

Criteria Subcommittee for the Historic Preservation Task Force

Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: 29 August 2008

Prepared by: Marsha Cook

Date: 31 August 2008

The purpose of the meeting was to elect a chair, set meeting times and discuss scope and approach.

Attendees:

Penney Evans Carruth, Marsha Cook, Yasmine dePagter, Michael Hoffman, Lisa Markalunas, Joe Myers, Ann Mullins, Suzannah Reid, Gilbert Sanchez, Jack Wilke, Amy Guthrie, Sara Adams
Jerry Blumberg (public)

Decisions:

Chair - Marsha Cook

Co-Chair - Gilbert Sanchez

Meeting Time - Wednesday mornings at 8:15 for 1 hour

Next Meeting - 3 September 2008

Meeting Location – City Hall

Discussion:

1. Amy provided everyone with a copy of **Criteria for Designation: 26.415.030.B of the Aspen Municipal Code.** The first two pages of the Integrity Assessment for Chalets are missing from the hand out and will be provided by staff.
2. Gilbert suggested that we review the information available at <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb22/>. It is a National Register Bulletin – Guidelines for evaluating and nominating properties that have achieved significance within the past fifty years.

In an effort to determine where we are going and how we should proceed, there was conversation regarding the following:

3. The threshold for designation is higher for National Historic Designation. However, there are no “teeth”. You may demolish a structure even if it has been designated. The “teeth”/restrictions are at the local level rather than national or state. We should review what is being done in Arizona and LA.
4. All 100-year-old properties in Aspen have been designated. The Criteria committee will not address Item #1 on the Criteria for Designation: 26.415.030.B of the Aspen Municipal Code.

5. What is criteria, when does it come into play? How is it different from context papers and guidelines? How do we identify structures and at what point is it designated?
6. There is support for the recommendation by the Voluntary vs. Involuntary subcommittee that we will not review/address properties that have already been designated.
7. The concept of an “addition” to a designated property being required to be architecturally different rather than being of the same style needs discussion. This should/will be addressed by the Architecture & Context subcommittee.
8. A definition for the terms “reversible” and “addition” was requested.
9. There are no scoring sheets or context papers for Modern-Chalet. There is a short paper.
10. Without knowing what the larger group wants to preserve – what do we need criteria for? Are there other styles that we have not identified that should be considered?
11. How does public opinion get into the process? Community Input/Public Participation will address this.
12. How many of what should be preserved?
13. The need for a non-profit organization committed to historic preservation may exist. This has been attempted in the past but was not successful. Perhaps something will develop as a result of the current task force efforts.
14. The historic preservation program should be “understandable, predictable and defensible”. “Uncertainty” is the current issue.

Action Required:

Staff to provide to subcommittee members:

1. Missing pages for Chalet
2. Existing paper on Modern-Chalet
3. Definition of “reversible” and “addition”

Subcommittee Members:

1. Review Criteria for Designation: 26.415.030.B of the Aspen Municipal Code
2. Review <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb22/>

3. Review white papers in the original binder proved by staff
4. Review photos of structures attached to Ordinance 48 in document (Index of Properties) given to us at the last task force meeting on 28 August 2008
5. Prepare list of items that we need to address

Agenda Items for Next Meeting – 3 September 2008

1. Identify items/topics to be addressed by subcommittee
2. Establish priorities (impact on other subcommittees)
3. Determine methodology/approach for review
4. Discuss schedule

Please advise as to any corrections and/or additions to the above even though these are not meant to be detailed minutes of our meeting.

**Criteria Subcommittee for the Historic Preservation Task Force
Meeting Notes**

Meeting Date: 9 September 2008
Prepared by: Marsha Cook
Date: 18 September 2008

Tom Buesch made an interesting presentation about international events that were taking place during the time that the Aspen Institute and the Music School were being established in Aspen. The relationship between these events, the Paepkes and the people they brought to Aspen influenced the style of many of the buildings being built during that time.

Tony Vagneur and Rowen Rowland joined Tom for a delightful discussion about Aspen during the time they were growing up and the changes that they have seen.

Meeting Date: 9 September 2008
Prepared by: Marsha Cook
Date: 18 September 2008

Attendees:

Yasmine dePagter, Michael Hoffman, June Kirk, Lisa Markalunas, Joe Myers, Suzannah Reid, Gilbert Sanchez, LJ Erspamer, Jack Wilke, Marsha Cook, Amy Guthrie, Sara Adams

Decisions:

1. Next Meeting – 24 September 2008 @ 8:15 AM
2. Location – Sister Cities room, City Hall basement

Presentation:

Amy Guthrie presented their perception of the architectural and cultural influences that were significant in Aspen in the 40's, 50's/60's and how that translated into the buildings of the period that have either already been designated, or which they have suggested should be.

Discussion:

1. We continue to struggle with when/where and if we should be dealing with land use codes and the impact that "criteria" may have on codes and/or codes on criteria.
2. During the next meeting we will identify the styles that the subcommittee believes to be worthy of further discussion.

Action Required:

Staff to provide to subcommittee members:

1. Missing pages for Chalets
2. Existing paper on Modern-Chalet
3. Definition of “addition”

Subcommittee Members:

1. Add architectural styles to the Aspen Historical Timeline – Gilbert Sanchez
2. Research applicable case laws - Michael Hoffman

Please advise as to any correction and/or additions to the above even though these notes are not meant to be detailed minutes of our meeting.

Criteria Subcommittee for the Historic Preservation Task Force Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: 24 September 2008
Prepared by: Marsha Cook
Date: 24 September 2008

Attendees:

Michael Behrendt, Yasmine dePagter, Michael Hoffman, Les Holst, Junee Kirk, Lisa Markalunas, Ann Mullins, Joe Myers, Suzannah Reid, Gilbert Sanchez, Jack Wilke, Marsha Cook, Amy Guthrie, Sara Adams

Decisions:

1. Next Meeting – 1 October 2008 @ 8:15 AM
2. Location – Sister Cities room, City Hall basement

Presentations:

1. Amy provided the definition of “reversible” and “addition” as requested by one of the committee members.
2. Photographs and a short paper on Modern Chalets – “Aspen’s 20th Century Architecture: Modern Chalet Style Buildings” were distributed along with “Aspen’s 20th Century Architecture: Chalet Style Buildings” and the Integrity Assessment for Chalets.
3. Gilbert has created and presented to the subcommittee an Aspen Historical Timeline that will be a valuable tool. Currently the timeline includes the dates of important events, the period of time when chalets, rustic and modern architecture were being constructed and examples of specific buildings representative of the styles. Victorians, Wrightian and Modern-Chalets will be added.

Discussion/Decisions:

1. Question: Do we have enough information on the history of Aspen to go forward?
Decision: While we recognize there is more to learn about Aspen’s history, particularly as it relates to the people and what they were doing during a particular time, most believe that we have enough information to move forward with the discussion of styles that may represent the history. We will continue to explore the history as each style is discussed.
2. Question: Is the story (history of Aspen) worth telling?
Decision: All but one member believe the history is important to tell.
3. Discussion – is the “story” about preserving the social structure and fabric which may be more about scale and massing rather than the individual

- building, is it about the people - which we can not preserve or is it about the buildings that reflect what the people were doing.
4. Discussion – the criteria – what is important and should be preserved must be acceptable to the public. Historic Preservation must be Understandable, Predictable and Defendable.
 5. Question: What elements of Aspen’s existing cultural and physical landscape best represent the story – what styles should be discussed? Decision: A meeting will be dedicated to each of the following: Chalet, Rustic, Modern, Wrightian, Modern Chalet and Miscellaneous (other styles, landscapes, sculpture, etc).
 6. There is agreement that we need more information about criteria as it relates to case laws. Michael Hoffman offered to research and make a presentation to the group.
 7. We will revisit the work plan after our meeting on chalets.
 8. Amy and Sara will lead the discussion on the various styles. Anyone with a particular interest can help with research and preparation for the meeting.

Action Required:

Subcommittee Members:

1. Add Victorian, Wrightian & Modern Chalet styles to the Aspen Historical Timeline – Gilbert Sanchez
2. Research applicable case laws - Michael Hoffman

Please advise as to any correction and/or additions to the above even though these notes are not meant to be detailed minutes of our meeting.

**Criteria Subcommittee for the Historic Preservation Task Force
Meeting Notes**

Meeting Date: 1 October 2008
Prepared by: Marsha Cook & Gilbert Sanchez
Date: 5 October 2008

Attendees:

Yasmine dePagter, Michael Hoffman, June Kirk, Lisa Markalunas, Ann Mullins, Joe Myers, Suzannah Reid, Gilbert Sanchez, Bill Wiener, Jack Wilke, Amy Guthrie, Sara Adams & Marsha Cook via speakerphone

Presentations:

1. Amy and Sara presented a time-line and photos of chalets. It is Amy's opinion that the photographs presented represent the complete inventory of chalets in Aspen. Structures that have been demolished were included. Many of the properties are lodges.

Discussion/Decisions:

1. Many were surprised that the inventory of chalets is not larger. Discussion followed as to ways to encourage the preservation of the structures.
2. Question: Are Chalets worth preserving, does this body of work represent Aspen's history?
Response: Yes
3. Question: In general, are the remaining examples of chalets reflective or representative of one of the following: an important event, an important person or significant architectural style?
Response: Yes with 1 no
4. Question: Are three (3) designated chalet style buildings adequate to represent the style and period of history?
Response: No
5. Establishing criteria and integrity are different things. We need to establish criteria before we evaluate the integrity of something.
6. The evaluation of specific houses, structures, etc. happens after the development of criteria. As we go forward with developing criteria, even though everything is on the table, we should begin by reviewing what has already been created. We don't want to throw out what may already work.
7. Caution was given to "locking down the list/potential properties".
8. There was discussion about scoring the properties presented.

Next Meeting:

1. 8 October 2008 @ 8:15 AM
2. Location – Red Brick Building Conference Room

Action Required:

Subcommittee Members:

1. Add Victorian, Wrightian & Modern Chalet styles to the Aspen Historical Timeline – Gilbert Sanchez
2. Research applicable case laws - Michael Hoffman

Please advise as to any correction and/or additions to the above even though these notes are not meant to be detailed minutes of our meeting.

Criteria Subcommittee for the Historic Preservation Task Force Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: 8 October 2008
Prepared by: Marsha Cook & Gilbert Sanchez
Date: 10 October 2008

Attendees:

Michael Behrendt, Michael Hoffman, June Kirk, Lisa Markalunas, Joe Myers, Suzannah Reid, Gilbert Sanchez, Amy Guthrie, Sara Adams & Marsha Cook via speakerphone

Presentations:

1. Amy and Sara presented a time-line and photos representing **rustic style architecture** in Aspen. The time-line reflects what was happening in the world during the time that rustic architecture was being built in Aspen. Railroads and the development of cars had impact on recreation sites. The Park Service promoted the rustic look. People wanted to go west for vacations and stay in log cabins. Some were able to buy homes and second homes began to appear in Aspen. The rustic style spans from 1930-1970.

Discussion/Decisions:

1. Currently log homes and pan abodes are considered to be “rustic style” architecture. The style also includes simple cabins such as those at L’Auberge. After much discussion the subcommittee decided to separate the two and discuss them independently rather than as a single body of work representing rustic.
2. Pan Abodes are available today as kits. They were cheap and built as vacation homes during the 1950’s and 60’s.
3. Five (5) log homes that have been designated and there are two (2) that could be.
4. Question: Are Log Homes worth preserving, does this body of work represent Aspen’s history?
Response: Yes (unanimous)
5. Question: Are five (5) designated log buildings adequate to represent the style and period of history?
Response: The question was determined not to be useful for this discussion.
6. Question: Are the remaining examples of log buildings reflective or representative of one of the following: an important event or trend, an important person or significant architectural style?
Response: Yes (unanimous)

7. Four (4) Pan Abodes have been designated.
8. Question: Are Pan Abodes worth preserving, does this body of work represent Aspen's history?
Response: Discussion, vote postponed
9. Question: Are four (4) designated Pan Abodes adequate to represent the style and period of history?
Response: More discussion desired
10. Question: Are the remaining examples of Pan Abodes reflective or representative of one of the following: an important event or trend, an important person or significant architectural style?
Response: More discussion desired
11. There are questions regarding the dates and authenticity of some of the pan abode type structures - new versus old.
12. While the feeling is that Rustic Architecture should be preserved, it may not be as important as Victorians and Chalets. The need to preserve log homes was unanimous where as the need to preserve pan abodes is mixed. It was suggested that we preserve only one or two of the best and let the others go. It was decided that more discussion is required.

Next Meeting:

1. 15 October 2008 @ 8:15 AM
2. Location – Sister Cities Conference Room – City Hall basement

Action Required:

Subcommittee Members:

1. Add Victorian, Wrightian & Modern Chalet styles to the Aspen Historical Timeline – Gilbert Sanchez
2. Research applicable case laws - Michael Hoffman

Please advise as to any correction and/or additions to the above even though these notes are not meant to be detailed minutes of our meeting.

**Criteria Subcommittee for the Historic Preservation Task Force
Meeting Notes**

Meeting Date: 15 October 2008
Prepared by: Marsha Cook & Gilbert Sanchez
Date: 19 October 2008

Attendees:

Yasmine dePagter, June Kirk, Lisa Markalunas, Suzannah Reid, Gilbert Sanchez, Bill Wiener, Amy Guthrie, Sara Adams & Marsha Cook via speakerphone

Presentation:

Amy distributed – “20th Century Resources by Style – Draft”. The list includes already designated and potential historic resources.

Discussion/Decisions:

Meeting notes for 8 October 2008 were reviewed.

This week’s discussion was a continuance of the October 8th meeting on rustic style architecture.

1. During the last meeting there was discussion about the poor construction and difficulty in upgrading and making pan abodes energy efficient. It was countered that yes, it is a big effort but it can be done, just like the Victorians – the question is: Is it worth it?
2. The setting, adjacency to other similar structures and integrity (alterations) are issues.
3. Some believe that there may be a hierarchy with this style.
4. There is a desire by some to preserve scale on properties adjacent to landmarked structures. Amy believes that these controls already exist with the current design standards.
5. Four (4) Pan Abodes have been designated.
6. Question: Are Pan Abodes worth preserving, does this body of work represent Aspen’s history?
Response: Yes (6 yes votes)

7. Question: Are the remaining examples of Pan Abodes reflective or representative of one of the following: an important event or trend, an important person or significant architectural style?
Response: Yes (5 yes)
8. As discussed in the previous meeting – while the feeling is that Rustic architecture should be preserved, it may not be as important as Victorians and Chalets. The number of structures needed and the quality of them/integrity, to tell the story, needs further conversation and has mixed support. Individual properties can be evaluated once the criteria has been developed and integrity scoring can be done.

Issues for Future Discussion:

1. How does visibility/accessibility affect the need/desire to preserve a structure?
2. Given the option of relocation in order to preserve versus demolition – should we consider creating an area where some of these buildings can be relocated, clustered and used for something else? It may not be perfect, but it may be a compromise worth considering.

Next Meeting:

1. 22 October 2008 @ 8:15 AM
2. Location – Red Brick Conference Room
3. Topic – Modern & Wrightian Style Architecture

Action Required:

Subcommittee Members:

1. Add Victorian, Wrightian & Modern Chalet styles to the Aspen Historical Timeline – Gilbert Sanchez
2. Research applicable case laws - Michael Hoffman

Please advise as to any correction and/or additions to the above even though these notes are not meant to be detailed minutes of our meeting.

*

**Criteria Subcommittee for the Historic Preservation Task Force
Meeting Notes**

Meeting Date: 29 October 2008
Prepared by: Marsha Cook & Gilbert Sanchez
Date: 30 October 2008

Attendees:

Members: Michael Behrendt, Marsha Cook, Yasmine dePagter, Michael Hoffman, June Kirk, Lisa Markalunas, Joe Myers, Suzannah Reid, Gilbert Sanchez, Bill Wiener, Jack Wilke, Amy Guthrie & Sara Adams
Guests: Chip Freeman, Jerry Blumberg & Nora ?

Meeting Notes for 22 October 2008 were reviewed.

The following clarification was made to our definition of “body of work”: when a “body of work” is referred to it means that we have reviewed multiple photographs, in a meeting, that have characteristics of a particular style. It does not mean that all of the structures included in the group of photographs, are considered by the subcommittee, to be significant or an example of a style, nor does it mean that there are no other structures that should be included. The over-all character, of the pictures, is the “body of work” – it is representative and not intended to be comprehensive nor inclusive.

Many of the Modern and Wrightian buildings are associated with Architects such as Fritz Benedict, Herbert Bayer, Charles Paterson, Ellie Brickham, Victor Lundy, Robin Molny & Harry Weese.

Presentation:

Amy presented photos of Modern Chalet structures. A copy of *High on the Mountain* an Architectural History of American Ski Resorts by Margaret Supplee Smith, information on Joseph Eichler, an article *Plywood at 100* and photographs of Aspen’s 20th Century Architecture: Modern Chalet Style Buildings were distributed.

Gilbert updated the timeline. A copy is attached.

Discussion/Decisions:

1. This is a transitional style of architecture in Aspen. The term Modern Chalet is one that staff coined to refer to this body of work. It is not a style that is universally recognized while elements of the style can be found in other areas.

2. The character defining elements are varied.
3. Concern was expressed as to why certain buildings such as the Wienerstube are not on the Ordinance 48 list. Amy explained that they only had two weeks to finalize the list and that there may be other buildings that should be considered.

Decision: The subcommittee voted 7 in favor, 3 abstaining, to recommend that the Wienerstube be added to the list.

4. No Modern Chalets have been designated.
5. Ownership was discussed. When Ordinance 48 was finalized, it was a political decision to remove multi-family properties from the list. Even though it may be unlikely for a condominium to be demolished, remodeling of the exterior may compromise historical significance.

Decision: The subcommittee recommends that the ownership structure should have no bearing on historical significance. 7 yes, 1 no, 2 abstained

6. The current Criteria for Designation states:

A property or district is deemed significant as a representation of Aspen's 20th Century history, was constructed in whole or in part more than thirty (30) years prior to the year in which the application for designation is being made, possesses sufficient integrity of location, setting, design, materials, workmanship and association and is related to one (1) or more of the following:

- a. An event, pattern or trend that has made a significant contribution to local, state, regional or natural history,
- b. People whose specific contribution to local, state, regional or national history is deemed important and the specific contribution is identified and documented, or
- c. A physical design that embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction or represents the technical or aesthetic achievements of a recognized designer, craftsman or design philosophy that is deemed important.

7. Historic Preservation should not be used to address Growth Management. This has been a debate in the past and preserving this group brings this to the floor.
8. It was suggested that we consider a tiered policy, some styles being involuntary and others voluntary. It was further suggested that the cut off for involuntary be WWII. Everything after WWII would be voluntary. No decision.

9. Question: Are Modern Chalet structures worth preserving, does this body of work represent Aspen's history? Are there some things within this body of work worth preserving? Is there a connection between modern chalets and the history of Aspen?
Response: Yes (8) No (2)
10. Interiors should be put on the list for future discussion. The Physics building is an example.
10. The presentation on case laws by Michael Hoffman scheduled for November 12 will be postponed for at least a week. The November 12 meeting will be used to review our "update" to be presented to the full Task Force and City Council.

Next Meeting:

1. 5 November 2008 @ 8:15 AM
2. Location – Red Brick conference room
3. Topic – Miscellaneous – buildings, landscapes, sculpture, etc.

Action Required:

Subcommittee Members:

1. Research applicable case laws - Michael Hoffman

Please advise as to any correction and/or additions to the above even though these notes are not meant to be detailed minutes of our meeting.

**Criteria Subcommittee for the Historic Preservation Task Force
Meeting Notes**

Meeting Date: 5 November 2008
Prepared by: Marsha Cook & Gilbert Sanchez
Date: 9 November 2008

Attendees:

Members: Michael Behrendt, Marsha Cook, Junee Kirk, Joe Myers, Suzannah Reid, Gilbert Sanchez, Bill Wiener, Jack Wilke, Amy Guthrie & Sara Adams
Guests: Nora Berko

Joe reported that earlier in the week the Districts subcommittee voted unanimously to create a single historic district that was river-to-river and mountain-to-mountain and the Involuntary/Voluntary subcommittee voted 4 in favor of voluntary only designation, 2 opposed and 1 abstention. As a result of these votes the criteria subcommittee may need to pinpoint properties that need to be preserved and we as a community cannot live without - to tell the story.

Bill Weiner expressed concern that the voting was inappropriate/premature in the Involuntary/Voluntary meeting. Differing opinions were expressed with no resolution – just discussion.

Any voting by a subcommittee represents recommendations that will be taken to the full task force for a vote prior to any recommendation to City Council. Majority and minority opinions will be presented to City Council.

Meeting Notes for 29 October 2008 – there were no comments.

Presentation:

Amy presented photos of miscellaneous potential resources. They included A-frames, mansard roof structures, cemeteries, sculpture, landscapes, etc.

Discussion/Decisions:

The subcommittee created the following list of potential resources for further discussion:

1. Sunken Gardens
2. Additions to Historic Buildings
3. Aspen Institute Campus
4. Plazas/Courtyards
5. Public Properties
6. Public Amenities
7. Other

- a. Malls
- b. Cemeteries
- c. Art/Sculpture
- d. Fuller Dome
8. Historic Activities
 - a. Railroads
 - b. Smelters/Mines
 - c. Brothels
9. Interiors
10. Stone Buildings
11. "Motley Crew"
12. Harry Teague and other Architects
13. Mansard Roof
14. Trailers
15. A-Frames
16. Brick/Panabode
17. Small Lodges

The question was raised as to how we address future buildings? A suggestion was made that if the architect is internationally recognized that there are ways to identify the importance and trigger designation. No resolution.

It was decided that the meeting scheduled for November 19th be used to determine what and how we should address the items identified today.

Our meeting on November 26th, the day before Thanksgiving, has been cancelled.

Michael Hoffman will be asked to make his presentation on December 3.

Next Meeting:

1. 12 November 2008 @ 8:15 AM
2. Location – Sister Cities Room – City Hall basement
3. Topic – Review activity to date for presentation to the full Task Force on November 13.

Please advise as to any correction and/or additions to the above even though these notes are not meant to be detailed minutes of our meeting.

**Criteria Subcommittee for the Historic Preservation Task Force
Meeting Notes**

Meeting Date: 12 November 2008
Prepared by: Marsha Cook
Date: 17 November 2008

Attendees:

Members: Michael Behrendt, Penney Evans Carruth, Marsha Cook, Yasmine dePagter, June Kirk, Lisa Markalunas, Ann Mullins, Joe Myers, Suzannah Reid, Gilbert Sanchez, Jack Wilke, Amy Guthrie & Sara Adams

Guests: Nora Berko & Charles Cunniffe

The following two corrections were made to the meeting notes for November 5, 2008:

1. Joe reported that earlier in the week the Districts subcommittee voted unanimously to create a single historic district that was river-to-river and mountain-to-river. (Notes originally said river-to-river and mountain-to-mountain.)
2. Item #5 under Discussion/Decisions was changed from "Public Properties" to "Public Open Spaces".

There was discussion as to whether it is appropriate for someone that does not attend a meeting to vote on an issue. Some of the points taken were: The vote is relative to the discussion at the time of the vote, it is difficult to attend all of the meetings, the process is evolving and opinions change as we learn more - possibly causing us to reconsider earlier votes. All votes to date have been "straw votes" used to determine support for something that requires further consideration. All issues will be voted on, at a later date, by the full task force. Those votes, representing majority and minority positions will be communicated to City Council. The general feeling was that you need to be a part of the discussion to vote.

The primary purpose of the meeting was to review the Progress Report document that was presented to the full task force on November 13, 2008.

The following revisions were made to the draft Progress Report:

1. "Recommendations to Date" was changed to "Votes to Date".
2. The word "some" was missing from each of the Votes to Date about styles to preserve and was added.
3. Differences in commercial and residential issues should be added to Outstanding Issues.

The suggestion to address the future, putting something in place to govern as time moves forward will be discussed in our next Criteria meeting.

Criteria has 3 levels going from broad to narrow:

1. Used to recognize trends/historical significance
2. Used to define styles, groups of buildings based on defining features
3. Addresses the individual building. This is where the integrity of the property is evaluated. The scoring sheets are used at this level.

The analogy of a funnel was used to describe the process.

A suggestion for moving forward is to have a consultant meet with us about existing criteria for the styles identified. Following that general presentation, the subcommittee can identify issues to further develop prior to retaining a consultant for the next step.

It was suggested that we review the HPC review process.

The scoring sheets are important and need reviewing. Integrity issues are the key to what should and should not be preserved.

Next Meeting:

1. 19 November 2008 @ 8:15 AM
2. Location – Red Brick Conference Room
3. Topic – Determine if, what and how we should address any of the potential resources identified in our meeting on 5 November 2008.

Please advise as to any correction and/or additions to the above even though these notes are not meant to be detailed minutes of our meeting.

Criteria Subcommittee for the Historic Preservation Task Force Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: 19 November 2008
Prepared by: Marsha Cook & Gilbert Sanchez
Date: 20 November 2008

Attendees:

Members: Michael Behrendt, Marsha Cook, Yasmine dePagter, Michael Hoffman, June Kirk, Lisa Markalunas, Joe Myers, Suzannah Reid, Gilbert Sanchez, Jack Wilke, Amy Guthrie & Sara Adams

There were no comments regarding the Meeting Notes for 12 November 2008.

The purpose of today's meeting was to review and prioritize other potential historical resources. The list of resources was separated into two categories:

- #1 Potential resources that should be addressed by the current task force. They will be discussed further in another meeting.
- #2 Potential resources worthy of consideration at a later date, possibly by another task force and/or staff.

The current task force should address the following potential resources:

1. The Meadows SPA - includes but not limited to the Aspen Institute Campus (9 - #1 priority votes, 0 - #2 priority votes)
2. Interiors - with public access (7 - #1 priority votes, 1 - #2 votes)

The following potential resources are recognized by some members of the subcommittee to be a part of Aspen's history. Another task force and/or staff should review them at a later date.

1. Additions to historic buildings. (1 - #1 priority votes, 8 - #2 votes)
2. Buildings with Plazas, Courtyards (including sunken gardens) (0 - #1 priority votes, 8 - #2)
3. Public Open Spaces – includes parks, historic ditch system (2 - #1 priority votes, 5 - #2 votes)
4. Art/Sculpture (0 - #1 votes, 8 - #2 votes)
5. Stone Buildings – City Market & Wienerstube are examples (0 - #1 priority votes, 6 - #2 votes)
6. Miscellaneous buildings – “Motley Crew” (0 - #1 votes, 6 - #2 priority votes)
7. Harry Teague and other contemporary architects (1 - #1 priority votes, 7 - #2 priority votes)
8. Mansard Roof buildings (0 - #1 priority votes, 9 - #2 priority votes)
9. Trailers (0 - #1 priority votes, 8 - #2 priority votes)

10. A-Frames (0 - #1 priority votes, 8 - #2 priority votes)
11. Small Lodges (2 - #1 priority votes, 6 - #2 priority votes)
12. Future Buildings (0 - #1 priority votes, 8 - #2 priority votes)
13. Signs painted on buildings (0 - #1 priority votes, 8 - #2 priority votes)
14. The historic grid – streets (2 - #1 priority votes, 5 - #2 priority votes)

From the original list of suggested resources developed by the subcommittee it was determined:

1. Public Amenities are covered under plazas, courtyards, etc.
2. Malls are covered under public space
3. Cemeteries are all already landmarked
4. Fuller Dome is covered under the Meadows SPA/Aspen Institute Campus
5. Historic Activities (railroads, smelters/mines) are already protected; Brothels – there aren't any to protect
6. Brick/Pan abodes will be included under Motley Crew
7. The historic racetrack is part of the Aspen Institute campus
8. The ruins at Marolt are already designated
9. The flume on Castle Creek is part of the county
10. There are no gardens left to preserve. The landscaping/gardens at the Institute are covered under the Meadows SPA

Discussion:

There was a philosophical discussion about the risk of keeping the future from being better than the past for future generations by preserving everything. Others believe that preservation does not prohibit change, it just adds more control.

The subcommittee needs to focus on criteria for existing resources. However, we need to include wording in our report that addresses the fact that today is tomorrow's history. We need to craft the ability to address the preservation of future buildings.

Policy/codes/etc. as they apply to the additions on historic properties was discussed. Based on the existing guidelines, you must distinguish the addition from the historic resource. The perception is that the addition must be contemporary. Staff explained that is not correct; the architects have driven most of the styles of the expansions in the West End. Some believe that the owner should be able to do an expansion that is consistent with the historic resource if they want to. It was determined that more background information is needed to have an informed discussion and this should be addressed in the Architectural subcommittee. This topic needs further consideration.

Various approaches were suggested for dealing with potential resources rather than being heavy handed and designating everything. Members of HPC said that the perception by the community that HPC is burdensome is wrong. An SPA gives HPC a courtesy review. It was suggested that if we can't trust the owner of an individual pan abode to preserve it, then we can't trust the campuses to be preserved. No resolution.

The review process for SPA's needs further discussion.

The Aspen Institute is considered by many of the subcommittee to be the most important example of mid-century design in Aspen.

The Given Institute is owned by the state and is not under local jurisdiction.

Next Meeting:

1. 3 December 2008 @ 8:15 AM
2. Location – Red Brick Conference Room
3. Topic – Presentation by Michael Hoffman on case laws.

Please advise as to any correction and/or additions to the above even though these notes are not meant to be detailed minutes of our meeting.

**Criteria Subcommittee for the Historic Preservation Task Force
Meeting Notes**

Meeting Date: 10 December 2008
Prepared by: Marsha Cook
Date: 12 December 2008

Attendees:

Members: Michael Behrendt, Marsha Cook, Yasmine dePagter, Michael Hoffman, June Kirk, Joe Myers, Suzannah Reid, Jack Wilke, Amy Guthrie & Sara Adams

Presentation:

Sara Adams gave an informative presentation on Interiors. She also distributed two papers that are worth reading:

1. **Preservation Brief 18: Rehabilitating Interiors in Historic Buildings**
Technical Preservation Services
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

<http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/briefs/brief18.htm>

2. **Exhibit B**
Section 26.415 of the Land Use Code “ Development Involving the Aspen Inventory of Historic Landmark Sites and Structures or Development in an “H,” Historic Overlay District”

The following definitions are included:

Interior: Any element situated within the exterior walls of a building, which includes and is not limited to interior exposed structural systems and visible materials.

Interior designated landmark: An interior that is listed on the Aspen Inventory of Historic Landmark Sites and Structures.

Interior finishes: Interior finishes important in defining the overall character of the building include but are not limited to: built in features, columns, cornices, baseboards, fireplaces and mantles, trim, signs, ceiling materials, paneling, light fixtures, hardware, flooring, wallpaper, plaster, paint, finishes such as stenciling, marbling, graining, historic graffiti, and other decorative materials that accent interior features.

This document was prepared by Staff, at the direction of Council, to begin discussions about interior preservation. Over the past year and a half, it has been reviewed by the HPC and P & Z. The exhibit includes the above referenced section in its entirety. Proposed text to be removed, text to be added and existing text to remain are included. This is a work in progress and has not been accepted or rejected.

Discussion:

Information discussed regarding interiors included the following:

1. The only interiors being considered are those with public access. This includes those privately and publicly owned.
2. Churches cannot be landmarked because of “freedom of religion” laws.
3. Four interiors have been landmarked in Telluride. Two publicly owned and two privately owned – a hotel and the opera house.
4. When reviewing an interior project it is common to consider/establish a hierarchy of spaces. Some spaces are more important than others and can be preserved at different integrity levels.
5. The exterior of a building must be landmarked in order to landmark an interior.
6. The interior of a building may be more important than the exterior in conveying the building’s history and development over time.
7. Most interior preservation efforts involve some level of alteration.
8. Aspen has very few candidates for the preservation of interior spaces.
9. A survey of potential interior historic resources does not exist and would need to be created based on criteria.
10. Current local laws do not allow for designation of interiors, even if they are voluntary.
11. The Courthouse is a good example of interiors.
12. Some believe that people are preserving what is good.
13. Experts could be used to review certain projects.
14. Incentives could/should be developed specifically for interiors.

Unanswered Questions:

1. What happens to the designation of an interiors when the property transitions from a space with public access to one of private use?
2. Does a Private Membership Club have “public access”?
3. How do you regulate interiors?

Recommendation:

Question:

Are interiors with public access worth preserving, does this body of work represent Aspen's history? Are there **some** interiors worth preserving?

Response: Yes (5) No (0) Abstain (2)

Miscellaneous:

Outstanding agenda items for today's meeting will be postponed until our first meeting in January. That meeting will focus on the qualities of or examples of building types/properties that we would go to bat for. The purpose being to help us identify what type of "higher standards" may be required in order to protect the more important structures.

Suggestions were accepted regarding questions for Debbie Abele.

Next Meeting:

1. 17 December 2008 @ 8:15 AM
2. Location – **Red Brick Conference Room**
3. Topic – guest speaker Debbie Abele

Please advise as to any correction and/or additions to the above even though these notes are not meant to be detailed minutes of our meeting.

Criteria Subcommittee for the Historic Preservation Task Force Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: 17 December 2008
Prepared by: Marsha Cook
Date: 4 January 2009

Attendees:

Members: Michael Behrendt, Marsha Cook, Yasmine dePagter, Michael Hoffman, June Kirk, Lisa Markalunas, Joe Myers, Suzannah Reid, Gilbert Sanchez, Jack Wilke, Amy Guthrie & Sara Adams

Presentation:

Debbie Abele, the author of Aspen's current Historic Preservation Ordinance attended our meeting. Debbie began the discussion by addressing questions that she had been given prior to the meeting. The informal meeting provided valuable information for the subcommittee. The meeting with the Criteria subcommittee was followed by a question and answer session at noon with the Economics & Incentives subcommittee.

Debbie made the following comments:

1. Communities do not make distinctions in styles.
2. Antiquity is 100 years old.
3. Before establishing a program the community needs to determine how many representative examples exist. What is the population? How many are represented? Good programs are proportional to the number of buildings of that style. Start with the population, the quantity and the context.
4. Analysis is significant.
5. What a community wants – “political will” determines what is designated.
6. “Political will” requires support.
7. Historic Preservation significance and importance are Council issues – political questions.
8. Styles – survey community to determine community support. Population may choose not to designate post WWII.
9. **Residential vs. Commercial.** The integrity is usually different because the commercial is constantly changing. The issue is if it maintains character. If the changes that have occurred would have been approved by the HP program, then they are OK.
10. Debbie does not think that a voluntary program works.
11. A voluntary program can work with incentives. Hybrids don't work – except money does talk. Voluntary won't work for those who do not care. Absentee owners are not engaged in community.

12. You must treat properties similarly. You can't treat part-time owners different from permanent residents.
13. "Average Reciprocity of Advantage"– singling out Victorians vs. WWII.
14. The process for designation is important.
15. In some areas post WWII properties are important as subdivisions, not individual homes. Some areas have established funds to replace doors/windows as long as they look the same as the original.
16. Review approvals vary and are different from designation.
17. Panabodes as a collection may be thematic rather than geographic.
18. There are different levels of recognition (can be landmarks) that must be decided:
 - Criteria for Designation
 - Criteria for Landmark Designation
 - Specific set of findings:
 - Greater Recognition
 - Greater Incentives
 - Visible to the public/community at large (need to recognize and know that it is there)
 - Exceptional (all component pieces; documented elements that have been studied over years)
19. Need to consider:
 - Geographic distribution – exposure to visitor
 - Analysis of population – style types must come first
 - Historic patterns of neighborhoods – homes and support (schools/churches)
20. Procedural Due Process is important (notice, hearings, must know the property may qualify).
21. Charleston has no guidelines.
22. Three types of reviews:
 - Consensual
 - Contractual
 - Regulatory
23. Contractual is Voluntary.
24. Each city can make rules as long as they comply with Constitution.
25. Rules must provide notice.
26. There is a difference between rules for Review and rules for Designation.
27. Demo should have separate rules.
28. Pitkin County has no demo denial – delay only.
29. Historic Preservation in Arizona is through zoning.
30. Aspen is a Charter Government prescribed through Ordinances.
31. Colorado is more open with the zoning process.
32. Super Majority – in some locations when a certain percentage of those opposed exist, they can file with the city and trigger a ¾ vote.
33. Dynamics, population and real estate are unique in Aspen.
34. It is hard to balance what is fair – it is a challenge.

35. Must have specific criteria for **Interiors**. The exterior must be designated first. There is not much out there to look at. The public must be familiar the interiors. Need community support. High quality craftsmanship. Must convey historic function. Incentives may include funding repairs and promotion of the property.
36. Question – when public properties become private (Sardy House). It is hard to touch anything inside private/residential. Need to offer incentives. Not sure what happens when the access goes from public to private.
37. Cities cannot designate state properties.
38. Churches can be designated through zoning and political will.
39. **Districts** – why have one big district rather than small ones? (Debbie’s question to the group.) Justifiable numbers of contributing resources needed to justify district – over arching numbers. Debbie suggested going with smaller areas rather than combining with commercial.
40. Response from group to Debbie’s question – desire to have a District driven by wanting to compete with Crested Butte and Telluride as a Historic Town. Debbie suggested simply posting a sign that says “Welcome to Historic Aspen”.
41. Debbie feels strongly about districts having a significant number of “contributing resources”. Conservation Districts are more of a planning mechanism. Debbie asked why pursue regulating non-contributing properties? The response from the group was to regulate height, scale & mass. Is that legal? Debbie – Height, mass & scale yes – but not style.
42. Can/how do you designate a finite number of representative examples of a style? Debbie’s response – It is legitimate with justification. It is done academically without designating all of a style. When requesting designation, it helps to tell an owner that they are only one of five but there is another one that can be selected.
43. Scoring becomes more objective when reviewed by multiple people. Community members are on review committees. The academic/scholarly review must come first.
44. Phoenix had a bond issue voted on by the community to support Historic Preservation.
45. LA has a rehab and tax program for post WWII properties.
46. **Architects** as criteria. Not all work by an architect is significant. You must prioritize the importance of the building. The building needs to be dissected – the setting, materials, not just who designed it or who they worked for.
47. Debbie thinks it is appropriate for the Task Force to review the structures attached to Ordinance 48. We need to review why we think they are important.

Debbie agreed/offered to provide the following:

1. Copy of the guidelines for Taliescent West.
2. Information on Interior designation.

The following comments are from the noon discussion with Debbie Abele:

1. Consider taking the existing Context Papers from a thesis format to bullet points and prioritize features.
2. Many communities have Design Review Guidelines.
3. Santa Fe uses points to determine what can be done within review guidelines on new construction.
4. Debbie stressed that programs shouldn't designate everything – you only pick the best.
5. There is no place like Aspen; Carmel has similar conditions because of the high land values.
6. You can't treat owners differently because of residency.
7. Document the process for categorizing properties, what are the categories or properties, how many of each style exist – ranking them.
8. Properties need to be surveyed.
9. Evaluate significance or importance against criteria.
10. What is the importance that designation has on the economy and value?
11. An example of an outreach program – modernphoenix.com
12. The city should be model behavior and designate their own buildings.
13. There is a process to delist a property.
14. Different guidelines/standards can be developed for different styles. Debbie thinks this system works.
15. Amy is unsure of how many properties have been involuntarily designated in Aspen.
16. Debbie could not give an example of a voluntary program that she thinks works well.
17. More and different incentives can be applied to more significant buildings. Different incentives for Landmark vs. designated.
18. Historic Preservation benefits the public – focus on properties that most benefit the public (hidden properties – low on list of priorities).
19. Need to identify potential properties.
20. Age – the age requirement helps with the procedural issues – notice to the owner that a property may be looked at.

Next Meeting:

1. 7 January 2009 @ 8:15 AM
2. Location – **Red Brick Conference Room**
3. Agenda – Discussion on qualities of or examples of building types that we would go to bat for. The purpose being to help us identify what type of

“higher standards” may be required in order to protect the most important structures.

Please advise as to any correction and/or additions to the above even though these notes are not meant to be detailed minutes of our meeting.

Criteria Subcommittee for the Historic Preservation Task Force Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: 7 January 2009
Prepared by: Marsha Cook
Date: 12 January 2009

Attendees:

Members: Michael Behrendt, Marsha Cook, Yasmine dePagter, Michael Hoffman, June Kirk, Lisa Markalunas, Joe Myers, Suzannah Reid, Gilbert Sanchez, Amy Guthrie & Sara Adams

General Discussion:

The question was asked if we have or need feedback from HPC regarding the existing criteria. Michael Hoffman believes that with his, Anne Mullins and other past HPC members on the task force that the issues have been addressed.

What motivated Michael Hoffman to get involved is the feeling that some buildings are more important than others and how can the community communicate such?

The purpose of today's meeting was to discuss qualities of or examples of buildings that we would go to bat for. The purpose being to help us identify what type of "higher standards" may be required in order to protect the most important structures.

Our plan was to review photographs of the properties attached to Ordinance 48 and any other buildings that subcommittee members believe important. Since the photographs were not available at the beginning of the meeting we decided to go around the room and have each member talk about examples that they believe to be important and something that they would fight to preserve.

Yasmine dePagter – Most important is the Aspen Institute, not so much the individual buildings but the "setting". Loves the Doerr-Hosier. There is nothing that she would go to bat for in the other categories.

Michael Behrendt – Values the Victorians. Values in terms of living – the texture, size and scale of buildings. Other than a few public buildings – nothing that he would die for. Save the very old, save what is good that is new, but let people who own them take care of them. We need to reward those that preserve buildings.

Suzannah Reid – Disagrees with Michael Behrendt. This is an academic endeavor, a continuum but not individual styles. Aspen is unique because of

mid-century styles. The Institute should be at the top of the list. Chalets are good examples but hidden consideration should be given.

Gilbert Sanchez – Agrees with Suzannah. Would like photos to refer to, remembers a handful of Chalets that should be preserved. There are one or two buildings in each style that should be preserved. Aspen Institute is the most important. Different buildings are what provide the mass and scale that Michael Behrendt is referring to.

Joe Myers - Believes that the task force can best serve City Council by presenting a very specific plan with specific properties named.

Historic buildings worthy of being saved are worthy of designation as landmarks and should not only be significant but also distinctive, unique and having stood the test of time, words not currently used in our present ordinance criteria. Our Victorians clearly meet those tests and so do Chalets and Rustics. If we lose those, they will be lost forever. That is not so with Moderns; they are still being built and he hopes that the best is yet to come. Joe is unclear as to whether Post Moderns are worthy of designation. Accordingly, if we decided on a two-tier system of voluntary and involuntary, he would include ten Chalets and at least eight Rustics for consideration of the involuntary list and, if any, only a few selected moderns and post moderns on the voluntary list.

The Chalets are Mountain Chalet, Alpenblick, Skier's Chalet, Chalet Lisl, St. Moritz, Tyrolean Lodge, the Cortina, and the Ullr Lodge, and houses at 765 Meadows and 949 Smuggler. The Rustics are Hickory House, Kitzbuhl Lodge, Alm House, Mt. Rescue and houses at 210 Francis, 129 East Hopkins, 411 Pearl Court and 615 North Third Street.

Obviously all of these structures would need to be investigated in much greater detail and would be subject, of course, to the integrity scoring system but they look like good prospects for designation. Joe is undecided about the Bavarian Inn and 621 West Francis, so would probably include them on our voluntary list. He has not seen 1101 East Cooper and needs more information on 401 Pearl Court, which is not on our list of 85 properties. There are three Victorians which should be considered for designation and they are 122 West Hopkins, 28 Smuggler Grove and 900 Stage Road.

Joe limited his consideration of properties to those within the bounds of the triangle formed by the Roaring Fork River, Castle Creek and Aspen and Shadow Mountains, which he understands are the boundaries of original Aspen, where

the critical mass of our historic buildings are located and what he hopes will be declared a historic district.

Lisa Markalunas – Agrees with Gilbert about context on mass and scale. The setting at the Aspen Institute is important. Other important buildings include Skier's Chalet, 949 Smuggler, and the one-story residential Herbert Bayer buildings. Nothing in panabodes or modern chalets.

June Kirk – The Mt. Chalet (location) is important. The St Moritz and the other 8 lodges should be preserved including the Ullr. Rustics are important – Hickory House and Mt. Rescue. Hesitate to include private residences. Would include fishing houses on Main Street and the Alm House. Would not include moderns. Not as concerned with the Institute changing things. US Bank was designed by Sam Caudill and should be preserved. North of Nell and Aspen Square should not be preserved.

Michael Hoffman – thinks of history differently. Should preserve “free spirit” of 60's – what drew people to Aspen. Wants examples of things that preserve free spirit rather than specific.

Discussion/debate pursued as to the appropriateness of identifying structures and how we go forward.

Suggestions/comments:

- Keep 1-2 of each style and let the others go.
- Infill has had an impact on Historic Buildings.
- Make recommendations of buildings to save, take to the task force, and then to City Council.
- General recommendation needed regarding height, mass & scale. Zoning has impact on Historic Preservation.
- Concern for due process – but we cannot do this in a vacuum.
- Include in criteria “distinctive, unique & having stood the test of time”
- Integrity scoring is a staff function
- Some programs have integrity scoring done by separate boards (not staff)
- Integrity scoring system needs to be reviewed/tested by task force members
- Need to look at “characteristics”

Next Steps:

Michael Hoffman offered to start writing our recommendation/report. He plans to start from scratch. Gilbert offered to review. Michael hopes to have something available for us to review within 2-3 weeks.

Everyone was encouraged to review the existing criteria and pass suggestions/questions to Michael. We have criteria, characteristics and integrity scoring.

Once we have the draft we will focus on the list of buildings to recommend.

Miscellaneous:

There are 2400 parcels in town. 250 buildings have been designated. (These are revised numbers.)

Next Meeting:

1. 14 January 2009 @ 8:15 AM
2. Location – **Building Department Conference Room (517 E. Hopkins)**
Underneath Aspen Daily News
3. Agenda – Integrity Scoring process

Please advise as to any correction and/or additions to the above even though these notes are not meant to be detailed minutes of our meeting.

**Criteria Subcommittee for the Historic Preservation Task Force
Meeting Notes**

Meeting Date: 14 January 2009
Prepared by: Marsha Cook
Date: 19 January 2009

Attendees:

Members: Michael Behrendt, Penney Evans Carruth, Marsha Cook, Yasmine dePagter, Junee Kirk, Joe Myers, Gilbert Sanchez, Jack Wilke, Amy Guthrie & Sara Adams

Guests: Rebecca Hill, Charles Cunniffe & Jerry Blumberg

Correction to January 7, 2009 Meeting Notes:

Michael Hoffman is working on Criteria, not the subcommittee's report.

Presentation by Amy Guthrie:

Amy distributed a document that included the following information:

There are 2,319 parcels of land in the City of Aspen. 279, or 12% of these parcels are landmark designated. Of the 279 landmarks, 257 are properties containing buildings from Aspen's first 13 years of history. Only 22 buildings from Aspen's last 113 years of history are currently landmarked.

There is no reason to believe that only Aspen's Victorian era residents produced places worth saving, however, creating a review process for younger properties that is clear and acceptable to the public has been challenging. Following is a list of eighty 20th century buildings that Historic Preservation staff has suggested might have historic significance. They are grouped by architectural style.

CHALET

1. 970 Cemetery Lane
2. 832 E. Cooper Avenue, Viking Lodge
3. 333 E. Durant Avenue, Mountain Chalet
4. 233 Gilbert Street, Skier Chalet Lodge
5. 928 W. Hallam Street
6. 100 E. Hyman Ave., Chalet Lisl
7. 334 W. Hyman Ave., St. Moritz
8. 520 W. Main Street, Ullr Lodge
9. 834 W. Main Street, Bavarian Lodge
10. 765 Meadows Road
11. 119 Red Mountain Road
12. 631 S. Galena, Alpinblick
13. 949 W. Smuggler Ave

14. 95 Westview Drive

RUSTIC

1. 1101 E. Cooper Ave., Hildur Anderson
2. 210 W. Francis Street
3. 129 E. Hopkins Ave.
4. 211 W. Hopkins Ave.
5. 300 W. Hyman Ave., Kitzbuhl Lodge
6. 220 E. Main Street, Cortina Lodge
7. 630 W. Main Street, Mountain Rescue
8. 730 W. Main Street, Hickory House
9. 403 Park Avenue
10. 411 Pearl Court
11. 246 Roaring Fork Drive
12. 69 Shady Lane
13. 1208/1210 Snowbunny Lane
14. 615 N. Third Street

MODERN

1. 408 E. Cooper Ave., Aspen Sports
2. 617 E. Cooper, Aspen Square
3. 1411 Crystal Lane
4. 1422-1441 Crystal Lake, Aspen Club Condos
5. 555 E. Durant Ave., North of Nell
6. 100 E. Francis St., Given Institute
7. 215 N. Garmish, Yellow Brick
8. 700 W. Gillespie St., Stranahan Hall
9. 606 E. Hyman Ave.
10. 610 E. Hyman Ave.
11. 630 E. Hyman Ave., Patio Bldg.
12. 700 W. Hyman Ave
13. 301 Lake Ave.
14. 420 E. Main St.
15. 435 E. Main St.
16. 592 McSkimming Rd.
17. 745 Meadows Rd.
18. 119 S. Mill St., Wells Fargo Bank
19. 307 S. Mill St., D-19
20. 536 W. North St., Christ Episcopal Church
21. 434 Pearl Court
22. 258 Roaring Fork Drive
23. 850 Roaring Fork Road
24. 54 Shady Lane
25. 300 S. Spring Street, Hannah Dustin
26. 1000 N. Third Street, Aspen Institute Campus
27. 700 Ute Avenue, Aspen Alps

28. 1280 Ute Avenue, Benedict Building

MODERN CHALET

1. 809 S. Aspen Street, Shadow Mountain Condos
2. 114 E. Bleeker St.
3. 118 E. Bleeker St.
4. 1001 E. Cooper Ave., Villager Townhomes
5. 608 W. Hopkins Ave., Madsen Chalets
6. 720 W. Hopkins Ave.
7. 621 W. Francis Street
8. 624 W. Francis Street
9. 626 W. Francis Street
10. 500 W. Smuggler
11. 24 McSkimming Road
12. 232 McSkimming Road
13. 219 S. Third Street
14. 407 N. Third Street
15. 1005 Waters Ave.
16. 610 S. West End Street, The Gant

WRIGHTIAN

1. 720 E. Hyman Avenue, Aspen Athletic Club
2. 322 W. Hyman Ave.
3. 120 E. Main Street, Design Workshop
4. Pedestrian Malls

OTHER

1. 110 E. Hallam Street, Red Brick
2. 327 W. Hallam Street
3. 200 W. Main St., Tyrolean Lodge
4. 1102 Waters Ave.

Presentation/Discussion on Criteria & Integrity Scoring

Amy reported that 1 in every 6 houses in the Cemetery Lane area has been demolished in the last 8 years and historic preservation is the only way to insure that things are preserved. The response by some was that it is not necessarily bad that they were demolished - they needed to be replaced, they were cheap and efficient construction when built.

The properties adjacent to Michael Behrendt are under consideration for redevelopment. They are both tied to historic designation and can be significantly increased in size by using historic preservation as a development tool.

The evaluation of a property has 2 parts:

1. Criteria – how it relates to the town’s history

2. Integrity Scoring.

Currently the staff and the applicant do scoring. Debbie Abele and HPC have, on occasion, been asked to provide scoring. Perhaps a third party/group should provide scoring.

Integrity Scoring:

1. Addresses the degree of alteration
2. It is a subjective process
3. Architectural/physical elements are what integrity scoring is about
4. Looking for authenticity (when remodeling the original structural elements are left, even though reinforcement may be required)

Staff does not have access to properties; therefore “drive-by” review may be the only option for assessment.

Scoring on LaCocina and the Holland House was discussed. Junee suggested that perhaps allowing the authentic portion to be incorporated into a new structure could be considered.

Gilbert expressed concern that we don't take into consideration all of the varying degrees of preservation, which are:

1. Preservation – when you preserve all layers of the structure
2. Restoration – taking the structure back to original (remove the additions)
3. Replication – rebuild what is missing from the original
4. Reconstruction – a new structure built from photos (least desirable)
5. Adaptive Reuse – going forward in time

Restoration versus preservation is often the debate. We need to make sure the Integrity Scoring System reflects our goals. We need to determine if we want to restore or preserve.

The Design Guidelines are the 3rd filter for the process.

When evaluating a building for designation, it is important that the building is in its original location. You receive higher points if it has not been moved. However, once designated as a compromise with the owner, you are allowed to move the building in order to do a lot split (if the FAR works), build an addition or dig out a basement.

New structures will score higher on Integrity Scoring because chances are they have not been moved or significantly altered. Just because something scores high it should not be designated. Properties must meet Criteria before integrity scoring is done.

Jack is concerned that there are no scoring sheets for modern chalets and half of the questions are the same for each style. Victorians have tight details, character defining elements, modern chalets are all different, no two alike.

Junee is unsure how the North of Nell and Aspen Square fit in. Amy explained that they represent a new type of building in Aspen. Benedict designed Aspen Square.

Staff reported that most of the properties on the list would meet Integrity Scoring requirements. We were reminded that many of the properties not on the list are the ones that would not meet the scoring requirements.

Things to Consider:

1. Create an independent 3rd party group to do the Integrity Scoring
2. Address Preservation vs. Restoration
3. Allow an owner to make changes if they are in keeping with the original intent
4. If a change has occurred that would have been approved by HPC, should it be acceptable for original designation?

Identifying Potential Resources

After much discussion, we decided that we as a subcommittee should identify properties that are important. In our next meeting we will use stickies and individually place them on the photos that should be preserved. This will be based on what we know at this time.

Next Steps:

1. Yasmine will call Lisa Purdy to discuss her impression of our process.
2. Michael Hoffman is working on Criteria.

Next Meeting:

1. 21 January 2009 @ 8:15 AM
2. Location – **Red Brick Conference Room**
3. Agenda – Identifying Potential Resources

Please advise as to any correction and/or additions to the above even though these notes are not meant to be detailed minutes of our meeting.