

Weston Burrer
Chair

Richard Cherry
Vice Chair

Deborah Espinosa
Secretary

PUEBLO

Historic Preservation Commission

Tanya Jones

Chris Markuson

Marie Schwager

David Webb

211 East D Street | Pueblo, Colorado 81003 | Tel 719-553-2259 | Fax 719-553-2359 | TTY 719-553-2611 | www.pueblo.us

Historic Preservation Commission

City of Pueblo, Colorado

Thursday, August 11, 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, Chris Markuson, Marie Schwager, and David Webb.

Commissioners Absent: Deborah Espinosa and Tanya Jones

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 June 9, 2011 by Markuson, second by Webb.

Motion passed 5-0.

PUBLIC HEARING

A. A Reconsideration of HPC 011-2011, 311 S. Union Avenue

Application to paint, alter storefront and roofline.

(Remanded from City Council Meeting of July 25, 2011)

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.

HEARING

Joe Koncilja, 125 West B Street, appeared and testified in favor of the application.

COMMISSION ACTION

Motion to approve HPC #011-2011 by Markuson, second by Webb 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 passed 5-0.

At this point in the meeting Chairperson Burrer recused himself from voting on HPC-019-2011.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness: HPC 019-2011, 101 S. Main Street

Application to add fire place openings in the addition and replace remaining exterior garage door with windows.

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. 101 S. Main Street is listed as a contributing building in the Union Avenue Historic District. The owner is proposing to replace the last exterior loading bay door along the Riverwalk with glass for a new restaurant and add two, 2 way fireplaces to the 4th story (basement level plus 3 normal stories) addition constructed in 2009-2010.

Analysis

101 S. Main Street was erected in 1917 and served as a cold storage building for the railroad. This building was an innovative structure for its time due to the use of cork linings in the walls for additional cooling. The building underwent a major rehabilitation from 2008 to the present day as well as the construction of a fourth story addition which was approved by HPC in 2010.

The first request is to approve two 2.5 ft by 2.5 ft, two way interior exterior fireplaces to enhance their 4th story assembly hall use. The fourth story was set back from the previous roofline to allow an outdoor patio to complement the Riverwalk. The change in use from railroad warehouse to active, pedestrian friendly, mixed use restaurant, office, and assembly hall necessitates certain improvements to attract businesses and function as part of the Riverwalk. The prior and proposed changes are not out of character with similar changes in cities which have undergone revitalization efforts nor different from exterior changes to historic buildings along other sections of the Riverwalk.

The second request involves replacing the last remaining loading dock door on the Riverwalk (northeast) elevation. This existing door is part of the recent rehabilitation and not an original door. The original door was replaced prior to the rehabilitation and the current door is a generalized reconstruction of an historic loading dock door. The replacement window will consist of one mullion approximately in line with the existing window mullions to increase interaction with the Riverwalk patios outside and bring light into the former warehouse.

RECOMMENDED MOTION

1. Staff recommends **APPROVAL** for the construction of two-two way fireplaces and the replacement of the last loading bay door with a storefront window system without conditions.

HEARING

Adolph Padula, 101 S. Main Street, appeared and testified in favor of the application.

COMMISSION ACTION

Motion to approve HPC #019-2011 by Markuson, second by Schwager.

Motion passed 4-0.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:53 p.m.