

Lafayette Historic Preservation Board
Meeting Minutes

1290 S. Public Road
January 19, 2017

Board Members Present:

Rebecca Schwendler – Chair
Seth White – Vice Chair
Bob Jencks
Janna Chatham-Kennedy
Candace Richter
Anthony Viers

Board Member Absent:

Amanda Downes

Darcia Thomas, Planning Commission Liaison
Greg Thompson, Staff Liaison

I. Call to Order

Chair Schwendler called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Mr. Thompson called roll.

II. Topics for Discussion

A. Continuance of Public Hearing/813 E. Baseline/Consideration of a Demolition Permit Stay

Mr. Thompson introduced the project and provided a breakdown of the staff summary.

The applicant discussed his plans for the building and the project in general.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Vicky Uhland, 303 E. Simpson, inquired why the request to demolish the building was coming forth now. Mr. Thompson noted the application was submitted to the City, so it followed procedure to this public hearing. Mr. Thompson noted the land use request on the subject property was moving forward to City Council in the near future and both applications were moving forward at the same time.

Chair Schwendler gave the history of the McDaniel's family and discussed the property background. She noted the horizontal siding was not original, but asked whether the vertical siding was. The applicant said he did not know, but he confirmed that someone was living there until a couple of weeks ago.

Member Kennedy wondered about the angle of the roof peak and if it were unique. Member Jencks suggested it looked like the roof had collapsed in certain areas but then agreed upon further inspection that it appears to have an unusual peak angle.

The Board considered the designation criteria, including A1, A5, B2, and B3.

The minutes herein are a summary of the business conducted at this meeting, not a verbatim transcription. Only the actions taken and text appearing within quotation marks are verbatim.

Member Jencks suggested the builders keep an eye out for historic items as they are digging foundations and working on the site.

Member Viers indicated this building didn't seem to meet the criteria. Vice Chair White indicated that keeping typical, modest houses is important. Member Jencks indicated something needs to be special to be preserved.

Member Kennedy made a motion to approve the demolition permit for 813 E. Baseline, which was 2nd by Member Richter. The motion passed 5-1 (White dissenting).

The Board requested the applicant look for artifacts as he redevelops the site. Vice Chair White asked the applicant if he were open to the idea of moving the building to the corner of the lot or allowing the building to be removed intact from the site at no cost to the owner. The applicant confirmed he can not keep the building at its current location and indicated a willingness to give the building to someone. The applicant indicated it needs to be moved quickly. The applicant also expressed interest in salvage prior to demolition if that is desired. Members Jencks and Chatham-Kennedy volunteered to be Board contacts for the applicant.

B. Continuance of Public Hearing/310 E. Emma/Consideration of a Demolition Permit Stay

Mr. Thompson introduced the project and provided a breakdown of the staff summary.

The applicant indicated that she is heartbroken about not being able to save the building but asserted that it is unsafe and can't be fixed. She showed where additions were placed on the building over time and indicated nothing is original.

Member Jencks indicated he can put her in touch with an engineer that can resolve the building's problems.

Dale Horton, the applicant's builder, came to the podium and indicated the basement has been dug out and walls framed. Chair Schwendler and Member Jencks indicated their homes' basements were done in the same manner. The applicant indicated the foundation is rotting on hers. Mr. Horton indicated it may be able to be saved if certain measures are taken. Mr. Horton noted the building has siding that isn't historic and the windows are aluminum. Additionally, the foundation consists of a variety of materials, including concrete, cinder block, and one area which doesn't have a foundation.

Member Richter indicated it's not really a 1910s house any more since there have been lots of additions. Mr. Horton noted all of the exterior materials on the building are not original.

Chair Schwendler pointed out that the footprint of the house remains similar, minus an eastern addition, to what is shown on the 1937 Sanborn map. She also summarized the history of the property's owners, and especially that of David Lueras. She inquired how the applicant would suggest preserving the history of the property if the building were demolished. The applicant indicated she did not know but could think about possibilities.

Chair Schwendler suggested that the house must have been constructed by the 1910s, which is earlier than the date provided by the applicant (1940). The applicant indicated there was no definitive information showing the building was built in 1940 other than the Boulder County Assessor

information. She did talk with the previous owner and reviewed information contained on the Multiple Listing Service (MLS).

The Chair opened the public hearing at 7:42 p.m.

Vicky Uhland, 303 W. Simpson, discussed her house relative to 310 E. Emma and their similarities and indicated she hasn't had a problem with her foundation. She noted historic homes don't have to meet current codes and they can be lifted up and a foundation be put under them. She questioned the implications for the applicant's 2015 PUD application if the house is demolished. Ms. Uhland encouraged the stay to allow the property owner time to save the home.

Kappy Hall, 316 E. Emma, discussed the importance of ordinariness and architectural variety in Old Town buildings. She indicated a preference for accessory dwelling units that have been added to sites. Individual buildings add to the whole and Old Town character.

Bonnie Freeman of 405 E. Emma indicated a poor foundation is not a good excuse and suggested the applicant seek another recommendation from an engineer.

Adam and Rachel Cerny of 308 E. Emma indicated the house should remain and is part of Old Town. The house fits with miners' shacks in the area. They indicated the current tenants are still there. They indicated the letter from the structural engineer was dated November 2016. The owner doesn't seem concerned with getting the tenants out immediately, despite the assertions in the letter which indicate the building is dangerous.

Grant Swift, 608 E. Geneseo, wants a stay to be granted so the applicant can find another opinion. He also mentioned he's concerned with bait and switch development and asked Mr. Thompson to look into whether there is a PUD loophole. He also said that he has the same kind of basement.

Karen Norback, who lives at 800 E. Geneseo, read from the applicant's 2015 PUD application which states that the house is historically important. She asked that a stay be put on the demolition permit.

Mr. Thompson gave copies of two additional comment emails to the Board and to the applicant for review.

The public hearing closed at 8:11 p.m.

Member Jencks asked the applicant if she is willing to save the building if the cost is reasonable. The applicant expressed a willingness to give the house to someone and doesn't think she can afford to save it. She's also willing to allow the Board to get artifacts.

Following a question by Member Viers, the applicant indicated there are tenants living in the building currently.

Member Richter suggested the Board bring the discussion back to the criteria. She noted the discussion needs to be about the significance of this house, not other houses in town. She indicated it seems like part of the existing building dates from 1910, and that additions were done at various unknown times since then.

The Board discussed the criteria, including Architectural criterion #5. Member Richter noted the house doesn't have a typical miner cottage look. Member Viers indicated the home is part of the community. Member Kennedy noted how it interacts with the neighborhood around it. The Board agreed that this criterion is not strongly applicable.

Regarding the Social/Historic criteria, the Board noted the Latino history of this property is important under criteria #2. Criterion #3 was also discussed in regard to David Lueras and his community impact. The Board agreed that this is the strongest criterion for the house. Mary Manzanares, who was married and became Mary Garcia, lived on the property from 1948 to approximately 2013. Both were important community members who happened to be Hispanic.

The Board discussed the Geographic/Environmental criteria and there was strong support for criterion #1, especially from members of the public who spoke during the public hearing. The Board also discussed criterion #2, in that this is a rare and recognizable triple lot.

In terms of Physical Integrity, criterion #3 is met, as the building is in its original location.

A motion was made by Member Viers that the following criteria were met:

Physical Integrity #3 (Is in its original location or has the same historic context after having been moved)

Social/Historic #3 (Is associated with a notable person or the work of a notable person)

Geographic/Environmental #1 (Enhances the sense of identity of the community)

and a 90 day stay should be placed on the demolition permit. The motion was seconded by Member Kennedy and passed 6-0.

The Board decided the liaison to the applicant will be Member Jencks.

C. Continuation of a Public Hearing/700 E. Baseline/Consideration of Demolition Permit Stay

Member Jencks recused himself from the Board for this item.

Mr. Thompson introduced the item and discussed the proposal with the Board.

The applicant, Bob Jencks, approached the podium and discussed his proposal for the property. Chair Schwendler noted that the 2nd shed adjacent to the alley is not shown on the 1937 Sanborn map. Mr. Jencks said that the age of that building is unknown but it appears to be more than 50 years old. The buildings could be fixed, but the site needs a functional garage. He isn't looking to split the lot and is willing to salvage materials from the buildings and reuse them. Mr. Jencks noted it appears the barn building was used as a stable at some point. Additionally, the hardware on that building may be original on the barn door. The new garage design he would like to add to the site would mimic the existing barn. The applicant indicated the demo would be done within 6 months. Additionally, he would have a 10-foot setback for the new garage.

At 9:05, the Chair opened the public hearing. She closed it immediately afterwards, seeing no one present from the public to speak on the project.

After some discussion of the site and project, including a comment from Member Richter about the existing buildings being fairly vanilla, the Board discussed the criteria. The board noted it could be

argued some of the criteria (A1, A5, A6, and B2) are met, but not to the level of warranting a stay. There is a lot of grey zone with this proposal in relation to the criteria.

Member Kennedy moved to issue the demolition permit. Member Richter 2nd the motion. The motion passed 5-0 with Member Jencks abstaining, having recused himself from the Board for this item.

III. Public Comments

There were no public comments for the Board. The Board requested the staff liaison send contact information to Mr. Jencks, who offered to help the property owners at 310 E. Emma and 813 E. Baseline with their process.

IV. Adjournment

The Board moved to adjourn at 9:36 p.m.