

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**Minutes**  
**September 9, 2021**  
**Via Zoom Remote Meeting**

The September 9, 2021 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was called to order by Chairman Steve Lane at 5:02 p.m. via remote meeting connection.

**1. Roll call**

Present were Commissioners Kim Carpenter, Lee Hardies, Steve Lane, Holly Norton, Rick Jacobi, Susanne Sibley and Council Representative Aren Rodriguez. Absent were Commissioners Gheda Gayou and Terri Goon. Also present were Staff Liaison Jade Krueger and recording secretary Maria Yost.

**2. Meeting minute's approval**

A. Approval of August 5, 2021 meeting minutes

**Commissioner Jacobi moved to approve the minutes as written. Commissioner Hardies seconded the motion. Minutes approved unanimously.**

**3. Report from Chairman**

Chairman Lane briefly explained that anyone who wishes to speak during Public Invited to be Heard or a Public Hearing item, the instructions will be displayed on the screen during the meeting, and comments will be limited to 3 minutes.

**4. Communications from the HPC staff liaison**

Ms. Krueger spoke to the Commission about the following:

- Ms. Krueger is attending the American Planning Association Conference this week in Keystone, Colorado. She mentioned that one of the seminars she had attended was a community engagement seminar that focused on youth, where high school students successfully designated a landmark.
- Participated in Grant Review for the State Historic Fund. Ms. Krueger is hoping to hear back soon about the City's application for the Callahan House, and the Commission will be reviewing that further as well.
- Code Updates are still being reviewed by the City's legal team and she hopes to have them back to the Commission soon for more discussion.
- The City's budget is in the process of being finalized. The Commission applied for funding towards the preservation plan, and conservation overlay for historic districts.

Chairman Lane asked Ms. Krueger if the Commission will get the code updates back from legal in the next month or two, so the Commission could start acting on them before the end of the year.

Ms. Krueger will reach out again to legal for an update on their timeline and will update the Commission.

Chairman Lane said they need to be sensitive to the public perception of HPC, since there have been numerous calls for the Commission to be leaders with historic preservation, and he would like to see some progress.

## **5. Old Business**

### **a. Electronic Participation Bylaw**

Staff Liaison Jade Krueger spoke to the Commission about the following:

Ms. Krueger explained that 2 votes will be needed by the Commission:

1. Include the bylaws to allow for electronic participation at any time moving forward.
2. October meeting - virtual or in-person.

### **Commission Discussion**

Chairman Lane feels the Commission should adopt the bylaws which would allow the Commission to have flexibility.

Commissioner Hardies commented that as unpredictable as the last year has been, it makes sense to have that provision in the bylaws.

### **Motion**

**Commissioner Norton moved that the Commission adopt the electronic meeting provision into the bylaws.**

**Commissioner Hardies seconded the motion.**

### **Vote**

**Motion passes unanimously.**

Chairman Lane asked the Commission what their preference is for the October meeting, virtual or in-person.

Commissioner Sibley asked about the mask mandate for Boulder County and how long it could last.

Chairman Lane asked Ms. Krueger if she knew what City Council is doing for their meetings and if they are wearing masks.

Ms. Krueger said she didn't know what City Council is doing in regards to wearing masks at their meetings and will check with legal on whether or not the speaker was allowed to remove their masks while speaking. She would assume that a mask would need to be worn during an in-person meeting.

Commissioner Jacobi commented that he is comfortable with wearing a mask for the October meeting. He said that the Zoom meetings are an acceptable alternative and will go with what is easiest for the Commission.

Chairman Lane commented that masks are tough for him because he finds it difficult to have a conversation when he can't see facial expressions. He is willing to do in-person meetings and will go with the consensus of the Commission, but does not mind staying with Zoom meetings.

Commissioner Sibley asked if the in-person meetings would take place at the Civic Center as they have in the past. Ms. Krueger responded that the meetings would be at the Civic Center.

Commissioner Norton agreed with Chairman Lane and feels it would be difficult to understand folks in masks. She is happy to stay with Zoom meetings in October.

#### Motion

**Commissioner Norton moved that the Commission meet virtually for the October meeting.**

**Commissioner Jacobi seconded the motion.**

#### Vote

**Motion passes unanimously.**

### **6. Public invited to be heard – for topics other than public hearings**

Chairman Lane opened the public invited to be heard for items not listed on the agenda. Instructions for Public Comments were displayed on the screen for 5 minutes allowing for callers to call in to the meeting.

No one wished to speak.

Chairman Lane closed the public invited to be heard.

### **7. New Business**

#### **A. Firehouse Art Center – Certificate of Appropriateness Application PUBLIC HEARING**

*Action Requested: Decision*

#### **Staff Presentation**

Staff Liaison Jade Krueger spoke to the Commission about the following:

- The COA is for a request for a new sign on the west side of the Firehouse Art Center at Coffman Street and 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- Both the LDDA Design Advisory Committee and HPC are receiving this proposal.

Notes from the LDDA Design Advisory Committee:

1. The sign needs to be a design that fits with the historic character of the building.
2. Provide a nighttime view of the proposed sign.
3. Address how the sign would be attached to the building without impacting the building.

Public Hearing Notice and Posting

The property was posted with a public hearing sign and a notice was provided in the newspaper. Staff has not received any inquiries to date on this proposal.

Review Analysis

- Complies with the review criteria for a Certificate of Appropriateness, Longmont Municipal Code Section 2.56.130.

The Commission is the decision-making authority with the following options:

1. Approve the application as proposed.
2. Approve the application with conditions.
3. Defer action on the application based on the need for additional information.
4. Deny the application.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission consider option 1 and approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with following conditions of approval:

1. The sign appears to be white, color needs to be incorporated into the sign. Dimensions, materials and electrical conduit be labeled in the final sketch up model.
2. Final Design is approved by the LDDA Design Advisory Committee.
3. This COA is valid for two years from approval date by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Applicant in Attendance: Wayne Northcutt, Board of Directors President, Firehouse Art Center

Mr. Northcutt said he feels the sign could be impactful and beneficial for both the firehouse and the downtown. There is a lot of pedestrian traffic along the corner of Coffman Street and 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He said that the sign is not intended to be white, and will be monochromatic, and will either be constructed of bent aluminum with a matte black finish or brushed aluminum. The design intent is to capture the 1930's look, modern and reminiscent of the cinema. The sign would be internally illuminated with some accent lighting, and he understands it would need to meet City requirements for outdoor lighting. Mr. Northcutt said they have reached out to a local

1 sign vendor and they are excited about the sign. He said he would be happy to hear comments  
2 and feedback from the Commission.

3  
4 **Commission Discussion**

5  
6 Chairman Lane asked Mr. Northcutt about the options that are proposed for the signs.

7  
8 Mr. Northcutt explained that both options are a little different, and both have a certain charm.  
9 One option would say firehouse in horizontal large block letters and the second option has a  
10 flames design going up behind the lettering on the sign. He mentioned that option 1 with the  
11 block letters will be easier to construct and they are leaning towards option 1. He said they are  
12 currently doing a fund raising campaign to pay for the sign, which will cost between \$20,000 and  
13 \$25,000.

14  
15 Chairman Lane said that his personal preference for the sign is option 1, and not the flames look  
16 in this particular context.

17  
18 Commissioner Carpenter asked what their plan is for the electrical components.

19  
20 Mr. Northcutt said they are trying to minimize the conduit and in terms of lighting, there will be  
21 some low voltage external accent lighting. The signage cabinet itself will be internally  
22 illuminated. He said there will not be flashing lights or strobe lights on the sign, and their intent  
23 is to draw attention to the firehouse and not so much to the sign.

24  
25 Commissioner Hardies asked for clarification on the type of signage panel, if it is an acrylic  
26 channel that the letters will slip into and are able to change out.

27  
28 Mr. Northcutt said the letters will be changed manually and they will swap out the letters as  
29 needed.

30  
31 Chairman Lane summarized that in the staff report, staff recommends option 1, with 3 conditions  
32 of approval, including approval from the LDDA Design Advisory Committee. He suggested that  
33 the motion also include the standard approval that a sign permit be approved by the City.

34  
35 **Public Hearing**

36  
37 Chairman Lane opened the public hearing. Instructions for Public Comments were displayed on  
38 the screen for 5 minutes allowing for callers to call in to the meeting.

39  
40 No calls were received from the public.

41  
42 Chairman Lane closed the public hearing.

43  
44 Ms. Krueger added that the applicant will also need to apply for and receive a building sign  
45 permit, as Chairman Lane pointed out.

46  
47 **Motion**

1 **COMMISSIONER NORTON MOVED TO APPROVE THE CERTIFICATE OF**  
2 **APPROPRIATENESS TO INCLUDE THE STAFF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL, AND**  
3 **TO APPLY FOR AND RECEIVE A BUILDING SIGN PERMIT.**

4  
5 **COMMISSIONER SIBLEY SECONDED THE MOTION.**

6  
7 Vote

8 **MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

9  
10 Chairman Lane thanked Mr. Northcutt for bringing this project to the Commission.  
11 Mr. Northcutt thanked the Commission.

12  
13 **B. 821 Collyer Street – Local Historic Landmark Designation**  
14 **PUBLIC HEARING**

15 *Action Requested: Decision*

16  
17 **Staff Presentation**

18  
19 Staff Liaison Jade Krueger spoke to the Commission about the following:

- 20  
21 • The Tudor Revivalist home was built in the mid-1920's, presumably 1925 and is just  
22 outside of the Historic Eastside Neighborhood.  
23  
24 • The home was constructed by M.W. Calkins; and the Reverend Emil Wagner, the pastor  
25 of the German Congressional Church resided there with his wife.  
26  
27 • By the late 1940's the home was owned by the Hamiltons who operated Hamilton  
28 Supermarket on Main Street.  
29  
30 • A cultural resource survey and historic and recent photos are included in the packet.

31  
32 **Public Hearing Notice and Posting**

33  
34 The property was posted with a public hearing sign and a notice was provided in the newspaper.  
35 Staff has not received any inquiries to date on this proposal.

36  
37 **Review Analysis**

- 38  
39 ➤ Complies with the review criteria for a local landmark designation 1, 3, and 7 of the  
40 Longmont Municipal Code Section 2.56.050.

41  
42 **The Commission is the decision-making authority with the following options:**

- 43 1. Recommend that the property be designated as a local historic landmark.  
44 2. Recommend that the property not be designated as a local historic landmark.  
45 3. Recommend that the property receive a merit of historical significance.  
46 4. Defer action on the request based on the need for additional information.  
47

1 Staff Recommendation

2  
3 Staff recommends that the Commission consider option 1 or 3; designation of a local historic  
4 landmark or a merit of historic significance.

5  
6 Applicants / Property Owners in Attendance: Colleen Kimball and Brad Bullard

7  
8 Commission Discussion

9  
10 Commissioner Jacobi asked Ms. Krueger if she could clarify what a merit of historical  
11 significance is as opposed to a designation.

12  
13 Ms. Krueger explained that when a property in Longmont is designated a landmark, the home  
14 owners receive a historic preservation plaque that is provided by the City to display on their  
15 home. A merit of significance is a paper certificate that acknowledges historical significance and  
16 does not allow for financial incentives or tax credits. The home owner also would not need to  
17 come before the Commission for exterior modifications to the home.

18  
19 Chairman Lane asked the applicants if they would like to speak about their home.

20  
21 Ms. Kimball said that they purchased their home in June this year, and it was listed as being built  
22 in 1939. She said when they did some further research on the home, they found a survey that  
23 mentioned the home appearing on the registry for the water and sewage board in 1926, and so the  
24 home is estimated being built in 1925. She said when they did the research, it was really  
25 interesting to learn more about the history of the City of Longmont. With their home's proximity  
26 to Collyer Park and with the redrawing of the historic boundaries to include the block of 9<sup>th</sup>, they  
27 felt they wanted to try to preserve their historic home. Ms. Kimball said that their home is a little  
28 quirky and different, and has so much character and they feel it is a bright light in the  
29 neighborhood. She said they would like to honor the house and preserve it not for just them, but  
30 for the future as well.

31  
32 Commissioner Norton asked about the more recent photo of the house and if the siding is vinyl  
33 or aluminum. She feels that the house is charming and asked them to explain a little more about  
34 the characteristics of the house.

35  
36 Mr. Bullard said that one of the reasons they purchased the house, is because it is the only one in  
37 the neighborhood that is very unique in its own way. The house has a nice front swoop area and  
38 doesn't have an enclosed patio, and has all vinyl siding that has been updated. There is some of  
39 the original wood siding exposed where you walk into the house and other parts of the house  
40 as well. They have cleaned up the shutters and trim and painted them in an off red and purple  
41 color. Mr. Bullard said their goal is to get the house back to its original shape and to preserve the  
42 house.

43  
44 Ms. Kimball added that along with the updated siding, the house also has a newer roof in a  
45 neutral color. There is some wooden siding in the back of the house, and they have also painted  
46 the shed in the back a reddish color which is close to the original color that they found in areas of  
47 the basement and old windows.

1 Chairman Lane asked if all of the original siding is under the vinyl. Mr. Bullard said the original  
2 siding is still there.

3  
4 Commissioner Jacobi asked the applicants if they have any long term plans for bringing it back  
5 to the original design and to take the vinyl siding off.

6  
7 Mr. Bullard said they have no immediate plans for changing the siding and they are not sure of  
8 the condition of the wood under the siding. He said there are some areas in the basement that are  
9 just wood and have not been taken care of. Since the house is almost 100 years old, they are  
10 working on preserving it and bringing it to light as much as possible.

11  
12 Ms. Kimball added that they also have plans to replace the driveway that is broken up, and a  
13 detached garage is planned on the west side of the property near the alley.

14  
15 **Public Hearing**

16  
17 Chairman Lane opened the public hearing. Instructions for Public Comments were displayed on  
18 the screen for 5 minutes allowing for callers to call in to the meeting.

19  
20 No calls were received from the public.

21  
22 Chairman Lane closed the public hearing.

23  
24 **Further Discussion by the Commission**

25  
26 Chairman Lane said that in light of the cultural resource survey report that was prepared by Carl  
27 McWilliams, the house didn't show a significance of a true landmark, and also the vinyl siding is  
28 an issue to him. He is more in favor of a merit of historical significance and appreciates the  
29 passion and excitement about the house that the applicants show. He feels that our local  
30 landmarks are our crown jewels, and would encourage the applicants to come back with a plan to  
31 take off the vinyl siding and restore the original exterior, which might merit more of a landmark  
32 status.

33  
34 Commissioner Norton commented that the report from 1998 by Carl McWilliams evaluated the  
35 property to the National Register criteria, and the house does not meet National criteria status.

36  
37 Ms. Krueger said that predominantly Mr. McWilliams does look at the National Register, but  
38 there is a section in his report that talks about local significance and eligibility field assessment  
39 for a landmark. With the knowledge about the property, it does meet some of the City's local  
40 standards.

41  
42 Ms. Krueger said she agrees with Commissioner Lane that this home deserves a merit of  
43 historical significance and they would like to see more of those in Longmont.

44  
45 Commissioner Norton appreciated the clarity, and feels local designations are important because  
46 there is more flexibility than at a National level designation.



Chairman Lane mentioned that in the report, under item 42, it says that the house probably does not qualify to be listed as a local landmark. Also under item 44, local landmark field assessment, it says the house is not eligible as a local landmark. He likes the fact that there is an intermediate step which gives the option of the certificate.

Commissioner Jacobi said he is unsure about the designation of the house as well. He feels when the Commission designates a house as a local landmark it serves two purposes. It signifies that the house is one of our crown jewels of our town and should be recognized as such. It also is a tool to control future development of the house. The house is in the Historic Eastside Neighborhood, is 95 years old, and the vinyl siding on the house looks similar to the original siding. He feels that if they approved a merit of significance, there would not be any control over the future appearance of house. A landmark designation would help control the appearance of the house in their neighborhood. He thinks that the Commission should possibly consider approving the landmark status, with an understanding that when the vinyl siding needs repair or to be replaced, that the original wood siding underneath be rehabilitated.

Commissioner Hardies thought that the merit of historical significance would be a great step, with the encouragement to rehabilitate the siding when it is feasible. He said he has seen similar wood siding projects where it required a considerable amount of replacement material and sometimes custom milled to match the original, and other projects where the siding is in good shape needing just prep work and paint. He feels that the merit of historical significance certificate would be well received by the applicants.

Commissioner Norton said she is on the fence and does not disagree with any of the points made. She wanted to acknowledge how wonderful it is that the applicants are excited about their house, and the historic value of the house being in this neighborhood. She is uncomfortable with the idea of thinking of historic preservation as a hammer to keep people from doing things to their house, and feels there are a lot of issues with historic preservation being gatekeeping to have neighborhoods look a certain way. She said they should celebrate the things that make our town unique, and help to preserve those characteristics. Commissioner Norton added that the bones of the house look great, with a unique swooping roofline, and the doors and windows retain unique features with keystone type characteristics. She said she would lean more towards a landmark status, but if the Commission decided to go more intermediary she would support that as well.

Commissioner Carpenter said that there are houses that the Commission has designated as a landmark that have vinyl windows and do not have the original windows. She feels it is less of an issue to have covered up siding, and that would be her main hesitation to denying the landmark status. She said the addition to the house is setback far enough and it is clear what the period of significance is for the house. She also mentioned that the people that have lived in the house have represented a part of Longmont's history.

Commissioner Sibley said she is excited to see more movement in a neighborhood that doesn't necessarily have a lot of historic homes, and likes that there is so much character in the house. If the house is designated, the Commission would have some say if the siding is replaced in the future. She sees points to all of the discussion, and likes the intermediary but also likes the idea of designating as well. She is thankful that the homeowners are so excited about their house which is wonderful to see.

Commissioner Jacobi mentioned that historically, Mr. Calkins is the son of Ben Calkins who was the first European American born in the Chicago Colorado Colony. They both settled in this neighborhood and his house is just down the street. He said a lot of families had brothers, sisters, and children that all lived on the same street back when the town was founded.

Chairman Lane clarified that his thought was incentive and not trying to make this punitive. He really likes the fact that the applicants are excited about the house and that there are so many great components to the house. His perspective is that if the end goal is to have the vinyl siding removed and have restored siding to help make this house really shine, then the intermediary step would be an incentive. He said that the applicants are positively engaged in the house and thinks that the Commission could reward that with some recognition. He suggested that if the applicants want to take this to the next step, they could come back with an application to remove the vinyl siding and restore the original siding, be approved for a landmark status, and get a tax benefit for the work done. He feels that this would be an incentive and an end goal that is a win for everyone.

Ms. Krueger said she shares in the excitement that the applicants have about their house. She mentioned that when working on creating the historic preservation plan, it will be important for the Commission to think about areas where awarding a certificate of merit might be an option in trying to target homes of this nature, and would give folks more resources. She said that this application is a great example. She suggested awarding the certificate of merit and also provide the applicants with more resources that would make their home more significant for a landmark status.

Commissioner Carpenter said that if they went ahead with the incentive approach and awarded the certificate of merit, they would want to consider public perception, and that the public is aware that this would not necessarily stop their homes from being significant. She feels they need a way to communicate to the public that there are different levels of criteria to meet if they would like to apply for a landmark designation.

#### Motion

**COMMISSIONER SIBLEY MOVED TO APPROVE THAT THE PROPERTY AT 821 COLLYER RECEIVE A MERIT OF HISTORICAL SIGNIFANCE AS AN INCENTIVE AND ENCOURAGE THE APPLICANTS TO WORK WITH MS. KRUEGER TOWARDS A LOCAL HISTORIC LANDMARK DESIGNATION.**

**COMMISSIONER HARDIES SECONDED THE MOTION.**

#### Vote

**MOTION FAILED 3 – 3**

In favor: Chairman Lane, Commissioners Hardies and Sibley

Opposed: Commissioners Carpenter, Norton and Jacobi

#### New Motion

**COMMISSONER JACOBI MOVED TO APPROVE THE LOCAL HISTORIC LANDMARK DESIGNATION FOR 821 COLLYER STREET.**

**COMMISSIONER NORTON SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Vote

**MOTION CARRIED: 4 – 2**

In favor: Commissioners Norton, Sibley, Jacobi and Carpenter

Opposed: Chairman Lane and Commissioner Hardies

Chairman Lane expressed to the applicants that everyone supports what they are doing, and their excitement about preserving their home. He encouraged them to keep moving forward on the path that they started.

Ms. Krueger let the applicants know that the next steps would be that their application would go before City Council as an ordinance, and she will be in contact with them about when that will move forward. She congratulated the applicants on the approval of the landmark designation.

Ms. Kimball and Mr. Bullard thanked the Commission and Ms. Krueger.

## **8. Discussion Items**

### **A. Recommendation for SH 119 & Zlaten Development Proposal – Dickens Farm**

Staff Liaison Jade Krueger spoke to the Commission about the following:

- Review of additional project material and make a formal recommendation, as this project will move forward to Planning and Zoning and then to City Council. This will be the final review for HPC.
- The applicant, developer, consultant and several other folks on the team are in attendance to answer any questions about the project.
- As a reminder, the recommendation from the Commission should be on historic significance and merit of the site, and not on use.
- Additional materials in the packet include archaeological testing and structural assessment reports.

Applicants in Attendance: Alicia Rhymer, Developer (United Properties), Melanie Medeiros, Consultant (SWCA), Dustin Randle, Assessment Engineer (ESD, Veradyn LLC), Kevin Butcher, Applicant/Property Owner, Tanner Kinde, (title?)

### **Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Hardies said that the report looks like a structural review only and asked the applicants if there was a historic structure assessment done for the property.

Ms. Rhymer said she believes that the historical structural assessment is included. She said that Dustin Randle completed a structural review based on the historical side, as well as renovation

1 and potential of these buildings or reclaiming them. She said that was part of the process and the  
2 cost associated with it. She asked Mr. Randle if he wanted to speak about the assessment.

3  
4 Mr. Randle said he has worked on similar projects where the new owners want to upgrade  
5 different historical sites. He said there is a problem with this property due to it being zoned  
6 commercial, and previously it was used as agricultural, and those are in conflict with each other.  
7 The structures are not in good enough shape to do anything commercially, including the barn and  
8 the residence, and there is no commercial aspect to the property. The structures would not look  
9 like they do today if they were to try to get this property to a commercial zoning use.

10  
11 Commissioner Hardies was hoping for a more thorough evaluation of the property from a  
12 preservation standpoint. He said that the structural review is a part of the historic structural  
13 assessment and he appreciates that it was done and the information included. He said that  
14 converting a former agricultural use into a new use is not simple and sometimes more expensive  
15 than tearing down and building new, but it doesn't mean it is the wrong thing to do. He felt it  
16 would have been nice to see that addressed in more of an open-minded fashion.

17  
18 Mr. Randle said that one of the problems right now, is that the structures are not really safe and  
19 there are people living in them from time to time. He said it scares him for the current owner  
20 with liability issues because of the vagrants that stay there, and there isn't a good way to seal up  
21 the buildings. There are some sketchy structural parts of one of the buildings, mainly the  
22 columns, and no way to assess the columns with them embedded into the concrete and if they are  
23 rotted out. He is concerned that parts of the building will fall down and people will be in it.

24  
25 Ms. Krueger said that Melanie Medeiros, Archaeological Consultant, is also in attendance and  
26 asked her if she could speak about the findings from the additional survey work.

27  
28 Ms. Medeiros said that some limited testing was done at the site, focused on high potential areas  
29 based on the layout of the farm and also the depositional context that would have good potential.  
30 They did eight shovel tests, and were limited by the number of utilities running through the  
31 property, and time and budget as well. The shovel tests were concentrated around the house and  
32 the garage structure. There is a map in the report showing where all the tests were located. The  
33 sights were excavated at 10 centimeter levels, and all the sediment was screened through one  
34 forth inch mesh, and any stratigraphy and artifacts that were encountered were documented. She  
35 said that they did not encounter a privy, and all shovel tests were positive for historic artifacts,  
36 down to about between 40-50 centimeters. Below that the soils were very compact.

37  
38 Ms. Medeiros said the artifacts date back to the early to mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. Artifacts that were  
39 encountered include ceramics, and a variety of glass including aqua glass, window glass  
40 fragments, and some sun-colored amethyst glass. There was some burned bone, and in one of the  
41 shovel tests there was some staining associated with charcoal pieces of oxidative sediment.  
42 Overall this suggests this area was probably a midden, where they threw their trash. The tests do  
43 suggest that there is archaeological potential at the site and is limited in depth. There has been  
44 some disturbance of the soils on the farm just from being inhabited for 70 plus years, and from  
45 agricultural activities. Ms. Medeiros said the tests also confirmed that the area is unlikely to have  
46 any significant prehistoric archaeology deposits and recommends that the site stay eligible under  
47 Criterion D.

1 Commissioner Norton said that she thinks this information answered some questions. She said  
2 the site still remains eligible under all four criteria, and is still incredibly important to the history  
3 of Longmont. She recognizes from the engineering report how much money it would cost to  
4 rehabilitate this. There were some questions that weren't answered about what the responsibility  
5 of the current owner is, who has left this property derelict for a decade. She said that the  
6 technical term is demolition by neglect. She asked if the current land owner has any ideas or  
7 plans for mitigating this, and moving forward with any development on this property.

8  
9 Ms. Rhymer said that the property owner has no interest in restoration of the property. She said  
10 that the owner has also offered to give the property to the City, and the City does not want the  
11 property. She reached out the Longmont Museum and cultural center to see about pictures and  
12 anything historic in relationship to the farm. She said the museum was surprised to know that the  
13 farm was connected to William Dickens and that the property had historical relevance. She let  
14 the museum know that if they would like any of these particular items from the barns, they are  
15 welcome to have them for display.

16  
17 Ms. Rhymer said from a restoration standpoint if someone were to pay the \$3.5 million dollars,  
18 the structures on the property would not look like they do currently. She referred to the report  
19 where it says that there are others issues besides structural, including asbestos, rotting of the  
20 structures, and the buildings and barn are in the flood plain.

21  
22 Commissioner Norton mentioned that the ditch on the property is a human-made irrigation canal  
23 system and a water conveyance system. She reached out to colleagues at FEMA and the Army  
24 Corps on this and they were skeptical that this was a true flood plain. She said they would need  
25 some confirmation from the City engineer who is responsible for identifying flood plains.

26  
27 Commissioner Norton said that her bigger question is how they will pay back the people of  
28 Longmont for letting the property sit derelict, and then being demolished for a 7-Eleven. She  
29 feels that the City should not take the land owner's offer, and that the offer to give this property  
30 to the City is disingenuous and misses the point of the irresponsibility of allowing this property  
31 to get to this condition. She clarified that when asking about mitigation, she is asking how they  
32 are going to pay back the people of Longmont for losing this important piece of history.

33  
34 Ms. Rhymer said that part of the project is dedicating the greenway to the City, which is part of  
35 the comprehensive plan to complete the trail system. They are also looking to provide a cash  
36 contribution to the City to complete the trail on the east side of the creek. She said that their  
37 thought process was to do some sort of placard that would memorialize the area. She mentioned  
38 that the farm in itself at one time was not just the barn and structures, it also included the  
39 surrounding area that is now industrial development. A portion of the farm has already been  
40 redeveloped and this is the last piece of the property. Ms. Rhymer said that the give is that they  
41 would take down the buildings that are already falling down and are a liability. She encouraged  
42 the Commissioners to take a trip out to the property to see the buildings, and see the profanity  
43 and damage that has been done. The adjacent residential properties would like to see the  
44 buildings come down as well.

45  
46 Commissioner Norton said that she is familiar with the property, and the closest residential  
47 property is quite some distance away and is separated by the ditch. She doesn't accept the basic

1 merits of the arguments. Dedicating the greenway is great for the environmental mission and  
2 great for recreation, but it is not historic preservation. She feels that a placard is inadequate, and  
3 that they need to come up with a mitigation plan proposal idea that is going to honor the history  
4 of the site. She said she cannot think of another site that she has seen in her professional life that  
5 has been eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under all four criteria. She said the  
6 level of significance of this property is really being lost on the project proponents.

7  
8 Chairman Lane asked Ms. Krueger to clarify what the directive should be for making a  
9 recommendation to the Planning Commission.

10  
11 Ms. Krueger said that the formal recommendation should be based on historic merit and  
12 historical significance of the site and whether or not the HPC supports or does not support, or has  
13 additional recommendations for maintaining some historical elements. She suggested the  
14 recommendations could include a placard, picture, or a picture mural system. After the  
15 Commission makes recommendations, the next step is for this project to go to Planning and  
16 Zoning to approve the zoning change, and then it would go to City Council.

17  
18 Chairman Lane asked the Commission for other thoughts or considerations they may have. He  
19 asked Commissioner Norton if there is anything she could suggest and include regarding the  
20 recommendation for this project.

21  
22 Commissioner Norton thought that as a Commission they could brainstorm ideas over e-mail,  
23 and realizes that time is of the essence to keep this project moving. She suggested that the  
24 Commission could ask for something that would be a public benefit to the City of Longmont as  
25 mitigation.

26  
27 Ms. Krueger said that would be a good idea. The recommendation could be to ask for some  
28 additional public benefit that is related to historic preservation. She said the discussion for this  
29 site could be continued in this process, but the Commission will need to give their  
30 recommendations before the next Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She said they  
31 would want to keep things off e-mail and continue any discussions at HPC meetings.

32  
33 Chairman Lane said it would not be appropriate to delay some form of an action. He said this is  
34 partly communicating the Commission's perspective to the applicant, and also communicating  
35 the Commission's perspective on the project to the other boards who will be the final decision  
36 making bodies in this process.

37  
38 Commissioner Norton suggested that the Commission request funding for a City-wide historic  
39 preservation plan, and that would help to avoid some of these issues in the future. There would  
40 be a clearer path for developers and landowners when they have ideas for development projects.

41  
42 Chairman Lane said that this project has made them aware of yet another outlying farm property  
43 that was important to the development of Longmont and largely has been forgotten. There is not  
44 a lot of data on some properties, and there are no restrictions. When someone looks at a piece of  
45 property, they will get a certain perspective based on the property, the codes and what's in the  
46 requirements. Once an applicant comes before the Commission with a plan in place, there is  
47 already an expectation. He said they can learn from this project, and attempt to prevent

1 something similar in the future. Chairman Lane said it would be an appropriate ask that there be  
2 a financial contribution that is earmarked for preservation planning, maybe specific to  
3 agricultural properties in Longmont.

4  
5 Commissioner Carpenter agreed that they need to do something to preserve more agricultural  
6 based properties, and feels that huge parts of our history are being lost because of large gaps in  
7 planning.

8  
9 Ms. Krueger added that she knows this is an issue for agricultural properties, and this is  
10 something she would encourage be addressed by the Commission in the historic preservation  
11 plan over the next year. She said the Commission will need to make a recommendation to this  
12 specific development proposal, and think about a different form of public benefit, if that were a  
13 recommendation.

14  
15 Chairman Lane asked the Commission for a motion in regards to their perspective on this  
16 property, and what the recommendations would be to Planning and Zoning.

17  
18 Commissioner Norton said that if the mitigation question is something they are having an issue  
19 with as a Commission, they need to go back to basics on what it is the Commission is tasked to  
20 do, to approve or not approve of this project from a historic preservation point of view.

21  
22 **Motion**

23 Commissioner Norton motioned to recommend that this project not move forward and not be  
24 approved.

25  
26 Chairman Lane said that the motion should be explained for the reasons that the property is  
27 eligible for the National Register under four criteria, which is a rarity. Without a better  
28 preservation plan, the City is losing this piece of history for not much community gain.

29  
30 **Motion Amended**

31 Commissioner Norton amended her motion to recommend that this project not move forward  
32 because it is a significant property under all four criteria making it eligible for the National  
33 Register. She said that a better preservation plan needs to be in place, which would give room to  
34 discuss other public benefits or mitigation to be asked for in the future.

35  
36 Commissioner Jacobi seconded the motion.

37  
38 **Vote**

39 Motion passes unanimously.

40  
41 Chairman Lane thanked the applicants and said the Commission appreciates the time and effort  
42 that they put forward for their project. He said they understand their position, but from the  
43 Commission's perspective given the history and richness of the site, they cannot stand behind  
44 this project.

**9. Comments from HPC Commission**

Commissioner Jacobi said that when he joined the Commission, he found it remarkable that the City has two residential National Historic Districts that have less redevelopment guidelines than almost all the other developments in the subdivisions in Longmont. Most subdivisions are guided by their homeowners association and covenants, and there is nothing like that in Old Town. He mentioned that in the 70's the Westside was owned as residential single family, and on the Eastside they were scraping houses and putting in apartments. He said that started the preservationist movement on the Eastside, and the City created a specific zoning classification for the Historic Eastside, RLE-1, residential low density established. This zoning included developmental recommendations and restrictions. He said that all of that zoning went by the wayside three years ago, with Envision Longmont and homogenization of the residential areas; and the Eastside and Westside are both now residential single family. Since that time there are three homes that have had construction on them, and he feels it is detrimental to the character of the neighborhood. He mentioned the home at 830 Emery, where the owner started tearing it down and now it is in construction limbo and partial demolition with a chain-link fence around it.

Commissioner Jacobi said they need guidelines in place, and it sounds like things are moving forward towards that. He has a copy of those previous specific use RLE-1 standards for the Eastside, and feels it is reasonable to try to get those guidelines back given the developmental pressure there is now. He said there has been a change in setback guidelines, and two houses in the neighborhood have put on additions that have taken advantage of that. He feels that those additions don't fit the character of the neighborhood. He said he would like to make a motion that the Commission ask City Council to temporarily reinstate the RLE development guidelines in locations where they were previously used, until Planning can come up with modified restrictions. This would include the Historic Eastside Neighborhood which extends beyond the National Historic District. The RLE district went from Kimbark Street to Martin Street and from 3rd Avenue to 9th Avenue. He said that the budget is being discussed next week at the City Council meeting and this issue may come up at their meeting. He mentioned that there are others in the neighborhood on the Eastside that have been talking to City Council.

Chairman Lane said that this item could be put on the HPC agenda for next month as a discussion item, and they would also need to open it up for public comment. Without going through all of that process, the Commission would not be able to have this as an action. He asked Ms. Krueger if they need a motion to put this item on the next agenda for discussion.

Ms. Krueger said she is hesitant to start this discussion quite yet, because it would only affect the Eastside, and they would want to look at this in its entirety with the Original Town which includes the Westside. There is also the Downtown District which is another National District. She said it might be beneficial to see how the budget plays out and figure out exactly what they would have for funding.

Commissioner Jacobi said that his intent was to have a simple stop gap measure to reinstate the guidelines temporarily to what they were previously. He feels that it will take some time to develop guidelines, and thinks they should get started sooner than later since it has already been three years.



Chairman Lane said that the process would be time intensive and very lengthy. The current zoning codes were changed over the course of many month long processes with multiple public hearings. As an example the Commission is still working on updating the demolition codes, and they will need something in the code to protect agricultural properties, and there are also several other codes they need to address. He feels that the best course of action for the RLE zoning is to pace this out for discussion at future HPC meetings.

Commissioner Norton asked if there is a way to encourage legal of reviewing some of the comments that the Commission had proposed during the HPC retreat meeting back in March. She feels they should highlight the urgency of returning to that, and to get the Commission's code proposals completed to take to City Council to address the suggested changes. She understands Commissioner Jacobi's sense of urgency to address the codes on the Eastside so as not to lose things before the processes are able to come to fruition.

Ms. Krueger said that that one of the highest priorities are the codes and there has been a lot of internal discussion. More discussion could come in two parts, administrative changes first, and then a second ordinance to change some of the more substantive items like the demolition codes. She will give an additional plea of urgency to legal to move this forward.

Commissioner Sibley commented that they do need to narrow things down for Planning and to work towards saving more properties. She is glad that the Commission is having this discussion about the codes again.

#### **10. Comments from City Council Representative**

No comments from Council Member Rodriguez. He thanked the Commission.

#### **11. Adjournment**

**Commissioner Sibley moved adjournment of the meeting. Commissioner Jacobi seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.**

Respectfully Submitted,

HPC Chairman/Vice Chairperson  
my/jk 09/09/21