

**DATE:** November 6, 2013  
**TO:** Landmarks Board  
**FROM:** James Hewat, Marcy Cameron  
**SUBJECT:** Update Memo

### **Pending Stays-of-Demolition**

The stay-of-demolition for the house at 428 Pleasant Ave. expires on Jan. 6, 2014. Staff, two board members and the applicant met on Sept. 25 to discuss alternatives to demolition. See attached meeting summary and letter from the applicant requesting that the stay be lifted.

The stay-of-demolition for the buildings at 1045 Linden Ave. expires on Feb. 19, 2013. Staff, two board members and the applicant met on Oct. 18 to discuss alternatives to demolition. See attached meeting summary.

### **Grandview Buildings**

A considerable amount of work has occurred to facilitate the move of the houses at 1220 and 1243 Grandview Avenue to Marine Street. The relocation of these buildings to this property will require code amendments in the form of a special ordinance from the City Council. Proposed amendments were reviewed by the Planning Board Oct. 12<sup>th</sup>. First reading by the City Council occurred on October 22<sup>nd</sup> and second reading of the ordinance is scheduled for November 19<sup>th</sup>.

Once the buildings have been relocated, the new owner will submit landmark designation applications. Assuming the City Council approves of the special ordinance, staff will be involved in reviewing the methodology for the moving and location of the two buildings.

### **11<sup>th</sup> and Pearl Streets Project, Ldrc Review.**

On October 11<sup>th</sup>, the Landmarks design review committee completed review reviewed setbacks, envelope, and mass and scale for the proposed new building (see attached notes). Review of elevations, storefronts and plaza will occur on November 8<sup>th</sup> with a follow-up meeting scheduled for November 22<sup>nd</sup>.

### **Historic Preservation Plan Adoption**

Second reading October 29<sup>th</sup> at City Council – update at meeting.

### **Demolition Ordinance Changes**

Continued 2<sup>nd</sup> reading by the City Council is scheduled for November 19<sup>th</sup>.

### **Structures of Merit**

Staff has called all of the property owners of the nominated buildings notifying them of possibility of designation. While many property owners are supportive of the recognition, a few are opposed. Update at meeting.

### **Comprehensive Planning and Sustainability Calendar**

See attached.

### **Fiscal Year 2014 Certified Local Government Grant Application**

Update at Meeting

### **2014 National Trust Conference Report**

Update at Meeting

## **Recent Historic Preservation Comments for Pending Site Review Projects:**

### **New Construction at 1301 Walnut Street (Staff level Site Review)**

*The Colorado Insurance Group Building located at 1919 14<sup>th</sup> Street was constructed in 1955 after designs by noted Boulder Modernist architect, James Hunter. An architectural survey and context of architectural Modernism in Boulder undertaken in 2000 (see attached), has identified this Mies van der Rohe inspired building as the only "big city" high-rise in the city. The survey notes the building's strong Modernist horizontal and vertical forms, curtain wall construction, and high level of craftsmanship displayed as unique in Boulder.*

*The architectural survey and context also finds James Hunter to be an "acknowledged master of Boulder architecture" and that the Colorado building represents one of his most important commissions of the 1950s. In 2006, the James Hunter designed "Nelson House", located at 1818 Baseline Avenue in Boulder, was individually listed in the State Register of Historic Places. While the building has been moderately altered over the years, the 2000 survey finds the Colorado Building to retain a high degree of historic integrity and to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under criterion C (architectural significance), as an exceptional and iconic example of post-WW II, Miesian design in downtown Boulder. Planning staff considers the building would also be eligible for designation as a local historic landmark. Redevelopment of the property requiring discretionary review would likely include conditions of approval requiring the submittal of a completed application to landmark the building as per policy 2.33 Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan.*

*Site Review approval of this project would require the applicant's submittal of a completed application to landmark the building and a portion of the property as per policy 2.33 Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan. Staff recommends that this occurs as soon as possible so that we can schedule a designation hearing. This will allow the Landmarks Board to review the proposed landmark and boundary in the context of the larger re-development of the property so that the subsequent Planning Board review will include the Landmark Board's comments and recommendations. Please note that the historic preservation ordinance (9-11-5(a)) states that once a completed application made by the property owner is received, a public hearing must be heard by the Landmarks Board between 60 & 120 days of the application date.*

*The small brick building at the north side of the property was constructed sometime between 1895 & 1900 as an accessory building for the house that once stood at 1315 Front Street (now Walnut). It is located in and contributing to the Downtown historic district. Any exterior changes will require a landmark alteration certificate. It is unlikely that the Landmarks Board would approve the demolition or relocation of this building. Likewise, the area of the proposed new construction abuts 1916-1922 13<sup>th</sup> Street (James Hotel), which is a contributing to and located in the Downtown Historic District, will need to be reviewed by the Landmarks Board for a landmark alteration certificate.*

*Tax assessor records indicate that the building at 1301 Walnut Street was constructed in 1949, though a historic building inventory form has not been completed for the property. It does not appear that the building is of historic or architectural significance. Because the building is older than fifty years in age, if removal of the building is planned, an application for demolition will need to be submitted and reviewed by the historic preservation program per Section 9-11-23 of the Boulder Revised Code.*

*The proposed new construction abutting the west side of the Colorado Building appears generally consistent with the General Design Guidelines and Downtown Historic District Guidelines. Likewise, the proposed west elevation of the building abutting the historically contributing building at 1916-1922 13<sup>th</sup> Street seems consistent with the guidelines. These areas of the proposed new construction would be subject to review by the Landmarks Board.*

### **New Construction at 2200 Broadway, Site Review**

*The Trinity Lutheran Church is a non-landmarked building located adjacent to the Mapleton Hill Historic District. Historic survey information indicates that the late gothic-revival church was constructed in 1929 after designs by Margaret Read of the architectural office of Glen Huntington. While the church is notable for its 1920s gothic-revival architecture location its location in an area known as Boulder's "church district", it is also significant as having been designed by one of city's most prominent women architects. The property is potentially eligible for designation as a local historic landmark.*

*A preliminary review of the proposed design indicates that that the proposed new construction will have no direct effect on the historic church building. The new construction indicates sensitivity to the historic building and overall context of the area. Since the church is potentially eligible for landmark designation, a condition of site review approval should be the submittal of a completed application to landmark the building as per policy 2.30 Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan.*

**428 Pleasant Avenue**  
Demolition Alternatives Discussion  
Sept. 25, 2013 1:00-2:00 p.m.

**Overview**

- The purpose of the Sept. 25, 2013 meeting is to explore alternatives to the demolition of 428 Pleasant Ave.
- The stay of demolition was imposed by the Landmarks Board on August 7, 2013 and will expire January 6, 2013 if no action is taken by the Landmarks Board.
- Staff will report to the Landmarks Board on exploration of alternatives to demolition at the October 2, 2013 meeting.
- The Board may choose to hold a public hearing to consider lifting the stay -of-demolition, to initiate landmarking of the property at a subsequent meeting, or to let the stay continue.

**Structural Integrity of the House**

- West side foundation wall replaced in recent years; CMU block not up to code, though it does not appear to have shifted, however, west wall of wood-frame portion visibly bowed.
- Piers required for correct stabilization of house
- Rubble foundation on east side with early concrete shoring wall on the exterior.
- Property located in mass movement area- piers required for new construction. For existing houses, external piers may be an option.
- Use of helical piers discouraged by contractors to the applicant
- Span of floor joists too far; temporary mitigation with 2x4's. Sister on 2x10's to floor structure; lose about 4" of ceiling height in basement.
- Basement floor recently removed and floor leveled by further excavation; possibly undermining rock rubble foundation on east side.

**Energy Efficiency**

- Spray-foam would allow an R-30 rating
- Insulation of attic space would result in lowered ceiling height

**Relocation**

- No space to move on-site

**Addition**

- Rear shed addition could be removed
- Applicant likes existing footprint/location of current house and wants to keep mature trees.

**Tax Credits and Other Incentives**

- Individual local landmarking would provide for the possibility of taking advantage of the 20% state historic preservation tax credit. For example, if \$150,000 were spent on the rehabilitation, \$30,000 could be potentially be taken as a tax credit (may be applied for a period of up to 10 years).

- Individual landmarking would provide the opportunity to take advantage of the exterior construction material tax rebate (up to \$12,000), relief from certain aspects of the compatible development regulations, the land use code and the energy code.
- If listed in the National Register Historic Places, owners would be eligible for a 20% federal tax credit. This would require the historic portion of the house be income producing (in-service for a period of at least 5 years).
- A waiver of sales tax on construction materials at the time of building permit application if at least 30% of the value of materials is for the building's exterior.
- Waivers from certain provisions of the International Building Code if approved by the Director of Development and Inspection Services. For example, lower railing heights may be permitted if historically compatible and safe.
- The potential for the Board of Zoning Adjustment to grant a variance for a historic building if it is determined that the development in conforming locations on the lot or parcel would have an adverse impact upon the historic character of the individual landmark or the contributing building in a designated historic district. Section 9-2-3 (4)

### **Next Steps**

Staff will summarize meeting, send to applicant, owner and the Landmarks Board. The board will discuss under "Pending Applications" at their Oct 3 meeting. The applicant may write a letter requesting that the board lift the stay of demolition.

From: COOPER SCHELL  
> Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 9:44 AM  
> To: Cameron, Marcy  
> Subject: Re: 428 pleasant st  
>  
>>  
>> Dear Landmarks Board,  
>>  
>> I'd like to thank Mark, Liz, James and Marcy for taking the time to meet me at my property to discuss options and alternatives to demolition. As per our conversation on site, the potential tax breaks offered for landmarking the home are not of benefit to me. I think it was also pretty clear upon inspection that the condition of the house does not lend itself to restoring. I would appreciate it if you all would consider lifting the stay so that I can proceed with the demolition permit.  
>>  
>> thank you, sincerely  
>>  
>> Cooper Schell  
>> 428 pleasant st  
>> boulder, co 80302  
>  
>

## 1045 Linden Demolition Alternatives Discussion

Friday, Oct. 18, 2013, 9:00 a.m.

### Attendees

Marcy Cameron, Historic Preservation Planner  
Brian Holmes, Zoning Administrator  
Kate Remley, Landmarks Board  
Kirsten Snobeck, Landmarks Board  
John Steinbaugh, Applicant/Owner  
Kathy Steinbaugh, Applicant/Owner

### Purpose of Meeting

- To explore alternatives to the demolition of 1045 Linden Ave. with the applicant.
- The stay of demolition was imposed by the Landmarks Board on October 3, 2013 and will expire February 19, 2014 if no action is taken by the Landmarks Board.
- Staff will report to the Landmarks Board on exploration of alternatives to demolition at the November 6, 2013 meeting.
- The Board may choose to hold a public hearing to consider lifting the stay-of-demolition at a subsequent, to initiate landmarking of the property at a subsequent meeting, or to let the stay continue.

### Condition/Rehabilitation

- The estimated cost to rehabilitate the existing 930 sq. ft. house is \$180,000, or about \$205/sq. ft.
- Necessary rehabilitation work includes a new roof, stabilization of the structure, new plumbing, electric and mechanical systems, interior finishes and building envelope upgrades.

### Energy/Building Code Requirements

- Wood shake shingles- The Chief Building Official acknowledges the stay-of-demolition and will not enforce the wood roof violation while the stay is in place.

### Addition

- The house is located toward the front of the lot, which allows room for a rear addition or new construction.
- The applicant expressed concern regarding resale value due to the house's close proximity to the sidewalk.
- Allowed FAR: approximately 4,300 sq. ft. The current building is approximately 900 sq. ft.
- Staff will send examples of successful additions to historic buildings to the applicants.

### Relocation- On-site

- The house could be moved on-site and used as an Owner's Dwelling Unit (OAU). OAUs are limited to 450 sq. ft., so a portion of the building would need to be partitioned off and used for storage or a like use. The property would need to be owner-occupied if the OAU were rented out. It could also be used as a studio or workshop.
- Mr. Steinbaugh indicated that as their home overlooks the property, he does not want multiple structures to clutter the lot.

**Relocation- Off-site**

- Mr. Steinbaugh indicated that he would donate the building if a site/funding were found.
- The board members will speak with Historic Boulder about the possibility of relocating the building.

**Tax Credits and other Incentives**

- Individual local landmarking would provide for the possibility of taking advantage of the 20% state historic preservation tax credit. If \$150,000 were spent on the rehabilitation, \$30,000 could be potentially be taken as a tax credit (may be applied for a period of up to 10 years).
- Individual landmarking would provide the opportunity to take advantage of the exterior construction material tax rebate (up to \$12,000), relief from certain aspects of the compatible development regulations, the land use code and the energy code.
- If listed in the National Register Historic Places, owners would be eligible for a 20% federal tax credit. This would require the historic portion of the house be income producing (in-service for a period of at least 5 years).
- Mr. Steinbaugh indicated that they were not interested in the available tax credits or zoning variances.

**Next Steps**

The board will discuss under “Pending Applications” at their November 6 meeting. The applicant may write a letter requesting that the board lift the stay of demolition.

**Landmarks Design Review Committee**  
Former Daily Camera Site | 1048 Pearl  
Setback Adjustment and Envelope: Meeting #2  
October 11, 2013

Landmarks Design Review Committee: **James Hewat, Mark Gerwing, Liz Payton**  
Staff: **Marcy Cameron, Sam Assefa** (9-9:45 a.m.)  
Applicant: **Cazes Martin**

Next meeting to review Elevations, Storefronts and Plaza scheduled for Nov. 8 and Nov. 22.

**J. Hewat** reviewed the Aug. 16 meeting notes, highlighting aspects of the design to be reviewed in this follow-up meeting.

- Setback should be at the approved 20' or greater; concern with visibility of the 4<sup>th</sup> floor;
- Parapet should be articulated;
- Hewat expressed concern about rooftop use/visibility of people directly at parapet;
- Concern that stair tower emphasizes 4<sup>th</sup> story;
- Walnut St Elevation: removal of angled piece considered to be an improvement but concern that building reads more horizontal; return with vertical articulation of brick portions.
- Pearl St. Elevation: brick module increased in width; important to emphasize verticality
- Important that brick reveals at corners not read superficial;
- 11<sup>th</sup> and Pearl corner- expressed concern with column size and placement.

Return with:

- Setback revisions along Pearl
- Brick articulation to emphasize verticality
- Railing/Parapet revisions
- Revisions to the structural support at corner of 11<sup>th</sup> and Pearl

**Setback on Pearl**

- **C. Martin** explained that the decreased setback was a result of structural requirements due to the parking changes; they've resolved the issue and returned the setback of the 4<sup>th</sup> story to 20'1".
  - **LDRC finds 20'1" setback consistent with LB approval.**

**Pearl Street Glass Box**

- New balcony at 4<sup>th</sup> floor added help articulate transition between brick and glass portions; similar to balconies on the alley.
- **S. Assefa** considers balcony will activate building and provide a human scale.
- **M. Gerwing** also supports balcony addition, noting that it breaks up the 2 story façade;
- **L. Payton** found no issue with the balcony.
  - **LDRC considers addition of balcony appropriate.**

- *Railing, fascia and underside material to be discussed in Materials meeting.*

### Parapet- Water Quality Planters

- **C. Martin** explained that water quality planters have been added to the 3<sup>rd</sup> story rooftop, flush with brick portions of the buildings (with the exception of one section at corner). This will create a buffer from the edge of the brick portions of the building, while users will be able to access the edge of the contemporary sections.
  - LDRC considers use of water quality planters appropriate.
    - *Railing details, cornice articulation to be reviewed at a later date.*

### Brick Reveals

- LDRC considers that the brick should wrap around the corner to provide a solid appearance, rather than a superficial veneer.
- **C. Martin** noted that extending the brick into the building would create complications to the interior layout and that the tenant will populate the space and add visual interest.
- **J. Hewat** remarked that the varied height of brick and glass portion on plaza helps to articulate difference.
- **M. Gerwing** stated that even 24" would even help, but acknowledged that from the interior, the veneer would be obvious. The masonry corner should read as a pier; suggested width approx. 6'.
- Curtain wall butting into brick is key; should read as being built onto the wall.
- **C. Martin** modeled 2' increase into building (4'8 total/7 bricks); LDRC considered it to be a great improvement.
  - Return with an increased width to the brick returns (LDRC did not set a specific width)



## Roof

- **C. Martin** explained that the fitness center tenant backed out, eliminating the need for a rooftop pool; area is now shown to be an elevated deck that is open to the public and covered by a trellis.
- **J. Hewat** questioned the visibility of the trellis from the street; would see edge;
- Pergola at east (unchanged from last time) appears quite high. The applicant noted that its design will continue to evolve and its thickness will decrease if possible.
- Restaurant portion also reads very tall, particularly the slab roof (currently 2'8"; likely will be approx. 2' and would be even with the bottom slab (22"). LDRC supported this balance, noting that slimming it down would provide balance and refinement.
- **C. Martin** confirmed that it is 10,'4; likely will be lowered (10' clear). Other floors about 11'. Will continue to evolve and reduce bulkiness of slab roof.
  - LDRC considers reduced height of restaurant portion to be more appropriate.

## Parapet

- **L. Payton** emphasized that the Downtown Design Guidelines on New Construction state that designs should incorporate traditional building elements, including parapets. The cornice is a primary opportunity to distinguish this building from a generic office building; it should reference the historic buildings in its context.
- No specific language regarding parapets; features may be interpreted in contemporary ways.

## Vertical Articulation of Brick

- **C. Martin** presented 4 schemes to articulate the verticality of the brick portions.
- Option 1: grid; Option 2: Columns (brick and spandrel); Option 3: inset panel 1-2" to accentuate arches; Option 4: setback panels; with steel channels.
  - **LDRC prefers Option 4 which splits the bays, provides human scale and articulates the piers; LDRC does not find Option 1 successful.**
- **J. Hewat** noted that **E. McLaughlin** considered Option 1 most appropriate based on comments from Planning Board. .
- **M. Gerwing** suggested a soldier course to continue to articulate the brick.
- **L. Payton** questioned if 1-2" bay setback made a difference.
- **M. Gerwing** suggested an Option 5: no setback; brick reveal at back piers edges.
- **L. Payton** noted that lintels, other details will also articulate the façade.
- **M. Gerwing** reiterated preference for windows to be inset.



① OPTION 4 ELEVATION  
3/32" = 1'-0"

### Walnut St. Elevation

- **C. Martin** presented revisions to the east side of the Walnut Street elevation, noting that the tenant change allows for 2 entrances at the front.
  - **LDRC encourages storefront access and finds revisions appropriate.**

### Garage Ventilation – Walnut St.

- **C. Martin** explained that the garage must be ventilated and it can't exhaust/intake off of alley. Intake proposed at west end of Walnut St. Elevation; may change if automatic parking is classified as storage or a garage.
  - **LDRC encourages mitigation to reduce visual appearance of grate on street (i.e. continue vertical mullions to ground).**

### Cornice

- **J. Hewat** considers that parapet cap should be increased.
- LDRC most concerned with parapet at 11<sup>th</sup> and Pearl corner. Projection is an issue
- **L. Payton** stated that a cornice that reference historic building will be primary way to differentiate this building from a generic office building.
- **M. Gerwing** agrees; it should have some heft, a shadow line, and be appropriate to the building.

### Visibility of 4<sup>th</sup> floor from Pearl St.

- Applicant still detailing water quality planters; articulation of cornice not complete.
  - **Deferred to later meetings; LDRC will review at a later meeting.**

### 11<sup>th</sup> and Pearl Glass Corner

- **C. Martin** presented the reviewed plans, noting that the structural column has been pulled back about 6' to the south, 3' to west and is located on the interior of the building and the upper floors cantilever out a little bit.
- **M. Gerwing** suggests increasing slenderness as it goes up to achieve a floating box affect.
  - **LDRC finds new location of the column appropriate and an improvement.**
- **J. Hewat** finds canopies at the corner distracting; M. Gerwing asked applicant to study it and return with other options, including removal of hard canopies.
- **L. Payton** expressed a preference for a corner entrance; M. Gerwing noted this would be difficult and awkward.
- **J. Hewat** considers that the glass box reads as an entrance and no canopies are needed.

### Alley

- **C. Martin** presented revisions to the alley: it will be two stories, enclosed (with open access on the rooftop level) and stated that it will be detailed to stay light and transparent. Public can walk through from one side of the building to the other on the roof. Planters, lighting, signage will indicate publicly accessible areas.
- **M. Gerwing** expressed preference for the previous, open option, but still considers it a vast improvement over the current one.
  - **LDRC considers alley revisions to be appropriate.**

### Other

- **L. Payton** reiterated importance of the Downtown Design Guidelines in regards to traditional building elements such as lintels, sills, cornices and hopes that these will be used to help differentiate this building. She hopes that the building will be one that people will care about.
- **J. Hewat** reiterated the importance of avoiding the appearance of a thin brick veneer.
- In general, the LDRC considers revisions an improvement and that the applicant has done a good job of incorporating comments from the last meeting.

### **Next Steps**

Staff will send out the meeting notes for review. The LDRC will meet on Nov. 8 to review Elevations, Storefronts and Plaza on Nov. 8, with a follow-up meeting on Nov. 22.