

Historic Preservation Commission

Meeting Minutes

**Monday, January 22, 2024
City Hall, Spruce Room
749 Main Street
6:30 PM**

Call to Order – 6:34 PM

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present: Lynda Haley, Chair
Christine Burg, Vice Chair
Gary Dunlap
Josh Anderson
Sloan Whidden
Marty Beauchamp
Keith Keller

Staff Members Present: Amelia Brackett Hogstad, HPC Planner
Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved by voice vote.

Approval of Posting Locations

The posting locations were approved by voice vote.

Election of Officers and Museum Advisory Board Liaison

Dunlap nominated **Haley** as Chair, and was seconded by **Burg**. The nomination was confirmed by voice vote.

Anderson nominated **Burg** as Vice Chair, and was seconded by **Beauchamp**. The nomination was confirmed by voice vote.

Keller nominated **Whidden** as Museum Advisory Board Liaison, and was seconded by **Burg**. The nomination was confirmed by voice vote.

Approval of 2024 Meeting Dates

The 2024 meeting dates were approved by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

City of Louisville

Community Development 749 Main Street Louisville CO 80027
303.335.4592 (phone) www.LouisvilleCO.gov

None were heard.

Public Hearing Items

a) Caboose Record Clarification

Brackett Hogstad explained that there needed to be clarification as to whether the probable cause finding for the “Caboose” from the December 2023 meeting included a condition. She said that it was unclear if the condition recommended by staff was included as part of the resolution adopted by the Commission. She added that the clarification vote was only for those that were present at that meeting.

Dunlap asked whether the condition was meant to be an expiration date for the probable cause finding.

Brackett Hogstad said yes.

Anderson said that he thought the Commission’s intention was to have the condition attached.

Keller said that this was his recollection.

Burg agreed.

Anderson moved to amend previous approval to include the expiration condition, and was seconded by **Burg**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 4 to 0.

b) 516 Grant Avenue – Demolition Review

Staff Findings:

Brackett Hogstad introduced the presentation for the demolition review. She went over the criteria from LMC and its purpose. She showed photos of the structure from 1948 and today, and noted the limited changes. She said that the house was around 80 years old, with some noted social significance, and that it could qualify for landmarking.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended releasing the demolition request, as even though some social and architectural significance was present, it was not strong enough to warrant a stay.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:

Vincent Colson, non-resident, noted his record of historic preservation as a developer, but said that the house did not fit as something that could be preserved. He said that his previous experience with the Commission taught him what preservation options were available, but that none were viable in this case. The house was full of asbestos, and would cost upwards of \$50,000 to remove and have it remediated. He added that costs have gone up with higher interest rates, and given the larger size of the foundation, it was not viable to rent it out or renovate it. He wanted to preserve some parts of it, like the garden and flagstone.

Questions of Applicant:

Dunlap asked if applicant had had any additional demolition requests before Commission in the past.

Colson said no, just the one other one at 1209 Main.

Public Comment:

Christine Mestas, resident, former owner, described her strong connection to the home but ultimately spoke in support of Mr. Colson's request. She said that her family had owned the home and she grew up there, and that she wanted a new family to have a chance to build a home on the site.

Commissioner Discussion:

Beauchamp said that there had been significant changes to windows and doors, and that there was obvious sagging in the roof. He believed that demolition was clearly the best path forward, and was in favor of releasing the property.

Dunlap said that he also noted sagging in the roof.

Burg said that the property ended up before the full Commission because it was eligible for landmarking, but noted that the applicant was not interest in preserving it. She said that there were a good number of similar properties landmarked and preserved, so it would be okay to release it for demolition.

Anderson suggested that the application came from the subcommittee to the full Commission to get a broader opinion. He said that asbestos mitigation was the most important cost consideration, and that it would be easier to manage it during a demolition process.

Haley said that came to the Commission because it met the age, architectural, and social significance criteria required for landmarking. She said that the Commission should make sure that holds weren't punitive, so given there was no intention of preservation, it was best to release the property for demolition.

Dunlap moved to release the property for demolition, and was seconded by **Beauchamp**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

c) 824 Lee Avenue – Demolition Review

Staff Findings:

Brackett Hogstad introduced the presentation for the demolition review. She said that the house was approximately 89 years old, and that it was moved to its current site from a mine in 1964. She noted that there appeared to have been some changes to the doors and windows, however there was very little documentation to show the original condition of the property. It did have some social significance due to its relocation from a mine site, and it could qualify for landmarking.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended releasing the demolition request.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:

Michael Reis, resident, recapped the staff presentation. He said that he was second owner of the property, and that the first owner told him the house was originally moved from a mine in Erie. He said that the demolition was part of a plan to subdivide and redevelop the lot, and that he believe the property was not of significant historical value.

Questions of Applicant:

Beauchamp asked whether the applicant had explored incorporating the existing structure into their redevelopment plans.

Reis said that their plan for subdividing the lot meant that keeping the existing structure was not feasible.

Public Comment:

Jean Morgan, resident, had some concerns about what would go on the lot after the demolition. She was concerned about the possibility of 3 residential subdivisions fitting into the neighborhood, and would rather something like the current house remain there.

Haley said that Commission could make recommendations, but did not have jurisdiction over future development.

Commissioner Discussion:

Beauchamp said this one was tougher for him as the structure looked to be in good condition. He was hung up on the location being next to the neighboring cabins. He appreciated the applicant's desire to redevelop the site, but wondered whether the existing house could have been relocated somewhere else.

Anderson appreciated concerns from Beauchamp, but it was not a concern he shared. He noted the unique history of the structure as it had been moved before.

Burg said that she had some concern about the lack of documentation about the architectural history of the house. She said that the location near Miner's Field was important, and noted the importance of the history of the area to the town. She believed it would be a good candidate for landmarking.

Keller said that he agreed with staff's recommendation, and would lean towards supporting releasing it, though he could be convinced otherwise.

Beauchamp said that the lack of documentation gave him pause to put a hold on the demolition.

Burg appreciated that the applicant had met with staff multiple times, and noted the probable cause process and assumed it had been discussed. She wanted to make sure that the applicant knew there were preservation options.

Haley said that it was hard because of the location. The neighborhoods east of railroad tracks were likely the next to be redeveloped. However, the fact it was moved in 1964 made the property seem less significant to her. She was concerned by the lack of documentation, but was leaning towards releasing the property.

Beauchamp said that he did not want to set a precedent for unnecessary delays in the demolition review process, and that it was important to consider each application on the

merits.

Dunlap said that it seemed like the structure was appropriate for neighborhood, and that it would be shame to lose it. However, he understood it was not that simple.

Anderson said that it was a tough and unfortunate situation, but that it would not be fair to delay the demolition.

Whidden said that she felt the same tension regarding the character of the neighborhood, but she was inclined to support staff's recommendation.

Anderson moved to approve the demolition release, and was seconded **Beauchamp**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 6 to 1, with Commissioner Burg voting nay.

HPC Work Plan Discussion

Brackett Hogstad introduced the work plan. She said that the goals were to identify the Commissioner's top priorities for the Commission in 2024, and to add to or alter list of projects from the packet.

There was an extended discussion amongst the Commissioners about the work plan for 2024, and what their priorities should be. There was also discussion about updating the Commission's bylaws.

Items from Staff

Brackett Hogstad explained the Open Government rules for the Commission, and updated the Commissioners about the agenda for the February 2024 meeting.

The Commission adjourned at 8:21pm.

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes

**Monday, February 12, 2024
City Hall, Spruce Room
749 Main Street
6:30 PM**

Call to Order – 6:30 PM

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present: Lynda Haley, Chair
Christine Burg, Vice Chair
Gary Dunlap
Josh Anderson
Sloan Whidden
Marty Beauchamp
Keith Keller

Staff Members Present: Amelia Brackett Hogstad, HPC Planner
Jeff Hirt, Planning Manager
Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved by voice vote.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the October 2023, November 2023, and January 2024 meetings were approved by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

None were heard.

Public Hearing Items

a) 1045 Front Street Alteration Certificate

Staff Findings:

Brackett Hogstad introduced the presentation for the alteration certificate, and noted that the application was referred to the whole Commission from the subcommittee. She explained its unique layout as a corner lot, and outlined its history. She said that the applicant was requesting the addition of a second dwelling unit on the property, the demolition of the existing garage, and the construction of a new garage. She noted that

the proposal had not yet received a building permit. There was an extension to the historic structure constructed in 1998, but while the proposal would limit the public view of this extension, it would not impact the historic part of the structure. She noted that the proposed design for the new garage would differentiate it from the historic structure.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of Resolution 1, Series 2024.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Dunlap asked to clarify whether the Commission should ignore zoning in their deliberations.

Brackett Hogstad said that the processes for obtaining the alteration certificate and the building permit were separate, but that staff needed to make sure that the proposed design was viable and that it would not conflict with the historic structure. She clarified that zoning was not under the jurisdiction of the Commission, so it should not play a part in their decision making.

Dunlap asked if the applicants were considering any variances.

Brackett Hogstad said no, and said that though it had yet to be approved, the preliminary design met all of the zoning requirements.

Dunlap recalled that the height limit in the RM zoning district was 20 feet, and that the proposal appeared to exceed that.

Beauchamp said that the second primary structure was allowed to be up to 30 feet in height.

Dunlap added that the second level of the garage appeared to also be a dwelling unit as it had a full kitchen and plumbing.

Brackett Hogstad said this was not part of the Commission's jurisdiction, so they could not consider it. She then went over the zoning requirements and maximum heights that were allowable for the property. She noted that the area in the garage would qualify as a guest suite under the zoning code.

Dunlap reiterated his concern that the layout of the kitchen made it look like an additional full dwelling unit.

Beauchamp said that this layout was allowed under the code.

Anderson clarified about what appliances would and would not classify the space as a kitchen.

Dunlap and **Brackett Hogstad** discussed how the proposed design would comply with the zoning code.

Applicant Presentation:

Peter Stewart, the architect, introduced their presentation. He covered the context of the historic structure and the poor state of the current garage. He noted that they found no significance for the existing garage. He said that they were not subdividing the lot and that they would retain the same owner. He then spoke about how they came to the proposed design.

Questions of Applicant:

None were heard.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Anderson spoke to why he referred the application to the full Commission from the subcommittee. He said that the primary reason was due to it being a corner lot rather than being mid-block, and that he did not have enough previous experience with similar lots to grant approval. He explained the criteria for approval from the LMC, and said that he would not have felt comfortable approving the application without bringing it before the whole Commission.

Burg agreed that the historic structure being on a corner lot was an important consideration, particularly given that it was more visible to the street. She liked that the new structures were not attached to the historic one, and that the historic structure would be well preserved.

Beauchamp asked to clarify whether the property was in the old town overlay district.

Dunlap said that it was.

Burg noted that Louisville did not have a “historic district”, and that the overlay was technically different.

Dunlap added that there were different zoning areas within the overlay district.

Beauchamp said that the site felt fairly dense, though he noted that the owner had use by right. He said that the lot would be challenging to build on given the almost 5 foot slope on it. He agreed that being on a corner lot would make it more visible.

Haley said that the design met the requirements for approval, but she felt that the massing and size of the proposal was a challenge. She appreciated that the original building would be left separate and intact.

Burg noted that they technically landmarked the whole property, even though the house was the only historically significant part. She did not feel that the proposal would negatively affect the house.

Anderson said that the language in the criteria was unusual, particularly given that it referenced a “historic district” even though one did not technically exist in Louisville. He felt that the proposed design was visually compatible with the rest of the overlay district, and that the density would fit in.

Haley noted that other proposed secondary dwellings tended to be smaller, and tended not to have two stories.

Anderson said that the design of the additional structures were a question of interpretation of the alteration certificate process.

Whidden said that the density of the proposal gave her pause, but that the design was ultimately within the scope of the requirements.

Dunlap again discussed his concerns about whether the garage could be considered an additional dwelling, and what amenities it could have before it crossed that threshold.

Anderson explained that the code would define it as a guest house and not an additional dwelling.

Dunlap said that it was a shame that the City hadn’t defined what an ADU was.

Haley reiterated that the HPC could only evaluate the proposed design, not the proposed use.

There was further discussion about the maximum allowable height for the proposed structures.

Brackett Hogstad clarified that the Commission could only judge the proposed height based on its impact on the historic structure.

Anderson said that it did look odd that there were three separate structures, and noted that three different dwelling units would not be allowed on a lot of that size.

Beauchamp asked whether the second structure would be considered a primary structure.

Brackett Hogstad said yes.

Beauchamp noted that the code required that no part of an accessory structure be within 10 feet of a primary structure, and that the proposal appeared to violate this.

Brackett Hogstad said that the 10 foot requirement was for commercial uses, and that the residential distance was 5 feet. She noted that there were some issues with the PDF version of packet, and that the proposal met these requirements.

Anderson said that he was leaning towards approval, though he was open to other opinions.

Haley said that she appreciated that this was brought to the full Commission.

Keller said that the proposed design fit in fairly well with the neighborhood, and was historically appropriate.

Haley said that because the historic building would be left untouched, the proposed design would preserve the landmark. She appreciated that the design would differentiate and distinguish it from the newer structures, and that the applicant focused on minimizing their impact.

Motion to approve Resolution 1, Series 2024 was moved by **Burg** and seconded by **Anderson**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

b) 1213 Jefferson Avenue Probable Cause

Staff Findings:

Brackett Hogstad introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. She said that form of the front portion of the house was intact, though there had been a rear extension and an attached garage added around the 1960s or 1970s. There had also been changes to the sidings and railings. The house was approximately 76 years old, was in the minimal traditional style, and met the architectural and social significance criteria.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended a finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Questions of Applicant:

None were heard.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Anderson said that he was in favor.

Haley noted that the application met all of the criteria, and had a very strong social history.

Beauchamp and **Whidden** agreed.

Dunlap said that it was an important part of the neighborhood, and would like to see it preserved.

Motion to approve the finding of probable cause was moved by **Anderson** and seconded by **Beauchamp**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

c) 733 McKinley Avenue Probable Cause

Staff Findings:

Brackett Hogstad introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. She noted that there had been some siding and window changes in the 1970s, though the structure was largely unchanged otherwise. The house was approximately 85 years old, was also in the minimal traditional style, and met the criteria for social and architectural significance.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended a finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:

Robert Tully, resident, spoke to the social significance of the house. He said that it was built for the children of the neighboring house in 1912, and that the original owners were from a pioneer family.

Questions of Applicant:

None were heard.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Haley pretty straight forward.

Beauchamp agreed, and said that he would be interested to learn more about the social history of the structure.

Burg liked that the property was largely unchanged, and felt that it was a good candidate for preservation.

Haley said context of time period important.

Motion to approve the finding of probable cause was moved by **Beauchamp** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

d) 800-804 Main Street Probable Cause

Staff Findings:

Brackett Hogstad introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. She noted that there had been a number of changes to the exterior façade, and it was unclear if the original buildings were still present. There were originally two buildings, but they were destroyed by fire in 1926, and it appeared that they were then merged into one. She speculated that the period of significance would be around the 1930s. An assessment would help to determine what was original and what the applicant could do to preserve it. She noted that this was a very prominent building, and it was likely to require extensive rehabilitation. The building was around 76 years old, and met the social and architectural significance criteria.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended a finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:

Erik Hartronft, resident, noted that building was now vacant after the last tenant moved, and they were trying to work out what they could do with the building. He said that the siding was briefly removed in the 1980s, and that he believed there was still a brick wall behind it. He wanted to do whatever was possible to preserve the building.

Questions of Applicant:

Dunlap suggested that there may have been a time preceding the brick wall.

Hartronft said there were brick walls visible on the interior, so he thought that the brick walls were actually original.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Whidden said that she had a great deal of curiosity as to what was there.

Beauchamp said that the location alone warranted approval.

Dunlap said that he was pleased that the applicants were interested in preserving the building.

Berg noted that there had been debate in the community about what would happen with the building since it was vacated.

Keller said that he loved the building and wanted to be able to showcase it. He recommended that the applicants consult with a structural engineer given the previous

fire. He was in favor.

Motion to approve the finding of probable cause was moved by **Anderson** and seconded by **Beauchamp**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

Discussion – Louisville Comprehensive Plan Update

Hirt introduced the presentation on the Comprehensive Plan. He said that he was there to share information on the Comprehensive Plan, and to get feedback from the Commissioners. He explained what it was, why they needed to do it, and what the City wanted to get out of it.

There was an extended discussion on the priorities of the Commissioners, with the general consensus that growth and development were the most important considerations.

Discussion – 2024 HPC Work Plan, Part 2

There was an extended discussion on the Commissioner's priorities for the year ahead. They also assigned positions to new subcommittees.

Motion to adopt the work plan made by **Berg** and seconded **Anderson**. The motion was adopted by voice vote.

The Commission adjourned at 8:38pm.

Historic Preservation Commission

Meeting Minutes

Monday, March 18, 2024

City Hall, Council Chambers

749 Main Street

6:30 PM

Call to Order – 6:34 PM

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present: Lynda Haley, Chair
Gary Dunlap
Josh Anderson
Sloan Whidden
Marty Beauchamp
Keith Keller

Commission Members Absent: Christine Burg, Vice Chair

Staff Members Present: Amelia Brackett Hogstad, HPC Planner
Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

None were heard.

Public Hearing Items

a) 936 La Farge Avenue Probable Cause

Staff Findings:

Brackett Hogstad introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. She said that there were changes to the windows sometime between the 1940s and the 1970s, in addition to changes to the roofing and the removal of the original chimney. Otherwise, the building was largely intact. She noted that the house was approximately 124 years old, was in the national form, and had strong social and architectural significance. Of particular note was the property's link to the Buffo family, and their long term single-family occupancy of the building.

Staff Recommendation:

City of Louisville

Community Development 749 Main Street Louisville CO 80027
303.335.4592 (phone) www.LouisvilleCO.gov

Staff recommended finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:

None were heard.

Questions of Applicant:

None were heard.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Beauchamp said that he agreed with staff's assessment, and though that the property looked to be in good condition and was well preserved. He was in support.

Whidden said that she agreed, and thought that it seemed like a good candidate.

Haley noted that the window changes were also more than 50 years old, and therefore also eligible for landmarking.

Dunlap said that this was the kind of property he wanted to see landmarked.

Motion to approve the finding of probable cause was moved by **Beauchamp** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 6 to 0.

b) 623 McKinley Avenue Probable Cause

Beauchamp disclosed that he had spoken with the applicants and recommended that they pursue a probable cause application. He did not feel that this would impair his judgement.

Staff Findings:

Brackett Hogstad introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. She noted that there had been some changes since 1956, including minor changes to the sidings. However, the overall form, windows and doors were largely intact. The house was approximately 71 years old and in the ranch form, which was not well represented in Louisville landmarks. There was also strong architectural and social significance, and a connection to the immigrant history of Louisville.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended a finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:

None were heard.

Questions of Applicant:

None were heard.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Haley said that this was a pretty straightforward case, and it met all of the criteria. She noted that some of the past changes could be reversed. She was in favor.

Whidden agreed, and felt that its underrepresented form was important to preserve.

Beauchamp concurred, and noted it was in very good condition.

Motion to approve the finding of probable cause was moved by **Dunlap** and seconded by **Anderson**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 6 to 0.

c) 700 Pine Street Probable Cause

Staff Findings:

Brackett Hogstad introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. She noted that the house had already been landmarked though no grants had yet been issued. The applicant would be eligible for a grant of up to \$4,000 to reimburse the cost of an HSA.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:

None were heard.

Questions of Applicant:

None were heard.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Beauchamp asked whether the property was landmarked by its current owner.

Aaron Vogelsberg, resident, said that his mother was the one who landmarked the property, and that she was the former owner.

Haley said that she didn't see any issues with the application, and was in support. She added that she really liked the applicant's Christmas lights.

Dunlap spoke to why an HSA would be useful for the property, and said that he was in support.

Motion to approve the finding of probable cause was moved by **Beauchamp** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 6 to 0.

Work Plan Updates

Brackett Hogstad updated the Commissioners on the GIS mapping project, and the difficulty the staff was having in finding someone to complete it in-house.

Items from Staff

Brackett Hogstad updated the Commissioners on the status of the downtown vision plan and the comprehensive plan. She also provided an update on the signage for the Austin-Niehoff House.

Updates from Commission Members

Whidden and **Haley** spoke about what they learned whilst attending the Saving Places conference the previous month.

Commission adjourned at 7:13

Historic Preservation Commission

Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 15, 2024

City Hall, Spruce Room

749 Main Street

6:30 PM

Call to Order – 6:30 PM

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present: Lynda Haley, Chair
Christine Burg, Vice Chair
Gary Dunlap
Josh Anderson
Sloan Whidden
Keith Keller

Commission Members Absent: Marty Beauchamp

Staff Members Present: Amelia Brackett, HPC Planner
Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved by voice vote.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the February and March 2024 meetings were approved by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

None were heard.

Public Hearing Items

a) 928 La Farge Avenue Preservation and Restoration Grant Request

Burg disclosed that she had a conflict of interest, and recused herself from the hearing.

Staff Findings:

Brackett introduced the presentation for the grant request. She said that the proposed works were identified in the HSA, and was below the maximum request amount. The second request was for a window replacement, though staff felt that the windows were not historic, and therefore would likely not qualify for grant coverage.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of Resolution 1, Series 2024, allowing for a grant of up to \$17,819.90. Staff did not recommend approval of grant funds for the proposed window restoration.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Dunlap asked how the window request would compare to the recent 701 Grant case.

Brackett said that she was not sure about that specific case, but she explained that there were some possible scenarios where staff would recommend approval. She noted that this would apply if the windows were historic, or where replacing the windows was necessary to protect the historic integrity of the structure. She added that the program was not intended to fund updates to non-historic windows, though it would be up to Commissioners to decide whether the windows were eligible.

Applicant Presentation:

JoAnna Alidu, resident, said that the HSA was completed pre-Marshall Fire, though post fire examination found that smoke and ash from the fire had compromised the integrity of the windows. She added that her intention was to replicate styling of the house's original windows.

Questions of Applicant:

Haley asked about the approximate age of the windows, and what material they were constructed from.

Alidu said that they were built in the 1980s or 1990s, and that they were wooden.

Anderson asked whether the design of the windows would be like for like.

Alidu said yes.

Anderson asked whether the windows had any vinyl components.

Alidu said that the current ones had vinyl tracking on the inside, but that the new ones would not contain any vinyl.

Haley asked what prompted the window replacement after the fire.

Alidu said that the windows were faulty, and that they were responsible for letting in smoke and ash from the fire.

Haley asked whether this would be covered by insurance.

Alidu said yes, and that their insurance seemed likely to pay for them.

Haley wondered why the applicant would apply for the grant if their insurance would also pay for the windows.

Alidu said that they had had a lot of non-communication with their insurer, and that it was not guaranteed that they would pay for them.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Whidden said that she was trying to wrap her head around the complexity of the window replacement. She wondered which situations window replacements would qualify for

grant funding.

Anderson suggested that replacing newer windows with replicas of the original historic windows could qualify.

Dunlap spoke about improvements to energy efficiency that would result from window replacements, and as to whether this would be an appropriate use of grant funds.

Anderson said that if the windows had been changed previously, they would be eligible for grant funding. He noted that windows from the early 1970s could technically be considered historic as they would be more than 50 years old.

Dunlap said that he was more favorable towards the application as the house had retained most of its historic aspects.

Whidden asked whether the Commission could table the grant amount requested for the window replacement pending the resolution of the applicant's insurance claims.

Haley wondered whether a new HSA would be necessary for the windows.

Brackett suggested that the Commission could introduce a condition on the grant stating that funds for the window replacement would only be approved if the applicant's insurance declined to pay for them. She also noted that though the applicant had supplied a letter stating that the windows needed to be replaced, the Commission could potentially request further examination of the state of the windows.

Dunlap noted that payment of the grant was contingent on the receipts of the completed work, which could provide them with time for the insurance to be finalized.

Brackett said that the safest option might be to continue the application as this was not something City had covered before.

Haley asked whether the Commission could approve the staff recommended amount and have the applicant come back once the insurance issue had been settled.

Brackett said that they probably could, but they would likely need to re-notice the application as a separate request.

Anderson said that he felt the window grant was not ready to be approved.

There was an extended discussion as to whether the Commission should fund the window replacement as part of the grant request. The consensus was that this could create a negative precedent for future applications. They agreed that rehabilitation of existing historic windows could be appropriate, but that they needed to at least wait until the insurance claim had been resolved. There was opposition to funding complete window replacements.

Anderson said that he would support approving staff's recommended grant amount, and to defer consideration of the windows to a later date.

Whidden said that she agreed.

Brackett said that the Commission should be able to rehear the case at a later date as the applicant would be presenting new information.

Motion to approve Resolution 1, Series 2024, to the staff recommended amount of up to \$17,819.90 was moved by **Dunlap** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 5 to 0, with **Burg** recused.

Work Plan Updates

None were heard.

Items from Staff

Brackett noted that one alteration certificate had been released since the last meeting, and that the Commission would be meeting again on April 29 to address two demolition requests.

Updates from Commission Members

None were heard.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was moved by **Anderson**, seconded by **Burg**, and adopted by voice vote.

The Commission adjourned at 7:25pm.

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes

**Monday, April 29, 2024
Electronic Meeting
6:30 PM**

Call to Order – 6:30 PM

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present: Lynda Haley, Chair
Christine Burg, Vice Chair
Josh Anderson
Marty Beauchamp
Gary Dunlap
Keith Keller
Sloan Whidden

Staff Members Present: Amelia Brackett, HPC Planner
Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

None were heard.

Public Hearing Items

a) 1234 Jefferson Avenue Demolition Review

Dunlap recused himself from this item as he missed the start of it.

Staff Findings:

Brackett introduced the presentation for the demolition review. She went over the purpose and criteria of the demolition review process. She then showed the change in condition of the building, and covered how it met the landmark criteria. The house was approximately 114 years old, maintained the National Folk form, and had a well-documented social significance.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended placing a 90-day stay on the application, ending on June 11, 2024.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

City of Louisville

Community Development 749 Main Street Louisville CO 80027
303.335.4592 (phone) www.LouisvilleCO.gov

None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:

Andy Johnson, DAJ Design, and **Jeff Raikes**, owner, both residents, introduced their presentation.

Johnson explained the history of the property, how the application came about, and why they believed the application should be approved without a stay.

Raikes explained his family history in the City, and noted his wish to preserve as much of Louisville's history as possible. The home was not in a position where it could be preserved.

Questions of Applicant:

Anderson asked if any images of the flooring or structural foundations had been shared with the Commission.

Brackett said that this had not been included in the packet.

There was a discussion between **Brackett** and **Raikes** about sharing these with the Commission.

Anderson suggested that an HSA could have been appropriate here. He asked whether there was a reason this hadn't been explored.

Johnson said that he advised against it based off of his view of the structure.

Brackett shared images of the interior and flooring of the house.

Johnson explained what the photos were showing.

Anderson appreciated getting a better look at the condition of the foundations.

Beauchamp asked whether it would be possible, hypothetically, to save the house.

Johnson said that they had evaluated this at the start, but they found that the house was essentially too far gone to be salvaged.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Burg went over the landmark criteria, and noted that there were similar form homes preserved in Louisville. However, she felt that this was a challenging decision, particularly given the home's unique design. She wanted to encourage the applicant to consider preservation.

Whidden agreed with previous discussion. She wondered whether there was another creative way to preserve the social history given the poor condition of the structure.

Haley did not know if it would be possible to restore the structure to its original condition given the lack of documentation on this. She added that she would like to see the replacement house keep a somewhat similar design.

Keller said that he felt conflicted, and that he was not sure a stay would convince the applicant to change their mind. He would, however, like to see it preserved if at all possible.

Anderson noted that it was a unique house, and that there were few houses in Louisville that were as ornate as this one. An HSA would have made this decision easier to make. He said that he was leaning towards a stay of either 90 or 120 days.

Haley said she was generally in favor of productive stays, and that it was not clear a stay would be productive in this case. She noted that it would not be possible to complete an HSA within the stay, but that this could still allow them to talk about other options.

Beauchamp said that his hesitation was to not create an undue burden on the applicant, but added that he wanted applicant to provide more documentation on the condition of the floor structure and the foundations.

Johnson said that he would be happy to provide this information and to have it reviewed by the sub-committee.

Beauchamp said that he would appreciate this.

Rakes added that the previous owner told him that the foundation was significantly worse than they had anticipated.

Beauchamp noted that the costs behind restoration would be pretty daunting for any homeowner.

Haley shifted the discussion towards the proposed stay, and as to whether 90 or 120 days would be more appropriate.

Anderson said that he was leaning towards the staff recommendation of 90 days.

Haley asked if there would be support for sending it back to the subcommittee so they could review the additional photos.

Anderson felt that it wouldn't be necessary.

Burg suggested that the applicant could meet with Brackett during the stay to review the additional documentation.

Brackett said that it would not be possible to have it sent back to subcommittee.

There was a discussion on the purpose of a possible subcommittee review of the new photos, the consensus was against this.

Motion to place a 90-day stay on the demolition review was moved by **Burg** and seconded by **Anderson**. The motion was approved by a vote of 6 to 0, with **Dunlap** recused.

b) 1006 Pine Street Demolition Review

Staff Findings:

Brackett introduced the presentation for the 1006 Pine St demolition review. She said that the proposal was for changes to the current sidings, doors and windows, and not a total demolition of the structure. She also noted that these had changed over time, and were not original to the structure. She explained the social and architectural significance of the property, and finally noted that the applicant had made it clear they were not interested in preservation.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended placing a 60-day stay on the application, ending on May 28, 2024

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Anderson asked if the current siding had been applied over the original siding.

Brackett said it was her understanding that the currently exposed siding was the original siding.

Burg asked to confirm that the siding was being replaced on all four sides of the building.

Brackett confirmed this.

Beauchamp asked to confirm that the applicant was fully aware of the landmarking process.

Brackett confirmed that they were.

Applicant Presentation:

Zeke Freeman, architect, non-resident, explained the renovations and changes planned for the property. He noted that their intention was to maintain the character of the existing building as much as possible, and that the existing siding was past the end of its useful life.

Levy Villa, owner, resident, said that he would appreciate a speedy resolution of the demolition review, and would appreciate not having a stay placed on the demolition.

Questions of Applicant:

None were heard.

Public Comment:

Andy Johnson, resident, said that he was very excited to see this building come before the Commission. He added that he would love to see the owner receive grant funding for restoration.

Commissioner Discussion:

Haley noted the significance and prominence of the building in Louisville, and noted that the Commission wanted the best for the building.

Dunlap added that the building was becoming more prominent in the City given its growth.

Haley suggested that the main items for discussion with the application would be the stay, and the materials and changes proposed for the building. She said that she was hesitant about the proposed changes to the siding, but that she had less of an issue with the proposed changes to the windows and doors. She also asked about the purpose of the elevated door adjacent to the railway tracks.

Brackett said that she had been unable to find details about it.

Anderson suggested it might have been a hoist-way for a loft or storage area.

Whidden said that she struggled with losing the charisma of the original sidings. She also felt that the high door was an important part of the building, which she suggested may have been used for loading train cars.

Anderson noted that the siding did appear to have deteriorated, and suggested that it may have been painted over too many times.

There was an extended discussion about the poor condition of the existing siding, the proposed changes to said siding, and how this would affect the aesthetic of the structure. There was also a discussion about preserving the door, something that the applicant said that they would be in favor of.

Haley asked why the applicant was hesitant to pursue preservation grants for the renovation.

Villa said that they had discussed this in the past, but that at this time they just wanted to get the renovation done as quickly as they could so that they could reopen.

Anderson said that he would be in favor of staff's recommendation for a 60-day stay.

Haley asked whether the Commission would have any say over the changes once the stay had expired.

Brackett said that the scope of the demolition would have to be in line with what was reviewed by the Commission.

Haley asked whether the applicant could then make further changes to the siding.

Brackett said that her understanding was that any major changes to what was currently proposed would need to be reviewed by the Commission again.

Freeman asked whether an approval with conditions would be possible.

Brackett said that she was not sure that this was possible from the code. He understanding was that the only options for the Commission was to either place a stay on the demolition, or to release it. She suggested that she could ask the City Attorney.

There was more discussion about the proposed siding, though the consensus was that the Commission was supportive of the proposed design.

Anderson said that he would be in support of the proposed 60-day stay.

Keller concurred, and added that the stay should be as short as possible.

Dunlap agreed, and wondered whether it would be necessary to have the subcommittee review any further changes.

Anderson said that the subcommittee would try to review the changes as quickly as possible given the applicant's desire for a quick resolution.

Motion to place a 60-day stay on the demolition was moved by **Anderson** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

Adjournment

The Commission adjourned at 8:38pm.

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes

**Monday, May 20, 2024
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM**

Call to Order – 6:30 PM

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present: Christine Burg, Vice Chair
Josh Anderson
Marty Beauchamp
Sloan Whidden
Keith Keller

Commission Members Absent: Lynda Haley, Chair
Gary Dunlap

Staff Members Present: Amelia Brackett, HPC Planner
Matt Post, Senior Planner

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

Andy Johnson, resident, wanted to provide the Commission an update on 1234 Jefferson. He showed some images of the inside of the original home.

Public Hearing Items

a) 1440 Cannon Street Probable Cause

Staff Findings:

Brackett introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. She showed photos of the previous condition of the home, and noted there had been little change in the last 60 years. The house was approximately 116 years old in the national style, and met the criteria for physical integrity and social significance.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended a finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Questions of Applicant:

Beauchamp asked whether the foundation had already been replaced.

Bob Musselwhite, applicant, resident, said that the foundation had been replaced at some point, and that it was made up of concrete blocks and slabs. He added that they had a structural engineer look at the foundation when they bought the property 14 years earlier, and that they said it was in good shape.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Beauchamp said he thought it was a straightforward application, and that it met all of the criteria. He was in support.

Keller agreed.

Burg said that she was in support, and was happy to see the City fund the cost of the HSA.

Motion to approve the finding of probable cause was moved by **Whidden** and seconded by **Anderson**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 5 to 0.

b) 900 Main Street Probable Cause

Staff Findings:

Brackett introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. She showed photos of the previous condition of the property, and noted there had been additions to the north and east, though these were both more than 50 years old. The property was approximately 69 years old, and was built as a residential-style commercial building. It had a strong connection to the commercial history of Downtown Louisville.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended a finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Berg asked if there was documentation relating to when the windows were first changed.

Brackett said that she was unable to find any information about changes to the windows or siding, but that this would likely be determined as part of the HSA.

Berg asked to clarify whether the additions to the building would be included in the HSA given they each had separate addresses.

Brackett said yes.

Applicant Presentation:

Andy Johnson, architect with DAJ Design, resident, introduced the applicant presentation. He spoke to the history of the building, and to what they wanted to find out through the HSA process.

Jeff Raikes, resident, spoke about the history of his family's ownership of the property.

Questions of Applicant:

None were heard.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Whidden said that she had really enjoyed reading about the history of the property and the business that had occupied it in the past. She was in support of the application.

Beauchamp agreed. He asked whether the applicant would consider exposing the brick and bring it back to its original exterior.

Rakes said that they likely would not.

Burg thought it would be good to complete the HSA so they could learn more about the past changes to the building. She noted that it met all of the criteria, and was in support.

Keller said that he agreed.

Anderson said that he was in support.

Motion to approve the finding of probable cause was moved by **Anderson** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 5 to 0.

Work Plan Updates

There was an extended discussion about updates to the Grant Program. **Brackett** said that the purpose of the discussion was to get feedback from Commissioners about how they would like to see the program changed. (30:57)

Items from Staff

Updates from Commission Members

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was moved by **x**, seconded by **x**, and adopted by voice vote.

The Commission adjourned at 7:44pm.

Historic Preservation Commission

Meeting Minutes

Monday, July 15, 2024
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM

Call to Order – 6:30 PM

Roll Call was taken, and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present: Lynda Haley, Chair
Christine Burg, Vice Chair
Gary Dunlap
Sloan Whidden
Marty Beauchamp
Keith Keller

Absent Commission Members: Josh Anderson

Staff Members Present: Amelia Brackett, Senior Planner.
Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

Agenda Approval

- Motion to approve the agenda for the evening.
- Motion seconded and approved by all members present.

Public Comments

No public comments on items not on the agenda.

Staff Presentation

917 Rex Street - Preservation and Restoration Grant Request

- Landmark alteration certificate and preservation/restoration grant.
- Property at 917 Rex Street: Landmark alteration certificate and preservation/restoration grant request.
- Undated photo, 1948 assessor's photo, and current photo.
- Porch added, changes to front porch, changes to siding.
- Structure and form remain intact since mid-century.
- Landmark criteria: Primary structure (built in 1936, 88 years old).
- Landmark criteria: Garage (at least 76 years old, placed before 1948).
- Architectural significance: Bungalow style (primary), barn door style clipped gable (garage).
- Physical integrity: Minor exterior changes.
- Social significance: Mining history, French immigration.
- Rear additions to house and garage: Minimal impact, differentiated in style, located at the rear.
- Side patio removal and front porch railings removal: Not original, changes align with restoration.
- Alterations to doors and windows: Preserve existing historic materials, remove non-historic elements.
- Elevations show additions on the rear of the house and garage.
- Alterations to front facade: Removing covered porch on the side, removing railings on the front.

917 Rex St - Grant Request

- Request for \$162,244.

- Staff ensured work was described as necessary in the historic structure assessment and related to preservation, restoration, or rehabilitation.
- Relates to building size, condition, architectural details, or other unique condition compared to similar Lewisville properties.
- Staff compared requests to what has been approved/requested in other circumstances.
- Staff recommends \$154,220.
- Site grading, drainage, exterior appendages, and exterior details do not qualify for extraordinary circumstances.
- Full structural work on house and garage meets extraordinary circumstances based on size and condition.
- Restoration and preservation qualify based on scope and preservation of architectural details.
- Roofing and waterproofing for two structures is extraordinary.
- Six letters of support from neighbors and community members.
- Staff recommends approval of resolutions for landmark, alteration certificate, and grant.

Questions for Staff

- Commissioner asks if the garage was built at the same time as the primary structure.
- Staff says they don't have a reason to think it wasn't built at the same time.
- Commissioner asks for clarification on what's not recommended.
- Staff says site grading, exterior appendages, and exterior details are not considered extraordinary.
- Commissioner asks how size is being used as an extraordinary circumstance.
- Staff clarifies they are trying to be specific and not set a precedent.
- Staff reviews based on whether it is typical for a full foundation to need to be replaced.
- Size is not just the primary structure, but the fact that the grant would cover both the primary and the garage.
- Commissioner asks about the garage sitting on a slab in a different location.

- Staff defers to the applicant to describe the specifics of the garage foundation.
- Having a new foundation on a historic structure is a preservation practice.
- Commissioner asks about roofing and interior work being included in the request.
- Staff says interior work like redoing floors or bathrooms is not included.
- Things that relate to fixing the walls or rehabilitating it to make it functional can be covered.
- Roofing relates to preserving the existing house or making it livable and usable.

Public Comments

No public comments

Applicant Presentation – Architect:

- Andy Johnson from DAJ Design is presenting, along with Talbot, the owner of 917 Rex St. Josh Johnston from DAJ Design is also present online.
- DAJ Design previously worked with Talbot on 908 Rex in 2020.
- The presentation will address questions to staff.
- 917 Rex is located in the Old Town overlay, near Community Park.
- County assessor records suggest the home was built all at once.
- The home has an added railing with "tombstone or surfboard" decor.
- A lean-to roof enclosed a concrete patio.
- The garage has sliding doors.

Floor Plans and Proposed Changes

- Red on the floor plan indicates original construction, orange indicates additions.
- The house has a basement.
- Proposed additions are to the rear of the house.
- Preservation work is planned for the studio.
- A new garage is proposed off the alley.

Elevation and Preservation Efforts

- The house will largely remain as is.
- The lean-to will be removed, exposing the rear entry door.
- Preservation efforts are considered for the windows, with a possible pivot to storm windows for thermal efficiency.
- The studio (old garage) has functioning doors that will be refinished and reused.
- The center flat wood panels will be used as windows.
- The house is believed to have originally been clad in Dutch Cove wood siding under the stucco.
- The original stucco is intended to be kept.

Zoning and House Move

- The lot coverage is below the allowable limit.
- The house was moved back to the alley to replace the foundation.
- The west side foundation was leaning, cracked, and brittle.
- The studio's original location presents issues with fireproofing, overhangs, and zoning compliance.
- Code requires the studio to meet minimum zoning setbacks.

Demolition and Discoveries

- The front porch was in serious deteriorating condition.
- The lean-to was tied into the rafter tails of the existing roof.
- The house move allowed for inspection of the foundation and buried elements.
- The bottom plate of the west side structure had deteriorated.
- 1940s Pinups and newspaper clippings were uncovered.
- The doors are in remarkably good shape and will be reused.

House Lifting and Foundation

- House was lifted, allowing study of the concrete foundation.
- The concrete foundation had:
- Aggregate ranging from fist-sized to cobblestone-sized.
- Zero reinforcing.
- Brittle composition.
- Shallow depth.

- The front porch was made with a concrete rat slab.
- The home was originally set on 24in center rafters, later infilled to 12in centers.

Budget Considerations

- Site grading and drainage are a package deal with foundation work, requiring changes to meet code and interact with the new foundation.
- Roofing and waterproofing focus on gutters, downspouts, roof venting, and house wrap for a weather-resistant barrier.
- Insulation and drywall are critical for structural integrity and meeting energy codes, preventing moisture management issues.
- Heating, cooling, plumbing, and electrical were excluded from the budget.

Applicant Presentation – Property Owner:

- Talbot Wilt thanks the council for their help with his last home restoration project at 908 Rex Street.
- He expresses his love for restoring historic properties and saving Louisville's charm.
- He bought the house at 917 Rex Street from owners who wanted him to preserve it.
- The property includes a historic home and a historic garage on a large triple lot.

Commission Discussion

- Commissioner asked if the proposed budget numbers could be separated between the primary structure and the detached garage.
- Commissioner questioned the budget allocation for changing the detached garage into a habitable studio, requiring insulation and drywall.

Questions of Applicant:

- Applicant clarified that the primary cost in the garage preservation is in the foundation and structure, along with windows and doors.
- Applicant stated that the drywall is critical for lateral support of the building itself.

Public Comments

- There were no public comments in person or online, but three written comments were received and reviewed by the commission.
- The different grant requests are dependent upon landmarking.
- Commissioner finds the landmarking straightforward given the condition of the house and how well-preserved it is.
- Commissioner agrees that this is a strong candidate for landmarking, adding to the continuity of the neighborhood with its bungalow style.

Motion and Roll Call

Motion to Landmark for 917 Rex St, seconded and approved by roll call vote.

Alteration Certificates

- There are two alteration certificates, one for the home and one for the garage.
- The proposed structures are consistent with the existing ones.
- The additions are thoughtful, with good differentiation.
- Commissioner thinks the moving of the garage is a fine alteration.

Motion and Roll Call

Motion to approve the Alteration Certificates for 917 Rex St, seconded and approved by roll call vote.

Grant Request Discussion

- The grant request falls under preservation, restoration, and rehabilitation guidelines, requesting \$162,446.
- Discussion focused on the use of funds to insulate the garage, changing its use to an accessory studio.
- Commissioner questioned whether changing the use results in extraordinary circumstances, as insulating and drywalling would not be necessary if it remained a garage.

- Commissioner sees it as preservation, incentivizing the maintenance of the historic garage by making it more usable with insulation.

Insulation & Drywall Costs

- The \$27,000 for insulation and drywall is for the existing structures, with a larger portion going to the house.
- Commissioner stated that storage doesn't need to be insulated, and that funding insulation for extra housing is not historic preservation's role.
- Commissioner agreed with Linda's point, questioning funding beyond what's needed to use the garage as a garage.
- Commissioner stated that interior work like drywall is generally not included, unless it's structural.

Site Grading & Drainage

- Staff had hesitations about funding site grading and drainage.
- Commissioner believes grading is vitally important and should be included in the grant, addressing poor foundations.
- Commissioner found Andy's explanation compelling, stating that bringing everything up to code and allowing for what's required for the New Foundation it's sort of part of that scope.
- Commissioner agrees that drainage is important for the viability of the structure, addressing the deterioration.
- Applicant mentioned the addition of half-round guttering, which would be considered preservation work.

Moving the Garage

- The current foundation was not in good condition for both the house and the garage.
- The structural assessment indicated it was difficult to tell if the garage was supported by a foundation.
- There were no anchor bolts holding the house down to its foundation.

- Moving the home and garage and doing foundation work would preserve the structures.
- It is fortunate that they had the room to move the structures back on the property to do the foundation correctly.

Commission Discussion

- The dyall installation is a sticking point.
- Adding site grading and drainage would cost about \$1,750.
- A decision needs to be made about whether to keep the drywall installation in the grant request.
- The commission needs to decide if the insulation and drywall are part of preserving the garage structure.
- Commissioner says no, and the speaker tends to agree because it wouldn't need drywall then or insulation.
- The issue is more around the use of it turning into conditioned space.
- Applicant: "There is a huge motivation emotionally to preserve these buildings."
- The grant program makes preservation tangible and real.
- It is important to question things when they are extraordinary.
- It is important to make sure that they are paying for what they are supposed to pay as a historic preservation commission.

Proposal

- The speaker is offering a formal proposal to subtract \$6,903 from the total requested amount.
- The staff recommendation subtracts the site grading and also the exterior appendages and details.
- Exterior appendages include removing the plywood floor, investigating the floor framing, repairing and replacing as necessary, removing the columns and railings and replacing the columns with tapered columns to match the historic appearance, adding structural elements to properly support the roof, and repairing or replacing the ceiling.

- Exterior details include replacing the soft and fashion throughout with matching historic sizes and locations, repairing, restoring, and replacing the window and door trim freeze board and skirtboard, and adding new Corner trim.

Commission Discussion

- The commission is discussing how to allocate the original \$40,000 in the project budget versus any additional costs due to extraordinary circumstances.
- One argument is that the original \$40,000 should cover the exterior work, which is typically covered in a preservation grant.
- Commissioner explains that her spreadsheets for extraordinary circumstances include a column for "fund request for typical items," such as exterior details.
- The extent of the damage, described as "throughout" the structure, qualifies the project for extraordinary circumstances.

Porch Condition

- Applicant describes the front porch as severely deteriorated, requiring complete replacement from the roof down.
- Property owner adds that the porch had plywood covering, concealing the extent of the damage until demolition began.

Motion and Roll Call

- A motion is made to approve resolution six or seven for the grant amount of \$162,000 minus \$6,900.
- The \$6,900 is for garage insulation and drywall, which is being removed from the grant.
- The revised grant amount is \$155,043, with the removal of garage insulation from Exhibit A.
- The motion is seconded, and a roll call vote is taken, with all commissioners voting in favor.

Staff Updates

- There were no alteration certificates issued in the past month.
- A demolition review was conducted for 533 and 421 East due to a permit issue from a 2023 public hearing.

- The next regular meeting is scheduled for August 19th.
- The agenda includes at least one case and a grant update.

Commission Member Updates

- A previous discussion about a retreat and work plan will be brought back in August with concrete grant resolution language.
- Commissioner is unable to attend the next Museum Advisory Board meeting and has informed GG Yang.

Motion to Adjourn

Motion to adjourn was moved, seconded, and adopted by voice vote. The Commission was adjourned

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes

**Monday, September 16, 2024
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM**

Call to Order – 6:30 PM

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present: Lynda Haley, Chair
Christine Burg, Vice Chair
Josh Anderson
Gary Dunlap
Keith Keller
Sloan Whidden

Commission Members Absent: Marty Beauchamp

Staff Members Present: Rob Zuccaro, Director of Community
Development
Emily Cline-Gibson, Planner II
Gabby Muratti, Administrative Assistant
Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

None were heard.

Public Hearing Items

a) 1025 Front St – Probable Cause

Staff Findings:

Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. She noted that there had been changes to the porch and windows, but that the house had otherwise remained intact since at least 1948. It was approximately 127 years old, in the national folk style, and met the criteria for architectural and social significance.

Staff Recommendation:

City of Louisville

Community Development 749 Main Street Louisville CO 80027
303.335.4592 (phone) www.LouisvilleCO.gov

Staff recommended a finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:

Kimberly Echols, resident, noted that her family had lived in the house for decades. She spoke to why the porch had been enclosed, saying that it did not have enough space for a full length dining table without the enclosed porch. She also noted that the windows and siding had been replaced due to a previous hail storm.

Questions of Applicant:

None were heard.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Anderson said that he was in favor.

Dunlap said that he was pleased the property had been brought forward for preservation, and was in support.

Burg noted the rare double pyramid roof, and said that she was looking forward to seeing the completed HSA. She was in favor.

Haley noted that it met all criteria, and said that she was in support.

Motion to approve the finding of probable cause was moved by **Whidden** and seconded by **Anderson**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 6 to 0.

b) 921 Main St – Probable Cause

Staff Findings:

Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. She said that there had been very minimal changes to structure, and that it was approximately 131 years old. The property was in the national folk style, and was originally a residential structure before being converted to an office use. She said that it met the criteria for architectural and social significance.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended a finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:

Andy Johnson, resident, from DAJ Design, spoke to the history and uses of the building. He noted that the owner had expressed interest in preserving and restoring the property.

Questions of Applicant:

Dunlap asked about the intended use of the building.

Johnson said that the applicant intended for it to remain commercial.

Dunlap asked how the age of the tree was determined.

Johnson said that it was discovered from a discussion with the city forester.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Haley noted the strong history, and that it was in good condition. She was in support.

Anderson asked to clarify the size of the grant. He also thought it was interesting that it was eligible for a commercial HSA grant given this was historically a residential property.

Haley confirmed that the grant was to be up to \$9,000, and said that the grant type was determined by current use.

Burg agreed that it was a good use of funds, and noted its prominent location. She was in support.

Motion to approve the finding of probable cause was moved by **Anderson** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 6 to 0.

Items from Staff

Cline-Gibson said that one demolition review had been released in late July.

Updates from Commission Members

Whidden spoke about the upcoming Museum advisory board meeting.

Anderson asked whether there could or would be an end of year summary on the costs of completed HSAs.

Zuccaro said that staff could look into it.

Dunlap spoke about his work with Burg to update the Commission's bylaws, and wanted to know where the proposed changes needed to be sent.

Haley suggested that staff review the changes before bringing them to the Commission.

Zuccaro agreed that the proposed changes should be sent to staff.

Motion to adjourn was moved by **Burg**, seconded by **Anderson**, and adopted by voice vote. The Commission adjourned at 6:56pm.

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes

**Monday, October 21, 2024
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM**

Call to Order – 6:30 PM

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present: Lynda Haley, Chair
Christine Burg, Vice Chair
Josh Anderson
Marty Beauchamp
Gary Dunlap
Keith Keller
Sloan Whidden

Staff Members Present: Rob Zuccaro, Director of Community
Development
Emily Cline-Gibson, Planner II

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

Andy Johnson, resident, from DAJ Design, wanted to discuss the costs of completing an HSA, and how he wanted to ensure that all HSAs funded through the grant process were completed to an acceptable standard.

Public Hearing Items

a) 641 Main St – Probable Cause

Staff Findings:

Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. She noted that there had been significant architectural changes between the 1948 assessor's card and the present day, though the building's footprint and overall character remained largely the same. It was approximately 144 years old, and met the criteria for geographic and social significance.

Staff Recommendation:

City of Louisville

Community Development 749 Main Street Louisville CO 80027
303.335.4592 (phone) www.LouisvilleCO.gov

Staff recommended a finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:

Phillippa Clark, resident, and **Sheri Levine**, non-resident, spoke to the structural integrity of the building. Clark said that they had concerns about the condition of the foundations, and wanted to get a better understanding of what needed to be restored.

Commissioner Questions of the Applicant:

Dunlap noted that the nearby Parks and Recreation building, which was of a similar age, had sunk a bit due to mine subsidence, and wondered whether this could also be an issue here.

Beauchamp asked whether they had any plans or ideas for upgrades or repairs yet.

Clark said that their intention at this stage was to assess the condition of the building, and added that they would consider applying for restoration grants if they felt they were necessary.

Levine spoke about her history with the building, and her desire to see it preserved.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Beauchamp felt that this was a straightforward case as it met the criteria, and was in support.

Dunlap said that this was an iconic building in Louisville, and that it was well worth preserving. He was in support.

Anderson said that he was in support.

Motion to approve the finding of probable cause was moved by **Burg** and seconded by **Anderson**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

b) 1040 LaFarge Ave – Probable Cause

Staff Findings:

Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. She said that there had been very minimal changes to structure, and that it was approximately 112 years old. The property was in the pyramidal roof style, and had a strong connection to Louisville's history. She said that it met the criteria for architectural and social significance.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended a finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:

Andy Johnson, resident, DAJ Design, spoke to the history of the house, and noted that there had been a well-integrated addition to the house completed at an as of yet unknown time.

Commissioner Questions of the Applicant:

None were heard.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Haley said that it seemed very straightforward.

Beauchamp agreed.

Anderson said that it was interesting to see a property that had seen such little change over time. He was in support.

Burg said that it was nice to see a corner lot, and was interested in learning more about it.

Motion to approve the finding of probable cause was moved by **Anderson** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

Items from Staff

Cline-Gibson noted the upcoming plaque ceremony, and upcoming workshops for the Comprehensive Plan.

Updates from Commission Members

Burg introduced the bylaws subcommittee's proposed changes to the Commission's bylaws.

There was also a discussion about the hiring process for the new Historic Preservation Planner.

Motion to adjourn was moved by **Anderson**, seconded by **Keller**, and adopted by voice vote. The Commission adjourned at 7:07pm.

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes

**Monday, November 18, 2024
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM**

Call to Order – 6:30 PM

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present: Lynda Haley, Chair
Christine Burg, Vice Chair
Josh Anderson
Marty Beauchamp
Gary Dunlap
Keith Keller
Sloan Whidden

Staff Members Present: Rob Zuccaro, Director of Community
Development
Emily Cline-Gibson, Planner II
Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

None were heard.

Public Hearing Items

a) 1016 Main Street – Probable Cause

Staff Findings:

Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. She noted that there had been very little change since the early 1900s, and that it was approximately 114 to 129 years old, in the Queen Anne style. She explained its notable social significance, and emphasized its connections to Italian immigrant history and the City's mining history. It met the criteria for architectural and social significance.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended a finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:

Andy Johnson, resident, DAJ Design, was the architect for the applicant. He spoke to the history of the house and its current condition.

Questions of Applicant:

Haley asked if they had found any Sears and Roebuck stamps or logos on the house yet. **Johnson** said that they had yet to find any.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Anderson said that this was an easy application to move forward with. He noted that it was well preserved, and was in favor.

Haley agreed, and said that it met all of the requirements.

Burg said that it would be nice to see Queen Anne style home preserved, and was in support.

Haley added that it was particularly important to preserve given it was on the National Register.

Dunlap said that it would help preserve Main Street. He was in support.

Motion to approve the finding of probable cause was moved by **Burg** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

Discussion Items

a) Bylaws Draft Update

Commissioner Discussion:

Burg spoke about the work of the subcommittee to update the bylaws, and was presenting the draft bylaws to the Commissioners for discussion. She added that there would not be a vote on these changes at this meeting, but it would instead be an opportunity to discuss them.

Dunlap went over some of the changes and reasoning for the changes. He also explained the intentions behind the changes.

There was an extensive discussion on the impacts of the changes, what Commissioners wanted to see out of them, and what they were and were not able to change without City Council approval. The general consensus was that the proposed changes were all reasonable and worth implementing.

Zuccaro also clarified that Commission could impose a maximum time limit on alteration certificates, but that it had to be at least 3 years. The Commission would also have to

explicitly state this maximum limit at approval.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

b) Difference in time periods for landmark designation (50 years or older) and demolition review (in or before 1955)

Staff Presentation:

Cline-Gibson introduced a staff presentation for the proposed change to the period of significance. She explained why staff at the time believed that the intention of Preservation Master Plan was to also change the landmark and demolition criteria to 1955, instead of just the demolitions as ended up happening. Staff wanted the Commission to discuss whether the demolition review criteria should be reverted back to a 50 year standard, or if landmarking should be limited to properties built in or before 1955, as they felt both should use the same standard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Haley noted that the national standard was at 50 years or older rather than being set to a fixed time period. She said that when it was adopted in 2015, HPC was in favor of keeping the time period in line with this, but City Council disagreed due to the potential to overburden staff and the Commission.

The general consensus of Commissioners was that they wanted to allow the preservation program to keep a “living history” of Louisville. As a result, they were in favor of using a rolling 50 year time frame rather than anchoring the time period to pre-1955, or any other fixed period of time. However, there were some concerns about the potential volume of applications that could come to staff and the Commission. There was a suggestion that the time period could be varied by neighborhood in the city.

Public Comment:

Andy Johnson, resident, said that it would be a question of geography rather than numbers. He suggested that the time period seemed rather arbitrary, and suggested weighting eligibility by the historic value of each neighborhood.

Items from Staff

Cline-Gibson provided updates on the CLG annual report, and on the Commission’s upcoming meeting dates.

Updates from Commission Members

Dunlap asked whether another member of the Commission would be interested in taking over the role of placing information about the work of the Commission in the Downtown Business Association’s newsletter once his term expires at the end of the year.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was moved by **Burg**, seconded by **Anderson**, and adopted by voice

vote. The Commission adjourned at 7:51pm.

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes

**Monday, December 16, 2024
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM**

Call to Order – 6:30 PM

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present: Lynda Haley, Chair
Christine Burg, Vice Chair
Josh Anderson
Marty Beauchamp
Gary Dunlap
Keith Keller
Sloan Whidden

Staff Members Present: Rob Zuccaro, Director of Community
Development
Emily Cline-Gibson, Planner II
Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

None were heard.

Public Hearing Items

a) 833 LaFarge Avenue – Probable Cause

Staff Findings:

Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. She noted that the home was approximately 77 years old, had unusual architectural features due to its past usage as a church, and had a strong social significance. It met all requirements for a probable cause finding.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended a finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:

Andy Johnson, resident, from DAJ Design, spoke to the history of the property.

Questions of Applicant:

None were heard.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Dunlap said he was pleased to see it on the agenda, and thought that it would be a great addition to the City's landmarked properties.

Haley agreed, and noted that it satisfied all criteria.

Beauchamp noted that there had been some changes, but he thought that it qualified on the social criteria alone. He did not think that the architecture was unique, but he was supportive of the application.

Motion to approve finding of probable cause was moved by **Whidden** and seconded by **Beauchamp**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

b) 1237 Grant Avenue – Probable Cause

Whidden recused herself from this item as the applicant was a family member.

Staff Findings:

Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. The property was approximately 76 years old, in the minimal traditional style, and had a long term ownership and connection to immigration history.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended a finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:

Rosemary Kavanagh-Whidden, resident, had met past owners before they passed, and spoke to the history of their connection to the property.

Questions of Applicant:

None were heard.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Beauchamp said that this was a very straight forward application, and that he was in support.

Anderson noted his interest in the continuous female ownership since construction.

Burg noted the lack of physical change, and said that it met all of the criteria.

Haley said that there were fewer post WWII properties landmarked in that area, and thought that this house would be a welcome addition.

Motion to approve the finding of probable cause was moved by **Dunlap** and seconded by **Keller**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 6 to 0 with **Whidden** recused.

Discussion Items

a) HSA Process and Grant Funds

Staff Presentation:

Zuccaro introduced the presentation on updates to the HSA process. He covered the history of the grant process, the purpose of the process, HSA procedures and scope of work, and why staff felt that change was needed. He provided a list of questions for Commissioners to discuss.

Public Comment:

Andy Johnson, resident, DAJ Design, pooled with **Josh Johnston**, resident, and **Michelle Frieswyk-Johnson**, resident, noted his history with the HSA process. He showed the results from an audit of HSAs conducted by his business, DAJ Design, and the costs associated with them. He said that the grants were not large enough to cover the costs of residential assessments, though they were largely on par for commercial properties. He suggested modest increases to the grant amounts, and that there be a provision for exceptional circumstances where the grants could be increased for more complicated assessments. He also suggested that all HSAs be documented and catalogued at the library.

Commissioner Discussion:

Haley asked about the list of qualified professionals the City provided to applicants who were interested in the HSA process.

Zuccaro said that they had not updated the list in a long time, and noted that typically applicants came to them after they had already started working with an architect.

Haley asked how often HSAs were sent back for more information.

Zuccaro said he was not sure, but thought that it had been at least a few years since this last happened.

Beauchamp asked how often the HSA process was used to successfully landmark a property.

Johnson said that they were able to complete them around 30% of the time, though were expecting to get to around 60%.

Anderson noted that the 30% figure was likely low due to the number of recently completed HSAs that had yet to get to the landmarking stage.

Zuccaro added that staff typically encouraged applicants for demolition review undertake an HSA, so that there would at least be a record of the history of the structure before it was demolished.

Dunlap said that the process was not straightforward for those who wanted an HSA simply so they could landmark their property. He also agreed that the completed HSAs should be saved with the library. He was concerned that only 3 landmarks were created by the Commission in 2024, and though that this number ought to be far higher.

Zuccaro noted that some applicants were hesitant about landmarking for fear that they could lose the ability to redevelop their property.

Dunlap noted that these people tended not to start the HSA process at all.

Anderson asked whether there should be any size considerations for the HSA grant amounts. He also suggested that the City should require a licensed architect conduct the HSA, or to at least have the City interview the proposed assessor.

Anderson suggested that staff could send out an exit questionnaire after the probable cause hearing to ask the applicants what they were interested in doing after the completion of the HSA.

Zuccaro asked the Commissioners if they wanted to move forward with increasing the HSA grant amounts, and if they wanted to make changes to the program like requiring a structural engineer or allowing for extra funds for extraordinary circumstances.

Anderson asked how many HSAs had been completed without a structural engineer.

Zuccaro said that all HSAs in the last two years had used a structural engineer. He suggested that they could require a structural engineer as a base line, but allow applicants to request a waiver to not require one.

Anderson thought that this would be a good way to approach it.

Dunlap noted that people who only intended to go through the HSA process so they could landmark their properties may not need or want a structural engineer.

Beauchamp felt that both a licensed architect and a structural engineer should be involved in the process.

Haley said that more people might be willing to work on HSAs if the grants were more commensurate with the costs and time needed to complete them.

Whidden agreed, and wanted to see a staff proposal for an increase to the grant amounts. She also noted that some people may lose interest in the process due to the time and energy required to complete it.

Burg agreed that there was a need to increase these grant amounts, and thought that the HSA grants should be addressed first.

Johnson said that the reimbursement process had never been an issue or barrier from their experience. He added that he felt that a structural engineer was critical to the process.

Zuccaro noted that an applicant could skip the HSA process and move straight to landmarking if they wanted to.

Dunlap asked whether any changes to the grant amounts would have to go before voters.

Zuccaro said no, it would be up to Council instead.

Zuccaro also suggested that staff could send the completed HSAs to Commissioners so that they could see them.

b) Annual Work Plan 2024 Review

Staff Presentation:

Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation on the review of the 2024 work plan. She explained what had been completed over the course of 2024, and what they had not been able to get done.

Commissioner Discussion:

There was a discussion about the previous plan to create a new online map of the landmarked and historic properties in Louisville that could better convey the stories of these buildings than the maps currently on the website.

Burg spoke about the progress on updates to the Commission's bylaws, and said that they should be ready for review some time in 2025.

Items from Staff

Cline-Gibson provided an update on the subcommittees' action, and noted that the next meeting date had been moved to January 27, 2025 due to the public holiday on the 20th.

Updates from Commission Members

There was an acknowledgment that this was **Dunlap's** last meeting as a member of the Commission.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was moved by **Burg**, seconded by **Beauchamp**, and adopted by voice vote. The Commission adjourned at 8:11pm.