



Historic Preservation Services

Community Development & Neighborhood Services

281 North College Avenue
P.O. Box 580
Fort Collins, CO 80522.0580

970.416.4250

preservation@fcgov.com

fcgov.com/historicpreservation

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

ISSUED: February 17, 2022

EXPIRATION: February 17, 2023

Brian and Barbara Berkhausen
1306 W. Mountain Avenue
Fort Collins, CO 80521

Dear Property Owners:

As you are aware, last evening the Historic Preservation Commission gave a Final Design Review decision for the work you are proposing for the Jackson-Bailey House & Garage at 1306 W Mountain Ave.

More specifically, the Commission **denied**:

1. Construction of an 887 square foot addition onto the existing 1,097 square foot home (*Note: 1,097 includes the approximately 76 square-foot rear mud porch slated for demolition*).
 - a. The Commission found this project component did not meet the *Standards for Rehabilitation*, specifically Standards 2 and 9.

The Commission **approved**:

2. Replacement of all historic basement windows with egress-compliant window units and infill of west-facing main floor window and replacement with two small one-over-one windows.
3. Demolition of non-historic garage, and construction of a new 630-square foot garage at the rear of the lot.

An analysis is included below.

Applicable Code Standard	Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation: Summary of Code Requirement and Analysis	Standard Met (Y/N)
SOI #1	<p><i>A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships;</i></p> <p>The property will remain in residential use. However, staff notes that the size and scale of the addition inclines toward inconsistency with this Standard. National Park Service "Interpreting the Standards Bulletin 37: Rear Additions</p>	Y

	<p><i>to Historic Houses,</i>” notes that “in cases where an overly large addition is required in order to accommodate an owner’s programmatic needs, a more suitable building should be identified.”</p>	
<p>SOI #2</p>	<p><i>The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.</i></p> <p>Designated as a significant example of a Craftsman Cottage, the building is characterized by its small size and compact massing compared to larger Victorian and modern homes. Its simple rectangular form under the front-gabled roof, and other Craftsman-style features including exposed rafter tails, the styled brick exterior, wood sash windows, and prominent brick chimneys together characterize the property.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of an 887 square foot addition onto the existing 1,097 square foot home – As Bulletin 37 notes, the expansion of modest scale houses can be particularly challenging in order to create an addition that is compatible with the historic building’s size, scale, massing, and design. The addition, as proposed, would alter the massing of the building as viewed from Mountain Avenue. While the addition is on the rear, and is at a lower height than the historic roof line, the visible east bump-out at the rear and significant additional space makes it difficult for the project to meet this Standard, as it would change a small cottage with a larger open yard into a larger house with significantly less surrounding open space on the lot, and would alter the building’s characteristic simple, rectangular massing into an irregularly-massed building more typical of Modern-style Ranch homes or earlier Victorian-era homes. 2. Replacement of all basement windows with egress-compliant window units, removal of a window on the east wall, and infill of west-facing main floor window, and replacement with two small one-over-one windows – Some of the exterior doors and most of the windows appear historic, although the storm windows were new (restored in the early 2000s by the previous owner). Treatment of the basement windows is common in this context and appears to meet this Standard (the basement windows are not a character defining feature). The modification of the west bathroom window from one historic unit to two non-historic is not ideal, but by itself may be considered consistent with this Standard due to its location on a side elevation, the reduced visibility of this window, and considering the context of the proposed preservation and rehabilitation of most of the remaining windows on the historic building. 3. Demolition of non-historic garage, and construction of a new 630-square foot garage at the rear of the lot – The 1968 two-car garage is not a contributing historic resource for this City Landmark and could be demolished without compromising the property’s significance. The design of the proposed new garage seems generally compatible with the property’s historic character. The roof orientation along a north-south axis is in keeping with the overall character and spatial organization of the site. 	<p>N</p>

SOI #3	<p><i>Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.</i></p> <p>While the Commission agreed with the Staff analysis that this Standard did not apply to this particular project, members did express concern that the design of the addition could create a false sense of history, but that this concern was best articulated under Standard 9 relating to the property being adequately compatible but distinguishable from the historic building section.</p>	N/A
SOI #4	<p><i>Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.</i></p> <p>The primary historic feature proposed for removal is the rear porch. While this feature appears to date from the property’s historic period and represents a common adaptation to historic residences in Fort Collins, staff does not believe the porch is a character-defining feature based on the significance of the property for Design/Construction as a significant example of a Craftsman Cottage. While staff generally encourages retention of rear porches whenever possible, in this case retaining it is not required in order to meet this Standard.</p>	Y
SOI #5	<p><i>Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.</i></p> <p>The project as proposed in the current (February 2022) version, meets this Standard. The plan has been modified from previous iterations to avoid demolition of the primary exterior wall of the house at its northeast corner.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of an 887 square foot addition onto the existing 1,097 square foot home – While the size, location, and design of the addition remains problematic because it alters the character-defining rectangular design of the cottage, its installation does not appear to require the removal of any character-defining elements of the property. Therefore, this project component meets this Standard. 2. Replacement of all basement windows with egress-compliant window units, removal of a window on the east wall, and infill of west-facing main floor window and replacement with two small one-over-one windows – While the historic status of doors on the property is mixed, the windows appear to be historic with new (c.2000s) matching wood storm windows and appear to be in sound shape for repair. Replacement of basement windows in bedroom areas for egress compliance is a regular part of building rehabilitation and meets the Standard. While the modification of the bathroom window on the west elevation is not recommended, it does not appear to conflict with this Standard. 3. Demolition of non-historic garage, and construction of a new 630-square foot garage at the rear of the lot – While the 1968 two-car garage does not characterize the property, the 1942 one-car garage does as noted in the Landmark nomination. As noted previously, the overall design and massing of this garage is generally compatible with the overall property. 	Y

SOI #6	<p><i>Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of an 887 square foot addition onto the existing 1,097 square foot home – N/A 2. Replacement of all basement windows with egress-compliant window units, removal of a window on the east wall, and infill of west-facing main floor window and replacement with two small one-over-one windows – While some of the doors on the residence are original and some are later alterations, the windows appear to be original with new (c.2000s) matching wood storm windows and appear to be in sound shape for repair, which is proposed. Replacement of basement windows in bedroom areas for egress compliance is a typical component of building rehabilitation and meets the Standard. While the modification of the bathroom window on the west elevation and loss of the rear-most east window is not recommended, the overall plan for windows on the residence appears to meet this Standard. 3. Demolition of non-historic garage, and construction of a new 630-square foot garage at the rear of the lot – N/A 	Y
SOI #7	<p><i>Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.</i></p>	N/A
SOI #8	<p><i>Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.</i></p> <p>The proposal includes excavation for the foundation and crawlspace under sections of the addition. Based on the construction date of the property, the disturbed nature of the soil, and distance away from natural waterways (beyond 200 ft), it is unlikely that excavation would uncover significant archaeological materials from the pre-contact or Euro-American settlement periods.</p>	Y
SOI #9	<p><i>New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.</i></p> <p>Generally, this Standard calls for additions to meet three main requirements: to be <i>compatible, distinguishable, and subordinate</i>. While components of the addition’s design meet these requirements, some conflicts remain under this Standard.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of an 887 square foot addition onto the existing 1,097 square foot home – The addition as proposed has elements that meet some of the requirements noted above. The roof height of the addition is below the historic roofline, helping to subordinate the massing of the addition to the historic building. The siding of the addition is proposed as lapboard which helps differentiate the addition from the historic building without disrupting the compatibility. The window selection for the addition are simplified versions of the historic windows. 	N

	<p>However, the new addition adds significant square footage to the existing house, making meeting the “subordinate” requirement difficult without the use of offsetting design features such as a hyphen that are typically used to allow for larger additions that retain the original building’s characteristic form, massing, and scale. The size of the addition disrupts the defining, symmetrical massing of the property, and is large for a property of this type (a small residential cottage). The bump-out of the addition by 7.75 ft on the east is significant for a home and lot of this size and disrupts the historic massing and orientation of the main house, creating further compatibility conflicts. Additions, especially onto small historic homes, should be at, or inset from, the historic sidewalls of the historic building. Where this is not possible, using a hyphen, courtyard, or other interrupting feature is recommended to connect the new construction to the original building and clearly differentiate the new construction. While the current design is close to meeting this Standard, necessary modifications remain to offset the new construction from the old in order to meet this Standard and retain the character-defining features of the building.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Replacement of all basement windows with egress-compliant window units, removal of a window on the east wall, and infill of west-facing main floor window and replacement with two small one-over-one windows – The removal/replacement of the basement windows should not conflict with this Standard. The removal of the window near the northeast corner as part of the addition, and the modification of the bathroom window on the west elevation is not recommended, but the minimal impact on the property’s overall historic character and character-defining features, does not appear to conflict with this Standard. 3. Demolition of non-historic garage, and construction of a new 630-square foot garage at the rear of the lot – The proposed new garage is generally compatible with, distinguishable from, and subordinate to, the existing property and appears to meet this Standard. 	
<p>SOI #10</p>	<p><i>New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.</i></p> <p>In these revised plans, this Standard appears to be met.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of an 887 square foot addition onto the existing 1,097 square foot home – While the addition conflicts with Standard 9 in significant ways, it appears compliant with Standard 10 as no demolition of character-defining exterior walls is proposed in the revised plans. 2. Replacement of all basement windows with egress-compliant window units, removal of a window on the east wall, and infill of west-facing main floor window and replacement with two small one-over-one windows – Replacement of basement windows in bedroom areas for egress compliance is a regular part of building rehabilitation and while not strictly reversible, is not altering the essential form and integrity of the property and meets the Standard. While the modification of the bathroom window on the west elevation is not recommended, it does appear to meet this Standard for the same reasons as the basement window modifications. 	<p>Y</p>

	3. Demolition of non-historic garage, and construction of a new 630-square foot garage at the rear of the lot – No historic resources appear to be affected by this aspect of the project.	
--	---	--

The Commission found that Item 1, the proposed addition to the historic house, the criteria and standards in Chapter 14, [Article IV](#) of the Fort Collins Municipal Code and was not approved.

The Commission found that the proposed Item 2, to modify basement windows and the west bathroom window, and Item 3, to demolish the 1968 two-car garage and construct a new garage based on provided plans, meets the criteria and standards in Chapter 14, [Article IV](#) of the Fort Collins Municipal Code.

Notice of the decision regarding this application has been forwarded to building and zoning staff to facilitate the processing of any permits that are needed for the work.


Please note that all approved work must conform to the approved plans. Any non-conforming alterations are subject to stop-work orders, denial of Certificate of Occupancy, and restoration requirements and penalties.

If the approved work is not completed prior to the expiration date noted above, you may apply for an extension by contacting staff at least 30 days prior to expiration. Extensions may be granted for up to 12 additional months, based on a satisfactory staff review of the extension request.

You may appeal this decision within two weeks by submitting a written notice of appeal to the City Clerk within fourteen (14) calendar days of this decision. Grounds and process for appeals are enumerated in Chapter 2, [Division 3](#) of the Fort Collins Municipal Code.

If you have any questions regarding this approval, or if I may be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to contact staff at preservation@fcgov.com or at (970) 416-4250.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

 DD742B4AF8F445E...

Kurt Knierim, Vice-Chair
Historic Preservation Commission