plaque on the building discussing its date of construction and evolution from 1890 including the rehabilitation design and date.
4. The historic transom windows and decorative transom window trim are not degraded in any way, but may be restored.

Commissioner Espinosa joins the meeting at 12:25 p.m.

HEARING

Tom Printz, T. L. Printz Constructors, appeared and testified in favor of the application.

Mr. Printz discussed his involvement with this case. Mr. Printz states he does a lot of work for the property owners, although sometimes some of the Koncilja’s clients pay back their debts by doing work on the Koncilja properties. Mr. Printz explained the reasoning behind the staff condition to add a date stamped pediment, so that the new construction is not confused with the original construction of the building. The idea came from a meeting with Mr. Broadhead, City Manager Jerry Pacheco, and Owner Joe Koncilja. Mr. Printz states that they will not touch any part of the building except above the transom and will use paint from the Historic paint palette.

COMMISSION ACTION

Motion to approve HPC #011-2011 by Espinosa, second by Markuson with the following conditions:

1. Façade alterations, sign panels, and color scheme are conducted according to submitted plans.
2. The pediment is date stamped “2011” so it can be easily seen from sidewalk.
3. The owner adds a small plaque on the building discussing its date of construction and evolution from 1890 including the rehabilitation design and date.
4. The historic transom windows and decorative transom window trim are not degraded in any way, but may be restored.

Commissioner Markuson withdraws his second on the motion.

Motion to approve and amend the conditions for HPC #011-2011 by Espinosa, second by Markuson with the following conditions:

1. Façade alterations, sign panels, and color scheme are conducted according to submitted plans.
2. The owner adds a small plaque on the building discussing its date of construction and evolution from 1890 including the rehabilitation design and date.
3. The historic transom windows and decorative transom window trim are not degraded in any way, but may be restored.

Motion failed 2-4 (Burrer, Cherry, Jones and Webb dissenting).

OLD/NEW BUSINESS UPDATES

Pueblo Historic Fund-update-Wade Broadhead

Burrer: I spoke with the City Manager (Jerry Pacheco) and the money may not be available for 2012 for the Pueblo Historic Fund. We have discussed working on a plan/business plan and presenting it to City Council and then push forward. If City Council approves of our idea, then we can start working on the project.

Broadhead: Even if we had two \$5,000 grants for the kick off of the project, it would be a good way to start.

Burrer: It will be important that person hire a contractor to work on these rehabilitation programs as well as the property owner granting the City an easement to the property so that if the property goes into disrepair then the City can fix the property.

June HPC Work Session, June 30th-update-Wade Broadhead

Broadhead: We will meet on June 30th for our work session at 12:00pm in the Planning Conference Room.

Columbus modification/nomination-update-Wade Broadhead

Broadhead: I won't be able to attend the meeting as my wife had our little girl on Sunday. I will monitor how the vote goes for the Columbus nomination.

Therafit Signage-update

Broadhead: I talked to the building owner and talked about the design guidelines. He was sensitive to that. He wants his business to look nice. His next tenant will definitely have different signage.

I-25 Mitigation Meeting

Broadhead: I am attending the I-25 mitigation meeting tomorrow from 1-3pm if anyone would like to attend. We will talk about if they will take the stacks down. They are supposed to come to this meeting with some other options. The meeting is at the CDOT headquarters on the south end of Colorado Springs.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:22 p.m.