



**CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**
Regular Meeting Minutes
Hybrid Meeting via Zoom and at Memorial Hall
July 1, 2026

A. CALL TO ORDER

A Regular Meeting of the Manitou Springs Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) was held at Manitou Springs Memorial Hall, 606 Manitou Avenue. Chair Rose called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM and declared a quorum present.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT FOR ROLL CALL:

Chair Matthew Rose
Vice Chair Matthew Murphy
Commissioner Ann Nichols
Commissioner Avrie Tomsik

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT FOR ROLL CALL:

Alternate Commissioner Jehan-Ara Khan (Excused)
Alternate Commissioner Tammila Wright (Excused)
Commissioner Joy Porter (Excused)
Commissioner Erin Handlin (Excused)

STAFF PRESENT:

Planning Director Frederick Rollenhagen
Senior Planner Chelsea Royston
Planner II Zachary Davison
Landscape Architect and Planner II Erin Ringsred

GUESTS PRESENT:

City Attorney Representative Mandy Bruning

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. HPC Minutes 06.03.2026

Commissioner Nichols moved to approve the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Chair Rose. The motion was carried (7-0).

C. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was no public comment.

D. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

There was no notice of council action.

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no Unfinished Business.

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. MCAC 2610 – 965 Manitou Ave – Exterior Improvements

Planner Ringsred presented Material Change of Appearance Certification (MCAC) 2610. The project involves a window replacement for the purpose of food sales. The application proposed two alternatives for the replacement window a vinyl and a pine clad.

Commissioner Nichols asked if the commission would be choosing the window between the two options proposed

Planner Ringsred stated that both options meet the applicants needs.

Chair Rose invited the applicant to speak.

The applicant was not present.

Planner Royston confirmed a judgement can be made by HPC without the applicant present.

There was a discussion about the material and trim of the proposed window alternatives, during which Planner Ringsred explained the two options proposed of vinyl and wood clad. Planner Ringsred stated that the adjacent window material was not known and that the existing window was plate glass with wood trim.

Chair Rose opened the public hearing

Scott Harvey, 80 Waltham, stated white vinyl windows did not seem appropriate for the structure.

John French, 511 High Street, stated that new windows would have performance benefits.

Chair Rose closed the public hearing

There was a discussion about the two alternative windows presented and it was generally agreed upon that the double hung window with pine cladding was preferred.

Commissioner Nichols motion to approve MCAC 2610 with the following conditions:

- The window style approved by commission would be the Lifestyle, Direct Set Fixed Frame Rectangle, Double Hung, with Pine Cladding.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tomsik The motion passed unanimously (4-0)

2. MCAC 2611 – 80 Waltham Avenue (Exterior Alterations)

Planner Davison presented Material Change of Appearance Certification (MCAC) 2611. The project involves replacement of a failing wood retaining wall with a concrete alternative. Additionally, a trash enclosure is proposed, which will be constructed along the wall near Waltham Avenue. The retaining wall will be colored to match an approved color sample that best complements the adjacent red rock formations. The trash enclosure will be painted with a similar tone.

Planner Davison confirmed both the trash enclosure and retaining wall are eligible for commission review

Applicant Scott Harvey stated the structural reasons for keeping the concrete and stone walls separate from one another. The request for the removal of two stones from the original wall was clarified. The applicant added that the intent was for the trash enclosure to be bear proof.

Planner Davison clarified that the concrete wall would be integrally colored with one of Manitou's approved standard concrete red, in order to best match adjacent stone and native stone.

There was a discussion about the color of the proposed wood and concrete. Planner Royston clarified that the stain of wood is not under HPC's purview and integral concrete colors must be from the approved list.

Chair Rose opened the hearing for public comment

No comments

Chair Rose closed the hearing for public comment.

Vice Chair Murphy asked if the two stones would need to be named as a condition in the approval.

Planner Davison clarified the stone removal was part of the initial proposal. But it can be added to the motion if preferred.

Chair Rose voiced concerns regarding the structural integrity of the wall if those two stones were removed.

Vice chair Murphy motioned to approve MCAC 2611. With the condition that those two stones can be removed if necessary. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Nichols. The motion passed (4-0)

3. MCAC 2612 – 2 Grand Avenue – New Construction of Accessory Structure

Planner Royston presented Material Change of Appearance Certification (MCAC) 2612. The project involves the construction of an accessory structure which would contain 6 parking spots for the residents at 2 Grand Avenue. There will not be any alterations to the existing historic stone retaining walls. Variances required for the setbacks and maximum lot coverage will be taken to the City Planning Commission for review and public hearing. Staff recommended condition one approval of the proposed MCAC is contingent on the approval of the required variance, and condition two should the required variances be denied staff shall be authorized to approve the modified design without further review by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Vice Chair Murphy asked for clarification on the material of the siding and roof material

Planner Royston clarified that the shake roof is synthetic and the horizontal siding is proposed as wood, but asked the commission to confirm with the applicant.

There was a discussion about the proposed building setbacks. Planner Royston clarified that the setback variances in HPC's purview are side setbacks only, the purview of the proposed setbacks is under the authority of CPC.

Commissioner Tomsik asked for clarification regarding materiality on adjacent structures and asked if the shake siding could extend to the ground.

Planner Royston confirmed stucco was present on the primary structure addition and indicated the siding question should be directed to the applicant.

John Pearing, 109 Pawnee Avenue, addressing the stucco question, the proposal of stucco is consistent with the character and materiality of the primary structure both on the original structure and the addition. The proposed shake roof material is also present on the primary structure and addition.

There was a discussion about the proposed Elevation 4 with the inclusion of stucco, shake and stone on that façade. The applicant indicated it was dependent on the grade change. Commissioner Tomsik expressed her preference for less stucco.

Chair Rose stated the variety of finishes on the primary structure is mimicked in the accessory structure which is a positive.

Chair Rose opened the hearing for public comment

Chair Rose closed the hearing for public comment

Commissioner Tomsik made a motion to approve MCAC 2612 with both of staff's conditions as proposed. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Nichols. The motion passed unanimously (4-0)

G. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Consideration of Jehan-Ara Khan for Historic Preservation Commissioner

Commissioner Nichols expressed her support for Jehan-Ara Khan as a full commissioner.

The commission voted approval for her recommendation unanimously.

2. Sub Committee Appointments for HPC Public Outreach Efforts

Chair Rose explained his interested in the creation of sub-committees to promote HPC's goals and objectives.

Planner Royston stated that the committees must remain two or fewer.

Chair Rose proposed tabling the conversation until the commission was full at the next meeting.

3. Chapter 17 – Code Revisions Discussion

Planner Royston presented Chapter 17 discussion outline. Comparisons were made between the adopted Manitou Springs code, the model code and the Salida Historic Preservation Codes for the purpose of starting discussion around what changes are needed and what areas of the chapter should be focused on. Staff recommended the following criteria be included under the administrative review criteria "reasonable accommodations to individuals with disabilities, as outlined by the Americans with Disabilities Act".

Planner Royston presented the concept of Minor MCAC versus Major MCACs and associated approval criteria for consideration by the commission.

There was a discussion about how window replacements would be reviewed under the proposed changes to Chapter 17. Commissioners expressed interest in streamlining this process to better guide property owners on their options.

Commissioner Nichols stated interested in Minor vs. Major MCAC's but that all applications should be heard in a public hearing. Consideration for reduced application material requirements as a benefit was expressed.

There was a discussion about administrative review projects and whether or not they should be included in consideration for annual rewards.

City Attorney Representative Bruning emphasized the importance of flushing out the criteria for a major vis minor MCAC.

There was a discussion about major vs. minor MCAC applications and their value. Planner Royston stated the goal is for the level of review and scrutiny to match the type, scope and scale of improvements proposed.

Commissioner Nichols asked staff if HPC is notified when an administrative approval is granted.

Planner Ringsred stated that administrative approvals do not require the notification of HPC. There was a discussion regarding what types of administrative approvals the planning department typically observes.

A discussion occurred about approval criteria and the existing codes that had been referenced to create the proposed criteria for discussion by the criteria. The planning department requested the commissioners send staff any thoughts they have regarding the code revisions between this meeting and the next.

H. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Rose moved to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 7:16 PM.

If you need this document in an alternative format, such as large print, accessible PDF, or Braille, please contact the City Clerk's Office at cityclerk@manitouspringsco.gov or (719) 685-2554.