

**CITY OF BOULDER
LANDMARKS BOARD
January 6, 2016
1777 Broadway, Council Chambers Room
6:00 p.m.**

The following are the action minutes of the **January 6, 2016** City of Boulder Landmarks Board meeting. A digital recording and a permanent set of these minutes (maintained for a period of seven years) are retained in Central Records (telephone: 303-441-3043). You may also listen to the recording on-line at: www.boulderplandevlop.net.

BOARD MEMBERS:

Kate Remley, Acting Chair
George Clements, Vice Chair
Fran Sheets
Deborah Yin

*John Gerstle *Planning Board representative without a vote
Briana Butler, (Absent)

STAFF MEMBERS:

David Gehr, Deputy City Attorney
James Hewat, Senior Historic Preservation Planner
Marcy Cameron, Historic Preservation Planner
Lesli Ellis, Comprehensive Planning Manager
Holly Opansky, Landmarks Board Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER

The roll having been called, Chair **K. Remley** declared a quorum at 6:01 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by **K. Remley**, seconded by **G. Clements**, the Landmarks Board approved (4-0) the minutes as amended of the December 2, 2015 board meeting.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Dan Corson, 757 8th Street, former Landmarks Board member, inquired about the status of two topics that came up at the December 2015 retreat: 1) Chautauqua matter regarding lighting and the Baseline sidewalk and if it will be reviewed at the Landmarks Board, despite that fact that it is a bond, and 2) Initiation of 14th Street historic district matter, especially, because of the applicant's history.

J. Hewat, replied that 1) the Chautauqua matter is on the February 3, 2016 Landmark Board agenda noting that the boundary of the Baseline sidewalk and retaining wall portions of the matter are outside of the Historic District, but the rest of the issue goes onto Kinnikinic Road; and that 2) the Ldrc approved the relocation of a building on 14th Street and Euclid to the north. **M. Cameron**, added that individual landmark designation applications were received for all the buildings on that block, possibly five buildings, and that they are presently on hold.

4. DISCUSSION OF LANDMARK ALTERATION AND DEMOLITION APPLICATIONS ISSUED AND PENDING

- Statistical Report

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Public hearing and consideration of a Landmark Alteration Certificate application to demolish an existing house built in 1957 and, in its place, construct a new 2,384 sq. ft. house at 2110 4th Street in the Mapleton Hill Historic District, per section 9-11-18 of the Boulder Revised Code (HIS2015-00254). Owner / Applicant: Katrina H. Anastas Revocable Trust / Angela Feddersen

Ex-parte contacts

K. Remley, F. Sheets, D. Yin, G. Clements, and J. Gerstle made site visits.

Staff Presentation

J. Hewat, presented the case to the board, with the staff recommendation that the Landmarks Board conditionally approved the request.

Applicant's Presentation

Angela Feddersen, 522 Humboldt Street, Denver, architect, spoke in support of Landmark Alteration Certificate offering the inspiration and intended use, as well as the specific design details, then answered questions from the board and the public.

Public Hearing

Cindy Carlisle, 411 Spruce Street, expressed concern about of the height and massing of the building and access to off street parking via the alley.

Justin Gold, 409 Spruce Street, expressed concern about access to the alley and privacy for the adjacent properties, his included – in particular, does the back of the house allow the residences to look into on the adjacent properties. He also supported the applicant remodeling the house.

Board Discussion

Since her work in the field of science and in particular at National Institute for Science & Technology, **K. Remley**, shared that she immediately recognized Dr. Robert Beatty's name, because he invented a calibration mechanism that measured microwave attenuation and became that field standard for a long time. She bought and shared the mechanism with attendees.

After being presented with several options by **D. Gehr**, the applicant, **A. Feddersen**, requested that the application and public hearing process be continued and heard on the March 2, 2016 Landmarks Board meeting, allowing the 9.11.15c to shift the typical timeline of receiving an answer in 45 days.

Motion

On a motion by **K. Remley** and seconded by **D. Yin**, voted and approved (4-0) to continue this item and public hearing at the March 2, 2016 Landmarks Board meeting. They detailed their areas of concern to be addressed:

AREAS OF CONCERN:

1. **Window-wall proportion:** Revise design so that the north, and west elevations have a traditional window to wall proportion (avoid large blank walls); consider revisions to reduce amount of blank wall on the façade (west). **K. Remley** referenced, Section U.8 of the *Mapleton Hill District Design Guidelines*.
2. **Windows:** Ensure that all windows are traditionally proportioned, scaled and profile, and that there are fewer types (shapes) of windows used (including redesign of redesign of the clerestory windows at the north and south). Consider reducing amount of glass at east face.

3. **Use of stone:** Revise application, massing, and type of stone. Consider application of ashlar stone at the foundation and a rustic stone on the main mass of the building with the wing similar to the frame. Brick construction on main body of house may also be appropriate.
4. **Use of metal:** Eliminate metal accents (standing seam roof on the porch and bronze fascia detail).
5. **Height:** Explore ways to reduce the overall height of the house (reduce ceiling heights, plate heights, etc.), especially because a nicer part of this design is that the massing is relatively simple (implied attractive / desirable).
6. **Front porch supports:** Eliminate the use of steel supports and consider open railing as opposed to masonry wall at porch.
7. **Rear porch:** Consider the use of a single door at the deck rather than two new openings.
8. **North deck:** Further integration of the deck into the roof structure of the addition.
9. **Skylights:** Eliminate the use of skylights toward the front of the building (reduce visibility).
10. **Alley:** Minimize the impact of the new house on the historic context of the north driveway (lane).
11. **Additional detail:** Submit drawings of rear accessory building and all proposed hardscaping including impact to existing as well as proposed retaining wall and patio areas.
12. **Documentation of existing house:** Prepare archival quality photographs and measured drawings of each elevation of the existing house prior to issuance of a building permit.

6. MATTERS FROM THE LANDMARKS BOARD, PLANNING DEPARTMENT AND CITY ATTORNEY

- A. Update Memo
- B. Subcommittee Update
- C. Design Guidelines and Code Revisions
- D. Outreach and Engagement
- E. Potential Resources

7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Approved on _____, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

_____, Chairperson