

Historic Preservation Plan | Current Program Areas and Comparison with Other Cities

Program Area by Ordinance	Overview	Comparison with Colorado Communities	Comparison with Communities in the United States
Landmark and Historic District Designation	<p>Under the Historic Preservation Ordinance, the Landmarks Board recommends landmark designation to the City Council. City Council designates by ordinance and can designate over an owner’s objection. Since 1975, 10 historic districts and 162 individual landmarks have been designated in Boulder.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual landmarks represent a wide variety of themes of Boulder’s History, from residences built in the 1860s such as the Squires-Tourtellot House to agricultural buildings including the Stephens Granary and modernist buildings like the First Christian Church. The ten historic districts range in size from nine properties in the Floral Park Historic District to over 900 properties in the Mapleton Hill Historic District. Additional public hearing process (including Planning Board) and engagement of residents prescribed for designation of historic districts. 	<p>Aspen: City Council designates, non-consensual designation permitted for Victorian buildings, Modern buildings require owner consent. 2 historic districts, 198 landmarks.</p> <p>Denver: City Council designates, non-consensual designation permitted. 51 historic districts, 332 landmarks.</p> <p>Fort Collins: City Council designates, non-consensual designation permitted. 1 historic district, 216 landmarks.</p> <p>Longmont: Designation without owner consent requires petition by 100 citizens, extraordinary significance, demonstration of the inability to move building, and/or designation may not result in an economic hardship to owner. District designation requires 25% support from property owners to nominate, and 51% to designate. 2 historic districts, 114 landmarks.</p> <p>Pueblo: City Council designates, non-consensual designation permitted. 2 historic districts, 135 landmarks.</p>	<p>Ann Arbor, MI: City Council designates. 14 Historic Districts.</p> <p>Berkeley, CA: Landmark Preservation Commission designates, non-consensual designations permitted with verified application of at least fifty residents. 281 Landmarks, 39 Structures of Merit, 4 Historic Districts.</p> <p>Madison, WI: Common Council designates, non-consensual designations permitted. 178 Landmarks, 5 Historic Districts.</p> <p>Austin, TX: City Council designates, non-consensual designation not permitted. 567 Landmarks, 3 Local Historic Districts.</p>
Design Review	<p>Exterior changes to landmarked buildings and those located within a historic district require review. There are three levels of review: administrative, review by the Landmarks design review committee (Ldrc, which is comprised of 2 board members and a staff member) and review by the Landmarks Board in a public hearing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no fee for landmark alteration certificate (LAC) review. Between 200 and 300 LAC reviews undertaken annually. Approximately 60% of applications are reviewed by staff. Design Guidelines adopted by the Landmarks Board to assist in interpreting the ordinance for alterations to individual landmarks and for properties in historic districts. District-specific guidelines have also been developed for most historic districts to supplement the General Design Guidelines. 	<p>Aspen: Sophisticated design review process by Historic Preservation Commission members for most exterior changes; single set of design guidelines.</p> <p>Denver: Considerable design review for exterior changes majority of which is by staff; general and district specific guidelines for some districts.</p> <p>Fort Collins: Some design review; general design guidelines and district specific guidelines for one district.</p> <p>Pueblo: Some design review; design guidelines for historic commercial district only.</p>	<p>Ann Arbor, MI: Historic District Commission reviews all applications for alterations on buildings within historic districts. Approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness are needed to complete any work.</p> <p>Berkeley, CA: Design review is done by the city staff or Design Review Committee. Landmark Alteration Permits must be approved for all new construction and exterior alterations on or involving landmarks, structures of merit or buildings within an historic district.</p> <p>Madison, WI: The Landmarks Commission must approve and issue a “Certificate of Appropriateness” for all alterations and new construction on a landmark site or in an historic district.</p> <p>Austin, TX: Historic Landmark Commission reviews all proposed exterior and site alterations to City Historic Landmarks and properties in Local Historic Districts.</p>
Structures of Merit	<p>The Structures of Merit (SOM) program was established in 1988 as a way to recognize non-designated properties possessing “historical, architectural, or aesthetic merit”. SOM recognition differs from Landmark designation in the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SOM listing is strictly honorary and is not subject to the same design review process. Procedure for recognition is less regulated. Following a change in 1997 to the historic preservation ordinance, demolition and relocation review is no longer required for SOMs less than 50 years old. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structures of Merit have been recognized in thematic groups, such as terrace buildings, houses designed by Charles Haertling, and houses located in the “Little Rectangle,” the center of Boulder’s early African American community. 	<p>Longmont: Certificate of Merit program; Landmark Commission may “recognize any property of historic, architectural or aesthetic merit, which has not been recognized under any other provisions.” The purpose of recognition in Longmont is “to encourage the protection, restoration, preservation, enhancement, and adaptive reuse of such properties.”</p> <p><i>*Aspen, Denver, Fort Collins and Pueblo do not have a Structures of Merit program.</i></p>	<p>Ann Arbor, MI: None. All structures within the 14 historic districts are subject to review by the Historic District Commission.</p> <p>Berkeley, CA: The Structures of Merit Program is often used to recognize historically significant structures which have often been moved from their original location. This program is mainly an honorary program that lacks the strict regulations to review alterations.</p> <p>Madison, WI: No Structures of Merit Program.</p> <p>Austin, TX: No Structures of Merit Program.</p>

Other Program Areas	Overview	Comparison with Colorado Communities	Comparison with National Communities												
Demolition Review	<p>Demolition review is required for all non-designated buildings in the city over 50 years old. The purpose of the ordinance is to prevent the loss of historic buildings that may have architectural or historical significance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applications for buildings constructed after 1940 are reviewed administratively and buildings constructed before 1940 are reviewed by the Landmarks Design Review Committee (Ldrc). The current historic preservation code defines demolition as the removal of (1) 50% or more of the exterior walls of a building (2) 50% or more of the roof area; or (3) the removal of any exterior wall facing a public street. • If staff or the Ldrc finds that the building <i>may</i> be eligible for designation as an individual landmark, the application is referred to the full Landmarks Board (LB). If the LB determines the property is not eligible for designation as an individual landmark, a demolition permit is granted. However, if the LB determines the building may be eligible, a stay of demolition for up to 180 days may be imposed. During this six month period, alternatives to demolition are sought, including incorporation of the existing structure into a new design, eligibility for tax credits if the building is retained, relocation of the structure, or landmark designation. If the 180-day period expires, the demolition permit is issued. • Approximately 60-100 demolition permit applications are reviewed by staff and the Ldrc each year. The Landmarks Board reviews approximately four to six applications per year. 	<p>Aspen: Review is required for buildings located in the Main Street or Commercial Core Historic Districts, or any building listed on the “Inventory of Historic Sites and Structures”. Due to development pressures, Aspen preservation staff created a list of modern resources deemed to have the greatest significance and integrity. The buildings on this list must wait 90 days to receive a building or demolition permit. During this waiting period preservation staff discusses the economic, social, and cultural values of historic designation. If the property owner still wants to move forward with alterations or demolition, they may proceed after the 90-day period has elapsed.</p> <p>Denver: Review is required for all buildings larger than 120 square feet, regardless of age. Most applications are reviewed at the staff level to determine potential historical significance. If the structure is determined significant and has potential for historic designation, a demolition notice will be posted on the property for up to 21 days. If no landmark designation applications are received within the 21 days the demolition will be approved; however, if an application and fee is received the landmark designation process will ensue. Once the landmark designation begins, Denver City Council has 120 days to designate the property.</p> <p>Fort Collins: Review process similar to Boulder’s, except that an application that is called up to the full board and determined to be eligible for landmark designation must also be reviewed through Development Review.</p>	<p>Ann Arbor, MI: The Historic District Commission reviews <u>all</u> applications for demolitions within historic districts. Demolitions are permitted within historic districts when the commission deems that retaining the structure is a hazard to public safety, might deter from a major improvement project or cause financial hardship on the owners due to an action beyond the owner’s control.</p> <p>Berkeley, CA: The Landmark Commission reviews applications for demolition on a landmark site, in an historic district or on a structure of merit site.</p> <p>Madison, WI: All demolitions on a landmark property or in a historic district must be approved by the Landmarks Commission. The ordinance requires that the Landmark Commission must hold a public hearing on all demolitions except for the demolition of detached garages, accessory buildings or non-residential buildings constructed after 1945.</p> <p>Austin, TX: Review is required for <u>all</u> applications by the Historic Preservation Office to determine whether the structure is potentially historic. A demolition or relocation permit is required for residential and commercial buildings with a fee; additional fees may be applied if the project requires review from the Historic Landmark Commission.</p>												
Survey	<p>Boulder first applied for a grant to establish a survey framework in 1975. As a result of this early effort, a large portion of the city’s older building stock has been recorded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 1985, the city began hiring professional consultants to document buildings and make assessments of architectural and historical significance, funded by CLG grants. • 17 survey projects have been completed to date, from a broad survey in 1985 to the Post-WWII Residential Resource survey in 2010. 	<p>COMMUNITY SURVEYS COMPLETED</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Boulder</td> <td>17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aspen</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Denver</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fort Collins</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Longmont</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pueblo</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </table>	Boulder	17	Aspen	2	Denver	11	Fort Collins	8	Longmont	8	Pueblo	3	<p>Ann Arbor, MI: There are currently 8 historic districts which have been surveyed.</p> <p>Berkeley, CA: Most of the city still has not been surveyed in depth. In 1977-1979 the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association in conjunction with the City did a survey and documentation of about 650 structures and sites, known as the "State Historic Resources Inventory."</p> <p>Madison, WI: Madison Intensive Survey published in 1994.</p> <p>Austin, TX: The Austin Historical Survey Wiki is a new interactive tool for the City of Austin and allows users to find and contribute information about historic buildings, sites, and landscapes of the past.</p>
Boulder	17														
Aspen	2														
Denver	11														
Fort Collins	8														
Longmont	8														
Pueblo	3														
Incentives	<p>Owners of historic buildings in Boulder may be eligible to take advantage of 14 incentives, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax Advantages (Federal, State Tax Credits, City Sales Tax Waiver) • Possible exemptions/variances from select building code and zoning standards (Floodplain, height, solar, front porch and land use requirements, requirement in rental house code for sprinklers, and residential growth management requirements). • Recognition: plaque program for individual landmarks • Grant eligibility for the State Historical Fund • Review Assistance (Landmarks Design Review Committee) <p>Among all Colorado CLGs, Boulder ranks second to Denver in the most State Tax Credit projects reviewed and completed.</p>	<p>Aspen: Allowance for 500 sq. ft. “Floor Area Bonus” for additions to designated historic properties; 0% interest loan available for up to \$25,000 for any property that is in violation of current zoning codes, in a state of “Demolition by Neglect”, or to fund necessary rehabilitation work. Demonstration of financial need required for eligibility.</p> <p>Fort Collins: 0% interest loan available for up to \$7,500 for rehabilitation of historic properties; properties must be locally landmarked and funding is only applicable to exterior work.</p> <p>Louisville: Historic Preservation Sales Tax, passed by voters in 2008. The revenue provides funding for the rehabilitation and preservation of historic resources that contribute to the character of Old Town. Funding is only available for buildings that are locally landmarked or enter into a preservation easement with the city.</p>	<p>Ann Arbor, MI: Owners of historic resources within locally designated districts may qualify for specific tax credits. A state income tax credit of 25% of rehabilitation costs may be available.</p> <p>Berkeley, CA: There are several incentives: The Mills Act, façade easements, State par-bond funds, Marks Act Historical Rehabilitation Bonds, and Community Development Block Grants.</p> <p>Madison, WI: Single-family houses listed on the National Register of Historic Places or determined by the State Historical Society to be individually eligible for the State Register of Historic Places are eligible for a 25% state income tax credit on the costs of rehabilitation.</p> <p>Austin, TX: The City Council grants tax exemptions to local historic landmarks. The amount of the exemption depends on whether the property is income-reproducing or not. These exemptions must be applied for yearly and must submit to an inspection of the premises to ensure the property is being maintained properly.</p>												

Other Program Areas	Overview	Comparison with Colorado Communities	Comparison with National Communities																												
<p>Certified Local Government (CLG)</p>	<p>CLG program established in 1980 to better integrate local governments into the national historic preservation framework and to foster local-state-federal partnership. Boulder was recognized as a CLG in 1985, making it the second community after Longmont to become a CLG in Colorado.</p> <p>Certified Local Governments must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a local historic preservation ordinance • Establish a qualified historic preservation commission • Maintain a system for survey and inventory of local historic resources • Provide for public participation in the local historic preservation process. <p>Boulder has received CLG grant funding each year except one since 1985. Grant funded projects have included architectural surveys, informational brochures, the development of design guidelines and board member/staff training.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>COMMUNITY</u></th> <th><u>YEAR CLG ESTABLISHED</u></th> <th><u>TOTAL CLG GRANTS AWARDED</u></th> <th><u>TOTAL CLG GRANT AMOUNT AWARDED</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Boulder</td> <td>1985</td> <td>11</td> <td>\$89,083</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aspen</td> <td>1985</td> <td>3</td> <td>\$5,090</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Denver</td> <td>1985</td> <td>3</td> <td>\$16,860</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fort Collins</td> <td>1991</td> <td>6</td> <td>\$78,540</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Longmont</td> <td>1985</td> <td>4</td> <td>\$118,830</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pueblo</td> <td>2005</td> <td>5</td> <td>\$115,680</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>COMMUNITY</u>	<u>YEAR CLG ESTABLISHED</u>	<u>TOTAL CLG GRANTS AWARDED</u>	<u>TOTAL CLG GRANT AMOUNT AWARDED</u>	Boulder	1985	11	\$89,083	Aspen	1985	3	\$5,090	Denver	1985	3	\$16,860	Fort Collins	1991	6	\$78,540	Longmont	1985	4	\$118,830	Pueblo	2005	5	\$115,680	<p>Ann Arbor, MI: Yes, Established 1985. No grants received (2003-2012).</p> <p>Berkeley, CA: Yes, Established 2000.</p> <p>Madison, WI: Yes, Established 1992.</p> <p>Austin, TX: Yes, Established 2001. Multiple grants received (2010-2012: \$31,600).</p>
<u>COMMUNITY</u>	<u>YEAR CLG ESTABLISHED</u>	<u>TOTAL CLG GRANTS AWARDED</u>	<u>TOTAL CLG GRANT AMOUNT AWARDED</u>																												
Boulder	1985	11	\$89,083																												
Aspen	1985	3	\$5,090																												
Denver	1985	3	\$16,860																												
Fort Collins	1991	6	\$78,540																												
Longmont	1985	4	\$118,830																												
Pueblo	2005	5	\$115,680																												
<p>Public Outreach</p>	<p>Over the years, efforts have concentrated on the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership with Historic Boulder, Inc. in education and outreach projects • Coordination and promotion of Preservation Month Activities, including tours of historic neighborhoods and an awards ceremony recognizing notable projects. • Presentations to local organizations, such as the Chamber of Commerce, Boulder Area Realtors Association, neighborhood associations and CU classes. • Presentations at state and national conferences. • Development and publication of informational brochures. • Digitization of architectural survey forms on the Carnegie Library for Local History’s website. • Production of a video about historic preservation in Boulder. 	<p>Fort Collins: Offers a variety of resources and educational tools for owners of historic structures. These include a design assistance program, resources regarding sustainability and historic preservation, and multiple guides to assist property owners in the rehabilitation of historic homes and buildings.</p> <p>Pueblo: For consultant-funded projects, preservation staff requests a copy of the presentation so it can be given at later dates to different groups; Preservation staff also conducts bicycle and walking tours of historic neighborhoods and regularly give presentations to community groups. Additionally, information is provided to neighborhood “welcome wagons” so new homeowners are aware of the required review processes.</p> <p>Denver: Denver has worked in close partnership with Historic Denver, Inc, a historic preservation non-profit. Historic Denver advocates have developed walking and bicycle tours, as well as a smart phone app, to engage residents and visitors in the history of Denver’s neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Ann Arbor, MI: The city staff does provide information on historic districts and assistance on applications for alterations within historic districts. Additional information, forms, and applications can be found on website.</p> <p>Berkeley, CA: The city believes “Historic and cultural resources are much more likely to be preserved if citizens are aware of them and believe in their importance.” They are in the process of striving towards a better outreach program.</p> <p>Madison, WI: The city of Madison has worked in close partnership with Madison Trust for Historic Preservation, an independent historic preservation non-profit. Madison Trust has helped to save and preserve various structures throughout the city, create educational information for residents and promote historic preservation through various tours.</p> <p>Austin, TX: The City of Austin does provide meetings twice a month for applicants seeking advice on Certificates of Appropriateness. Parties interested in general historic information can find listed resources on the Austin Historic Preservation website and may use the Austin Historical Survey Wiki.</p>																												
<p>Sustainability</p>	<p>The Local Environmental Action Division (LEAD) provides leadership to achieve Boulder’s goals of sustainability and environmental quality. The mission is to engage and assist the community to reduce waste and energy use through education, services, and economic assistance.</p> <p>These programs include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zero Waste: Since July of 2009, the city has been expanding its existing recycling services to embrace a more comprehensive Zero Waste infrastructure. • Historic Building Energy Efficiency: In 2006, City Council adopted a Climate Action Plan to meet the Kyoto Protocol goals of substantially lower emissions of greenhouse gases. It is the city’s aim to create compatibility between historic preservation and energy efficiency goals. One such goal is to make a building’s environmental footprint smaller. 	<p>Aspen: In an initiative to reduce its carbon footprint and become an environmental leader, the City of Aspen has begun to harness renewable resources and provide incentives for its community to do the same. Currently the city is on track to being carbon neutral by 2015 and obtaining all power from renewable resources.</p> <p>Denver: Greenprint Denver, through the City of Denver, strives to provide a “world class community where people and nature thrive” by promoting efficient resource use and reducing environmental impact.</p> <p>Fort Collins: The City of Fort Collins has committed to sustainability through daily operations that are balanced in the human, financial, and environmental resources for present and future generations.</p> <p>Longmont: Sustainability in the City of Longmont is offered through many programs dedicated towards helping residents protect valuable watersheds, preserve open spaces, use more renewable energy, and by having alternate forms of transportation available.</p> <p>Pueblo: The county of Pueblo and local communities have implemented a sustainability policy to help maintain a healthy and vibrant community by promoting energy efficiency, the use of renewable resources and focusing on conservation.</p>	<p>Ann Arbor, MI: Created in January 2011, Ann Arbor’s 18 month sustainability framework project lays out sixteen overarching goals. The Historic Preservation department does offer energy conservation information on how to make your historic house green.</p> <p>Berkeley, CA: Noted in the 2011 Downtown Area Plan, it is a goal to “incorporate sustainable practices as an essential component of economic development, and establish downtown as a recognized center for business and institutions that are committed to environmental sustainability.”</p> <p>Madison, WI: Historic Preservation is minimally noted in the 2011 Madison Sustainability Plan meeting minutes.</p> <p>Austin, TX: The City of Austin works collaboratively with several city departments and the community to offer multiple sustainability programs including environmental protection, community gardens, recycling, green re-development projects, and energy information.</p>																												