



City of Colorado Springs

City Administration
Building
30 South Nevada Ave,
Suite 102

Meeting Minutes - Draft Historic Preservation Board

Monday, December 5, 2022

4:30 PM

City Administration Building
30 S Nevada Avenue, Suite 102

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Present: 6 - Chair Lowenberg, Board Member Hines, Board Member Musick, Vice Chair Wardwell, Board Member Baumgartner and Board Member Lobello
Absent: 2 - Board Member Smith and Alternate Gullickson

2. Approval of the Minutes

3.A. Communications

William Gray - Senior Planner

Bill Gray - Downtown Review Board approved City Auditorium Historic Resource Survey Plan to be discussed at January meeting.
Working on presentation on Union Printer's Property.
Working on discussion of Catalyst Campus.

3.B. Citizen Comments

Citizen Comments are limited to three (3) minutes per person and should not address any of the items on today's agenda.

There were no citizen comments.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

None

5. ITEMS CALLED OFF CONSENT

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6.A. [HIST-22-000](#) A Report of Acceptability for a new garage/ADU located in the rear yard located at 1512 North Nevada Avenue.
[5](#)

(Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:
William Gray, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Development
Department

Attachments: [Staff Report 1512 N Nevada Detached Garage ROA 10242022](#)

[Project Statement](#)

[Site Plan](#)

[Floorplan](#)

[Architectural Elevations](#)

[Property Photos](#)

[Sanborn Map](#)

[Vicinity Map](#)

[7.5.1605.C](#)

[ONE HP Overlay Zone Design Standards](#)

Bill Gray: 1512 N Nevada

HIST-22-0005

Report of acceptability for a new detached garage ADU to be located in the rear yard of 1512 N Nevada Ave. The applicant and property owner is here in the audience this evening. We do have people who are present both virtually and in the room who would like to provide public input on the proposed application.

The address is 1512 N Nevada Ave. The property is zoned R-2. Approximately 9000 sq ft in size. This includes the demolition of an existing outbuilding. With this application we notified property owners within 150 feet of project (20 property owners). There was one public comment during the review period of this application, which I provided to the board. It mainly included the Sanborn Map information, as well as comment on the historic nature of the existing building.

You can see that there is a main residence. Its original construction date is approximately 1895. It is a contributing building in the historic district due to its architecture. There is a 288 sq ft garage that was built in the early 1900s. Here are a couple of photographs of the property. There is the main residence and the existing garage.

Here is the Sanborn map of the proposed property, and this is the correct Sanborn Map. I did want to let the Board know that the map included in the staff report was not the correct location. I apologize for that. It won't change my recommendation as it relates to the proposed project, though. The garage that is being removed is in the lower right-hand corner. As stated earlier, this garage is not a contributing structure. It was not included in the inventory of all of the buildings that established what characteristics made this a historic neighborhood.

The rear of the property is where the new building is being proposed. It is 1.5 stories and would be approximately 770 sq ft.

Characteristics of outbuildings include location, size, shape, design, materials, and access. There are two items that staff identified as components that could be modified: double garage door to single and windows to double hung.

Staff recommends approval of the 1512 N Nevada Project. We find that it meets criteria for a report of acceptability. Staff recommends the following conditions:

1. The one double garage door is changed to 2 single bay garage doors.
2. Replace the slider windows with double hung windows (vertically sliding) that are minimum square of taller than they are wide.

Applicant: We were hoping to keep the double garage door for the sake of getting a car in there from the alley.

In addition, we would have loved to keep that structure if possible. There is no plumbing, no electric, it's not structurally sound, and the roof was severely damaged in a recent windstorm. It doesn't contribute to the aesthetic of the area-you can't see it from the street. It really doesn't have a function right now. In addition, we believe safety is a consideration.

Public Comment:

Gregory Friesen, 1510 N Nevada Ave: We've lived there for 24 years, and in the 24 years we have lived there, the only people who have made any improvements to the current house, have been current owner. I can affirm the current owner's statement that the current owner is interested in historic preservation. We can see that just from the investment that has been put into the house. When I look at the aerial map and look at the Sanborn Map, I do not believe the Sanborn Map is portraying the current building. With the Nevada alley, there are 22 garages. 8 out of 23 garages have double door openings. On the Nevada side of this superblock, only two houses have driveway access. Vehicles on all the other houses are stored in structures accessed on the alley. I also want to note that based on the South side of the roof of the building, it is non-complying roof shingles. I support the removal of this building and the construction of the new unit.

Mike Anderson: Me and my wife reside in 1516 N Nevada. We've lived there 36 years. I serve on three nonprofits dedicated to the preservation of this neighborhood, but I don't speak on behalf of any of organizations. We regret to speak out in opposition to this project today. After reviewing the application, we object to the project as presented. Our property will be the most affected. It is maybe 5 feet from our property line. First thing we see in the morning will be that building, and it will loom over everything that we do. The project will essentially be a large monolithic box devoid of any significant architectural characteristics. It does not fit the architectural style of the other properties in the Historic district. We believe the application materials are incomplete and do not contain sufficient descriptions. The design does not seem to be consistent with several of the standards in the overlay district.

The main house has elaborate window treatments and appear to have been The house has cedar shingle siding, while the proposed design is very simple, having no distinguishable architectural features. Windows include horizontal sliders and support Staff's recommendation to change that to double hung. The only specification of the materials on the garage we could see was on the vertical elevations. The lack of specification for materials is of concern.

Everyone wants to see the build be consistent with what is approved by HPB. We do not believe the project meets the review criteria for the report of acceptability. We believe it will have a negative impact if approved.

Kathy Anderson: My name is Kathy Anderson. We own the property 1516 N Nevada, which is the property right next door to the applicant's property. I'm only speaking on my own behalf. I concur with what my husband has said and I have some concerns. The application materials appear to contain inaccurate and incomplete information about the existing structure. Incorrectly referred to the existing structure as a shed when it is indeed a garage. The applicant's statement indicates that the structure is structurally unsound. If that is true, shouldn't there be some sort of structural engineering report to confirm?

I am concerned about the construction of an ADU so close to our house. It will be over 25 ft tall and only 5 feet from our property. What a shame that the existing building will be destroyed just to make way for an STR.

Ramona Crane, 1524 N Nevada: I want to speak in favor of it. There are a lot of janky buildings, and that has been one of the jankiest back yards to date. I also have a double door garage door, to be consistent with what theirs will look like. I also don't believe anybody else's house will be affected by solar panels.

Anything in that alley is only an improvement to that janky alley.

Edward Stevenson, on behalf of Brooke Stevenson, 1520 N Nevada: It has no architectural integrity, it has no significance to the neighborhood. It is falling down regardless. I can attest the difficulty of getting a vehicle into a single door garage from that alley. My garage is also about 25 feet tall, and my neighbors to the north have solar panels. Going down the alley, there are several garages that are even taller than 25 feet. The proposed structure very much matches the primary structures. Any arguments about it being an ADU, who cares? That's not for the Historic Preservation Board to review. We are very much in favor of this.

Boardmember Musick: I'm wondering whether possibility of grants for rehabilitation of this barn was considered?

Gray: Someone would have to work with a nonprofit or a local government in order to submit an application for something like that. For private property, federal and state funds are not typically available for something like that. I don't believe there is a grant that exists for that. If somebody came and asked us, we would look to see, but in this case, it was "we want to propose a new detached structure." We did encourage that some of the design elements of that building be incorporated into the new proposed outbuilding.

Boardmember Lobello: I have a couple of questions. I'm going to talk about the demolition of the historic outbuilding. This is definitely something that I would want to do a little bit more research on if I had known was coming my way. What other outbuildings are included in the register for historic building?

Gray: Very few. Almost all of them in the Historic district are residences or

commercial buildings. Very few of them were

Boardmember Lobello: So we don't know if they were even assessed.

Gray: There were a few, but typically outbuildings such as carriage houses, barns, were simply referenced as buildings that were part of the assessment, but typically excluded from the inventory.

Chair Lowenberg: I agree with you there-I would have done a bit more investigation if I had realized. I think it would be prudent to have the opportunity to consider all the information properly.

Boardmember Lobello: My other question for staff is, does it seem that this garage is a 1907 garage?

Gray: I can't say for certain, but I can say that the Sanborn Map from 1907 that there was a structure in the yard. I can't say whether the buildings were dimensionally accurate, or whether we're for sure looking at the same barn.

Chair Lowenberg: But there is no documentation showing that this was a contributing structure.

Gray: I apologize for not putting the right Sanborn Map originally. The standard talks about outbuildings preserving the integrity of the district, which indicates to me that it needs to have been assessed.

Boardmember Lobello: I find it difficult to say that we potentially have a historic structure that we can condone demolishing.

Applicant: But you can't see the structure from street, you can only see it from the alley. I don't understand how it contributes to the historic character of the neighborhood.

Boardmember Musick: Under these circumstances, I believe it would be great if there was some mechanism to have grants to move historic buildings somewhere else. There are a few existing TB huts that are not at original sites. But they are preserved as a relic of our history.

Gray: I'd just like to remind people that the applicant is proposing to do this without the garage condition.

Applicant: The double door gives a great turning radius-that's the only reason we did that.

Boardmember Hines: Could we make a modification at this time? How can we be sure that Sanborn knew what he was doing? Are we sure that there was such a structure at the present site?

Gray: Yes, it was showing on the correct 1907 map.

Applicant: But it's in the wrong place.

Gray: Here's what I'll say about all of that. These are accurate maps of what has been on properties, but the placement is not always accurate. This is not a contributing building to the historic district based on how the district was created.

Boardmember Musick: Is it possible to get a double door that looks like a single door, aesthetically?

Applicant: Yes.

Boardmember Lobello (to applicant): It seems, based on what your neighbors have said, that you are doing a wonderful job of taking care of the house and preserving the historic character of this neighborhood.

Chair Lowenberg: Are we ready to make a motion?

Boardmember Hines: How can we modify?

Boardmember Musick: One modification might be to drop the condition of the double door.

Boardmember Baumgartner: I motion to approve the report of acceptability with the condition that the applicant puts a single door as opposed to a double door.

Wardwell: I second that motion.

Roll Call Vote

Nay by Boardmember Lobello.

Passed on a five to one vote.

Boardmember Lobello: I fundamentally disagree with the idea of taking down a historic structure whether it is officially contributing or not. This would be a completely different conversation if there wasn't a structure that we had to demolish.

Gray: What Boardmember Lobello is saying is that the project doesn't meet design criteria ten of the historic preservation guidelines.

Approved in a five to one vote.

Chair read appeal requirements and dates. Deadline is December 14th by 5 PM.

Motion by Board Member Baumgartner, seconded by Vice Chair Wardwell, to approve a Report of Acceptability for the 1512 N Nevada garage/ADU project based upon the findings that the project meets the review criteria for a report of acceptability, as set forth in City Code Section 7.5.1605.C. with the following condition:

1. Put in a single garage door instead of a double garage door. The motion

passed by a vote of 5:1:1:0

Aye: 5 - Chair Lowenberg, Board Member Hines, Board Member Musick, Vice Chair Wardwell and Board Member Baumgartner

No: 1 - Board Member Lobello

Absent: 1 - Board Member Smith

7. NEW BUSINESS CALENDAR

8. PRESENTATIONS/UPDATES

RetoolCOS - Unified Development Code

Morgan Hester - Planning Supervisor and Mike Tassi - Assistant Planning Director

Presentations and Updates:

ReTool COS.

Chair Lowenberg: It appears that the disposition of the board is not to make a comment.

Public Comment:

Pat Doyle: Did the members of the board receive Tim Scallion's comments? Will there be any discussion of the ordinance?

Chair Lowenberg: It seems as though there will be a discussion at a later date regarding the historic preservation ordinance.

Gray: The intent was to say that we have presented to the board the section of ReTool related to historic preservation.

Doyle: Will we have a chance to provide public comment?

Mike Tassi: The City Council meeting on January 10 will be a public hearing and that will be your opportunity to speak.

9. Adjourn