

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Minutes
September 1, 2022

1. Meeting Called to Order

The September 1, 2022 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was called to order by Chairman Steve Lane at 5:04 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at 350 Kimbark Street.

2. Roll Call

Present were Commissioners Steve Lane, Susanne Sibley, Lee Hardies, Rick Jacobi and Council Representative Aren Rodriguez. Absent were Commissioners Gheda Gayou, Holly Norton, Terri Goon and Doug Barnert. Also present were Senior Planner Jennifer Hewett-Apperson, Planning Director Glen Van Nimwegen, Principal Planner Brien Schumacher and recording secretary Maria Yost.

3. Meeting minute's approval

A. Approval of the August 4, 2022 meeting minutes

Approval of the August 4th meeting minutes was deferred until the next HPC meeting. There was not a quorum of Commissioners present that had attended the August 4th meeting.

4. Report from Chairman

Chairman Lane mentioned that the Historic Preservation Commission met in a joint session with City Council on August 16th to review code changes relative to historic preservation. He said the Commission appreciates Staff and City Council's willingness to hear the Commissions perspectives.

5. Communications from HPC Staff Liaison

Senior Planner Hewett-Apperson spoke to the Commission about the following:

- Staff met with the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board as part of their tour of open spaces, to take a look at the Dickens Barn and the Zlaten Drive property.
- Parks and Recreation will be discussing the property at their board meeting on September 12th and potentially taking action on whether they would like to acquire the property as that development project moves forward.
- There are a number of community members in attendance that will be speaking about a possible development project in the Bohn Farm area. There is a historic farmhouse on that property that the neighbors are interested in talking to the Commission about.

1 Planning Director Glen Van Nimwegen mentioned that there cannot be discussion by the
2 Commission on the Bohn Farm project, but they can hear comments from neighbors about the
3 project.
4

5 **6. Public invited to be heard**
6

7 Chairman Lane opened the public invited to be heard.
8

9 **Cathlin Hyatt, 133 Grant Street**
10

11 Ms. Hyatt said she lives just behind the Bohn Farm property. She writes History Colorado
12 historical fund grants for a historical building in north Boulder. As one of the neighbors of Bohn
13 Farm, she is very interested in trying to save this property. She is speaking on behalf of a group
14 of their neighbors, and they are very concerned that this historical building is likely going to be
15 torn down. She provided a handout to the Commission, “Bohn Farm Fact Sheet” and pointed out
16 in the handout there is a proposed plan from the developer, and she has put stars on the map
17 showing approximately where the house and barn are located. She said there is a lot of
18 information on the fact sheet, and she has based it loosely on the historical designation
19 application because it seems to be the relevant information.
20

21 Ms. Hyatt wanted to highlight a couple of things on the fact sheet. She said the property was
22 originally the D.C. Donovan Brickyard, and the D.C. Donovan House on Pratt Street has already
23 been designated as a local landmark in the City. The house itself was built in 1900 by the D.C.
24 Donovan family and then moved to the Bohn Farm property. The D.C. Donovan family was also
25 a significant family in Longmont. Bob and Irene Bohn spent pretty much their entire life on the
26 farm over their 65 years of marriage. The farm was a poultry and dairy farm at various points.
27 She thinks that history so often overlooks the contribution of women, and Irene Bohn was really
28 significant to the community. She went back to school to get her LPN degree after her children
29 graduated from college and then dedicated her life to serving fellow mastectomy patients. She
30 would visit the patients and provide them with the physical care that they weren’t necessarily
31 getting because there were not follow-up appointments for physical therapy from the doctors at
32 that time. Irene Bohn was honored for the service she provided by several organizations
33 including the American Cancer Society. Ms. Hyatt asked the Commission if they could review
34 the fact sheet and hopefully get involved to help them save these beautiful historical buildings.
35

36 Ms. Hyatt said they are hoping with the Commission’s involvement they can at least prevent the
37 demolition from happening soon so that more research can be done to see if these are buildings
38 that can be landmarked with or without the developer’s consent. Ideally, they would like the
39 developers consent. She said they know their neighborhood is designated as an area of change
40 and they are not trying to prevent change or growth. They are hoping that change can happen in a
41 way that is going to respect the history of the neighborhood and preserve the neighborhood’s
42 namesake of the Bohn Farm House and Barn. She thanked the Commission.
43
44
45
46

1 **Chris Conklin, 234 Francis Street**
2

3 Mr. Conklin said he lives in the Bohn Farm neighborhood. He would like to direct the
4 Commission to take action to inform the City Planner to educate the developer of the Bohn Farm
5 about the tax advantages of preserving a landmark designation for the Bohn Farm. He feels it is a
6 win-win situation for everyone. He said that as a neighborhood they would get the historic
7 designation and the developer would get the tax credits. He thanked the Commission.
8

9 **Bob McLaughlin, 620 Emery Street**
10

11 Mr. McLaughlin said he is speaking on behalf of the Historic Eastside Neighborhood. He
12 provided a handout to the Commissioners, titled “Design Guidelines for Additions and New
13 Construction in the Historic Eastside Neighborhood”. He said he watched the tape of the August
14 16th Study Session between HPC and Council. Their neighborhood (HENA) supports the lateral
15 move of the HPC code into the Land Development Code Title 15. They support strengthening
16 the demolition ordinance including a section on demolition by neglect, and they support ADU’s
17 in their neighborhood that are designed to echo the themes of the pre-1940 architecture. HENA is
18 concerned about several issues that came up in that meeting, and one is creating historic
19 preservation overlays that are one lot in size. They believe this is completely unworkable and
20 leads to a hodgepodge in the neighborhood. Design guidelines that apply only to historic
21 preservation overlay districts are unacceptable. He said they do not believe that ADU’s should be
22 exempt from design guidelines and can be accommodated just like every other structure. The
23 Historic Eastside would like a mechanism that establishes a conservation overly district that
24 applies to the entire residential neighborhood and all homes would be treated equally. It would
25 protect the continuity of the view from the street, front elevations remain and additions and
26 ADU’s are located in the rear. It would provide flexibility to reconfigure housing to meet a
27 family’s changing needs. New construction should echo the architectural patterns from our early
28 development and it should foster cooperation among neighbors rather than creating animosity
29 due to different rules for different lots.
30

31 Mr. McLaughlin said that the HENA proposal that has been handed out to the Commission, was
32 submitted to the City one year ago. This proposal is not targeted at a historic preservation,
33 instead it fosters neighborhood conservation through land use guidelines. He said it would apply
34 to all properties zoned RSF within Historic Eastside Neighborhood. It does not conflict with
35 Longmont’s historic preservation code or create additional work for HPC, except for the
36 historically designated properties where the reviews would be done by staff. He said the
37 proposal does not create new or restrictive measures. From the mid-80’s until 2018, the RLE
38 zoning covered the same land area and required that new development reflect the established
39 patterns in the neighborhood. It has only been since 2018 that their neighborhood has had no
40 architectural guidelines. He said this proposal builds on the RLE concept by identifying specific
41 criteria that foster a sense of place. It allows great flexibility and accommodates the existing
42 patterns. Mr. McLaughlin said he knows of no properties within the existing Eastside built prior
43 to 1940 where the architecture does not fall within these guidelines. He said he believes that this
44 document has been given to ADU applicants during pre-application conferences, and as a result
45 the last two ADU projects in the neighborhood have followed these guidelines and have had

1 strong support from HENA. The guidelines have proven to be an effective approach. He thanked
2 the Commission.

3
4 **Sharon O’Leary, 534 Emery Street, Co-Chair Historic Eastside Neighborhood (HENA)**

5
6 Ms. O’Leary said she would like to address three things at the meeting. The first being the
7 proposed ADU that the Commission will review tonight. She said that although cars and garages
8 were not built when this historically designated home was, the home owner’s outstanding plan
9 integrates all historical aspects needed to blend the presently awkward garage into a timely
10 sensitive structure supporting an ADU into a historically designated home. She said that is
11 exactly what the Historic Eastside Neighborhood is striving for. They appreciate the thoughtful
12 time consideration and expense that the homeowner put into their plan, and they strongly support
13 designs that are sensitive to Longmont’s oldest neighborhoods integrity. She said they hope the
14 Commission would support a project like this.

15
16 Ms. O’Leary said next she is greatly concerned about HENA still not having a conservation
17 overlay zone as promised. She said the reason the Historic Eastside Neighborhood is the largest
18 intact neighborhood in the City of Longmont is because of their 30 year prior zoning. During that
19 time the Westside had different zoning hence a different look and not an intact neighborhood.
20 She feels that if the Commission City Planners and City Council tried to come up with a one-
21 size-fits-all for both neighborhoods, it will not work. She said it is like trying to design a glove
22 that fits both the right hand and the left hand, it will not work. She asked the Commission to
23 please move forward with the original overlay plans that were submitted to the City from the
24 Historic Eastside Neighborhood as just a starting block, and not have to recreate the wheel.

25
26 Lastly, Ms. O’Leary wanted to check in on the progress with demolition code and discussions on
27 demolition by neglect. She suggested that if needed she would request that the Commission meet
28 a little longer or maybe have an HPC retreat to create the groundwork for a quicker and
29 thoughtful process. She said she honestly appreciates everything the Commission does, and it
30 just seems like maybe there’s not enough time, and carving out a retreat might help move some
31 things forward. She thanked the Commission and welcomed Council Member Rodriguez.

32
33 **John Loughran, 220 Sherman Street**

34
35 Mr. Loughran said as the Commission is working to preserve the historic nature of the buildings
36 and community, he would like to ask that they consider also the temporary vinyl banners and
37 structures at the West Side Tavern. Some of those structures which are deemed temporary, have
38 been up for a couple of years and are contributing to some of the traffic issues. He said that they
39 also detract from the historical nature of the buildings in the neighborhood and asked the
40 Commission to take them into consideration. He thanked the Commission.

41
42 Chairman Lane closed the public invited to be heard.

43
44 **7. Public Hearings**

1 **Note:** Chairman Lane proposed that they motion to switch the order of the public hearing items
2 on the agenda due to an update to the application for 329 5th Avenue. The Certificate of
3 Appropriateness for 329 5th Avenue, would be discussed first, with discussion of porch
4 alterations only. The Carlson Farm Amendment to the Landmark Designation and Certificate of
5 Appropriateness would be discussed second.

6
7 Motion:

8 Commissioner Jacobi moved that the items be switched on the agenda. Commissioner Hardies
9 seconded the motion.

10
11 Vote:

12 Motion passes unanimously 4-0.

13
14 **A. 329 5th Avenue: Certificate of Appropriateness for new Accessory Dwelling Unit and
15 Porch Alterations**

16 *Action Requested: Decision*
17

18 **Staff Presentation**

19
20 Senior Planner Hewett-Apperson spoke to the Commission about the following:

- 21
- 22 • Update to the application: Originally the Certificate of Appropriateness for 329 5th
23 Avenue addressed the construction of a new Accessory Dwelling Unit and garage, as well
24 as porch alterations. She asked the Commission to address the porch alterations only.
25
 - 26 • The new Accessory Dwelling Unit and garage are still in the works, and there are some
27 potential design changes that are under consideration as they resolve some conflicts with
28 historic preservation codes and accessory dwelling codes. Zoning and historic
29 preservation staff will be meeting next week on moving this forward.
30
 - 31 • The home is also known as the HS Webb House and was built in 1907 as a single family
32 residence with a single story garage at the rear of the property. The home was designated
33 as a local historic landmark in 2019.
34
 - 35 • The applicant is requesting to replace non-historic, deteriorating porch columns and
36 railings with wood columns and a knee wall consistent with the original historic style.
37
 - 38 • Original columns were round and tapered. Proposed square columns are consistent with
39 the overall vernacular style of the home.
40

41 **Public Hearing Notice and Posting**

42
43 The property was posted with a public hearing sign and a notice was provided in the newspaper.
44 Staff has not received any inquiries to date on this proposal.
45

1 **Commission Options**
2

3 The following options are presented for consideration by the Historic Preservation Commission:

- 4 1. Approve the application as proposed.
5 2. Approve the application with conditions, including approving in part and denying in part.
6 3. Defer action on the application based on the need for additional information.
7 4. Deny the application.
8

9 **Staff Recommendation**
10

11 Staff recommends that the Commission approves the porch alterations as proposed.
12

13 **Applicant in Attendance: Tim Stone, Property Owner, 329 5th Avenue**
14

15 Mr. Stone said they have lived in their home about four years. Their goal is to honor the heritage
16 of the house and try to preserve it as the original architecture. One of the things that stood out to
17 them was the wrought iron railing in the front. He said in preparation for their application, he did
18 some work on the front porch because he recognized that one of the posts was penetrating the
19 support system on the roof. He referred to the powerpoint slide showing that the post is
20 beginning to fail, and at the base you can see that the railing is rusted significantly. He said the
21 previous home owner had overlaid a new decking over the original decking. The posts are
22 encapsulated now and when moisture collects around them it has no way to dry and the rust
23 begins to develop. He said most of the posts are rusting and the post in the very front of the
24 house shown in the slide is the worst.
25

26 Mr. Stone said whatever the decision is by the Commission in terms of meeting the historical
27 appropriateness, the railing system has to be replace in one fashion or another. The roof is
28 sagging and the porch has some sag to it. Their goal at this point is to try to preserve as much as
29 possible the original architecture of the house which has been their goal from day one. He
30 mentioned that the house was recently painted white, which was its original color as they know it
31 probably seven colors later. Mr. Stone is a licensed general contractor of the City of Longmont
32 and intends to do the work himself. The integrity of the knee wall and new columns will be
33 significantly greater than the existing one and he intends to put in six inch Douglas fir posts and
34 reinforced underneath if needed. He said they won't do any demolition until their request has
35 been approved. Another slide showed a crude rendering of what the front of the house would
36 look like. The knee wall would be 24 inches high and a new handrail would be built as well. The
37 siding would match the cedar lap siding on the house. He said he would be happy to answer any
38 questions the Commission has.
39

40 **Commission Discussion**
41

42 Commissioner Jacobi said he is glad they are preserving the historic integrity of the home. He
43 was curious about the photo of the original porch that showed that the house had round columns
44 and asked about their plan to put in square columns instead. He asked if there is a big cost
45 difference and why the change.

1 Mr. Stone said there is a cost difference and if they were to do round columns they would likely
2 try to source them as original solid wood which is expensive and very difficult to find. He would
3 not want to put in replicas of fiberglass or something of that nature. He said it is not uncommon
4 to see the square posts and they are prevalent throughout the eastside. While their plan does not
5 take it back to the original design, it gets it very close and consistent with what they see in the
6 neighborhood. There are a couple of homes on Collyer Street just around the corner from them
7 that he took pictures of and presented that show the type of square posts that they would like to
8 use.

9
10 Commissioner Sibley said that she is okay with the square posts. She asked about the porch
11 alteration photo of the front of the home where it looks like the columns are white with black
12 trim.

13
14 Mr. Stone said since the house has been repainted, they accented the trim on the windows and
15 eaves in black to continue with that theme. The predominant color of the knee wall is white and
16 the current wrought iron railing is black. He said the columns would be completely white.

17
18 Chairman Lane asked if they are seeking tax credits with this Certificate of Appropriateness. He
19 said if they were, it would be more of a push towards the original round columns and more of a
20 restoration. Since they are not seeking tax credits there are less restrictions associated.

21
22 Mr. Stone said they will not be seeking tax credits and it is not necessary for this project.

23
24 **Public Hearing**

25
26 Chairman Lane opened the public hearing.

27
28 **Sarah Levison, 634 Emery Street**

29
30 Ms. Levison said she is a neighbor that lives about a block away. She said she has four columns
31 in storage that are round that she would be willing to sell to Mr. Stone. They were in a similar
32 situation where the original front porch on their house was torn off because it had rotted, and it
33 only left the side porch. When they did an exterior painting, they didn't do a Certificate of
34 Appropriateness. They had new columns fabricated out of Washington State that were the same
35 or nearly the same as the others. After they ordered their new columns, they were almost the
36 same shape and size, and they found out that the hardwood store off of South Main would have
37 fabricated them for the about the same amount of money. She said she would advocate going to
38 the round columns and they are not hard to source.

39
40 **Sharon O'Leary, 534 Emery Street, Co-Chair Historic Eastside Neighborhood (HENA)**

41
42 Ms. O'Leary said she is right up the street from Mr. Stone. Her house, the house next door to her,
43 and 530 Emery Street have round columns, along with all of the porches on Emery Street. She
44 suggested going for the tax credit and the round columns. She said it would replicate the
45 authentic home, which sounds like what the owner is striving for, but even more so it would fit in
46 with the integrity of that block and the whole neighborhood.

1 Chairman Lane closed the public hearing.

2

3 **Comments from the Commission**

4

5 Commissioner Hardies said after listening to the comments and looking at this more carefully,
6 that unless it is a really big difference in cost, it clearly would be a better solution to go with the
7 round columns if they can be obtained. He feels it would be a better choice for the sake of the
8 home, the neighborhood and Mr. Stone's property value.

9

10 Chairman Lane feels that the square columns would not be inappropriate and he wouldn't deny a
11 Certificate of Appropriateness for square columns. He said in this particular case he understands
12 the round being a better choice. He is comfortable with an approval with a recommendation to
13 use round columns if possible.

14

15 Commissioner Jacobi looked at a picture of 437 Collyer Street that is a cute cottage house with
16 square columns and is a couple of houses from his. He said it has a beautiful porch and he was
17 questioning whether it was rebuilt. His house is on Collyer as well, and his porch was rebuilt and
18 has round columns. He believes his original porch had square columns. He agreed with
19 Chairman Lane that it would not be a game changer to put on square columns, but he also agrees
20 with everyone that round columns are original and predominant in the neighborhood, and he
21 would prefer round columns.

22

23 Commissioner Sibley agreed that she would prefer round columns, but is not opposed to the
24 square columns with proportions similar to 437 Collyer Street.

25

26 Motion

27 **COMMISSIONER JACOBI MOVED TO APPROVE THE CERTIFICATE OF**
28 **APPROPRIATENESS FOR 329 5th AVENUE AS PROPOSED WITH THE DESIGN**
29 **CHANGES TO THE PORCH WITH A RECOMMENDATION TO CONSIDER ROUND**
30 **COLUMNS. COMMISSIONER SIBLEY SECONDED THE MOTION.**

31

32 Vote

33 **MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 4-0.**

34

35 Note: Planning Director Van Nimwegen suggested that the portion of the garage and Accessory
36 Dwelling Unit be continued to the next regular HPC meeting.

37

38 Senior Planner Hewett-Apperson added that from a procedural standpoint if a public hearing
39 item is continued it does not need to be re-noticed in the newspaper. It will be an agenda item at
40 the next HPC meeting.

41

42 Motion

43 **CHAIRMAN LANE MOVED THAT THE PORTION OF THE GARAGE AND**
44 **ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT BE CONTINUED TO THE NEXT HPC MEETING.**
45 **COMMISSIONER JACOBI SECONDED THE MOTION.**

46

1 Vote

2 **MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 4-0.**

3

4 **B. Carlson Farm/1901 S. Main Street: Amendment to Landmark Designation and**
5 **Certificate of Appropriateness**

6 *Action Requested: Decision*

7

8 **Staff Presentation**

9

10 Senior Planner Hewett-Apperson spoke to the Commission about the following:

11

12 • The Carlson Farm was designated as a local historic landmark in 1997. The Classic
13 Cottage style farmhouse was built in 1910 on what was originally an 80 acre farm.

14

15 • The property is located southwest of the intersection of South Main and Pike Road and is
16 approximately a one acre site.

17

18 • The applicant seeks to amend the landmark designation so that it applies to the historic
19 structures that are planned to be moved to the eastern portion of the property, consistent
20 with the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) approved by the Commission on April 7,
21 2021.

22

23 • The Certificate of Appropriateness granted in April 2021 included design guidelines for
24 new development on the property to move the historic structures to the eastern portion of
25 the property to facilitate development of the western portion of the property.

26

27 • A condition of the Certificate of Appropriateness approval was that the applicant submit
28 a subsequent COA with more details about the proposed new structures as part of the
29 application.

30

31 • At the time of the historic survey the property consisted of six structures; a farmhouse,
32 garage, barn, shed, chicken coop and storage building.

33

34 • The applicant has submitted proposed design guidelines for new residences for HPC
35 approval and will present this to the Commission in more detail.

36

37 • The applicant is pursuing a separate application for development to replat this property
38 into six parcels.

39

40 • The landmark status applies to the property as a whole as opposed to the individual
41 structures. Staff feels it is appropriate to modify the landmark status so that it specifically
42 applies to the historic structures as opposed to the full acre parcel.

43

44 • On the powerpoint Ms. Hewett-Apperson pointed out the original locations of the
45 buildings and where they would be relocated to. The Farmhouse would stay in its original

1 setting. The proposed replat map shows 6 lots, and Lot 6 is the largest where the historic
2 structures would be moved to as approved in the COA from April 2021.

3
4 **Public Hearing Notice and Posting**

5
6 The property was posted with a public hearing sign and a notice was provided in the newspaper.
7 Staff has not received any inquiries to date on this proposal.

8
9 **Commission Options**

10
11 The following options are presented for consideration by the Historic Preservation Commission:

- 12
13 1. Recommend that the property’s landmark designation be amended to specifically apply to
14 the historic structures.
15 2. Recommend that the local historic landmark designation remain in its current condition.
16 3. Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed design guidelines.
17 4. Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions (specify conditions).
18 5. Deny the Certificate of Appropriateness.
19 6. Defer action on the request based on the need for additional information.

20
21 For either option 1 or 2, the Commission should base its recommendations on the review criteria
22 for designation of landmarks. Options 3, 4 and 5 should be based on the review criteria for
23 Certificates of Appropriateness.

24
25 **Staff Recommendation**

26
27 Staff recommends APPROVAL of the design guidelines proposed by the applicant, consistent
28 with condition #1 of the Certificate of Appropriateness approved on April 8, 2021.

29
30 Staff further recommends APPROVAL of the request to amend the Carlson Farm landmark
31 designation to clarify that the designation applies to the historic structures to be moved to Lot 6
32 of the proposed plat.

33
34 **Review Analysis**

- 35
36 ➤ Complies with the review criteria for Designation of Landmarks, Section 2.56.050 and
37 Certificate of Appropriateness, Section 2.56.130 of the Longmont Municipal Code.

38
39 **Applicant in Attendance: Jack Bestall, Property Owner & Project Planner**

40
41 Mr. Bestall presented slides from March 2021 of the proposed site plan for discussion. He said
42 they were looking for a way to preserve and sustain the buildings and to create a base for the new
43 development and an HOA that would support the development. He is asking the Commission to
44 consider approving the Certificate of Appropriateness and Amendment to the Landmark
45 Designation.

1 HPC: March 4, 2021 Guidance
2

- 3 ▪ Best Approach – to preserve and sustain? – yes.
- 4 ▪ Intermingling or Clustering? – clustering historic from new.
- 5 ▪ Is Relocation an Option? – yes.
- 6 ▪ Is increasing to 6 from 2 residential units acceptable? – yes.
- 7 ▪ Can contemporary forms of the historic styles be used? – possibly-new buildings should
8 not compete or contrast dramatically-compatible scale.
- 9

10 Certificate of Appropriateness Request
11

- 12 ▪ Purpose – preserve & sustain Carlson Farm.
- 13 ▪ 1. Reconfigure Historic Area: cluster historic buildings around Carlson Farmhouse,
14 Lot 6.
- 15 ▪ 2. Design Guidelines: structure guidelines for new residential architecture so as not to
16 compete or contrast dramatically with farm house - scale compatibly.
- 17

18 Reconfigure Historic Area
19

- 20 • The Historic Building Survey shows the original location of the buildings. Mr. Bestall
21 pointed out where the buildings would be moved to on the East side of the property.
- 22 • Fifth Filing FDP Amendment B
- 23 • Existing Conditions
- 24 • Preliminary Plat-Site Plan Proposal. Mr. Bestall explained the concept of the Site
25 Plan.
- 26 • New Residential Design Guidelines
- 27 • Carlson Farm House - original photo
- 28 • Exemplar: Classic Revival
- 29

30 Carlson Farm Design Guidelines Intent
31

32 The plan for Carlson Farm provides for the conservation of the farm house and associated farm
33 buildings relocated to Lot 6 which will maintain its local historic designation; and the
34 development of 5 residences on Lots 1-5. The Farm Design Guidelines allow for a range of
35 traditional styles and contemporary expressions of those styles on Lots 1-5 fronting Pike Street,
36 conditioned on each design providing a scale and features compatible with the historic buildings
37 on Lot 6. Designs of new residential architecture should also be mindful of making a transition to
38 the adjacent architecture at Prospect (planned community to the west and south).

39
40 Architectural Style Derivation

- 41 ▪ Carlson Farmhouse – Revival
- 42 ▪ The Barn – Salt Box
- 43

44 Traditional Compatible Styles

- 45 ▪ National Style

- 1 ▪ Bungalow
- 2 ▪ Colonial Revival
- 3 ▪ Craftsman

4

5 Derivative Styles

- 6 ▪ Modern Farmhouse
- 7 ▪ Modern Craftsman
- 8 ▪ Modern Salt Box

9

10 COA Compliance Criteria

11

12 1. The proposal meets applicable standards.

13

- 14 ▪ Condition – the Design Guidelines comply with the guidelines of the Council and
15 draw selectively from the Prospect guidelines as reviewed by the Historic
16 Preservation Commission and approved in a COA submittal at the time of Site Plan
17 application.

18

19 2. The proposed work preserves, enhances, or restores and does not damage or destroy the
20 exterior architectural features of the designated property.

21

- 22 ▪ Condition – the clustering of the historic buildings to Lot 6 to conserve these
23 resources will comply.

24

25 3. The proposed work does not adversely affect the special character or special historical,
26 architectural, or aesthetic interest or value of the landmark and its site or the district.

27

- 28 ▪ Condition – relocation of the historic buildings will minimize adverse effects – by
29 maintaining the buildings in context with each other; separate and apart; and
30 providing design guidelines to guide compatible design of the new buildings.

31

32 4. The architectural style, arrangement, texture and materials used on existing and proposed
33 structures are compatible with the character of the existing landmark and its site of the
34 historic district.

35

- 36 ▪ Condition – the new design guidelines will instill an architectural style, arrangement,
37 texture and materials in the new buildings that will be compatible with the character
38 of the existing historic buildings.

39

40 Mr. Bestall said they believe that the design guidelines match up with the applicable standards of
41 the Commission. He is asking for approval of the guidelines and the historic designation being
42 isolated to the buildings on Lot 6 through a Certificate of Appropriateness. He said he is glad to
43 answer any questions from the Commissioners.

44

45 **Commission Discussion**

46

1 Chairman Lane said the original proposal showed four new lots plus the conservation piece, and
2 this proposal show five lots. He said there was also discussion at the April 2021 HPC meeting
3 about a possible ADU in the barn and asked if that is now off the table.
4

5 Mr. Bestall answered yes to all those comments. He said the fifth lot of the new homes would be
6 taking the place of an ADU in the barn. He referred to the slide of the Preliminary Plat-Site Plan
7 and pointed out that they were hoping to keep the driveway, and by removal of that driveway
8 there was additional room for a lot. He feels that will create a nice series of porches towards Pike
9 Road.
10

11 Chairman Lane mentioned that in the presentation that the Commission reviewed back in April
12 2021, the back line of the existing house lot was the eastern edge of the driveway. He asked if
13 Lot 6 will be any smaller than originally planned because of the addition of Lot 5 and removal of
14 the driveway.
15

16 Mr. Bestall said that Lot 6 did not get any smaller, and that they held to a narrow standard of 51
17 to 52 feet for each of the five lots in order to make Lot 6 as whole as possible. He mentioned that
18 the setback from Main Street is fairly substantial on Lot 6. In order to get water and sewer on the
19 lot, they are discussing bringing the alley all the way through the lot, but they would prefer to
20 maintain that part of the lot as part of the Carlson lot. He said it would be part of the civil
21 engineering aspect of the property on whether the alley will need to go through Lot 6.
22

23 Chairman Lane said that on the site plan the alley is showing as a 30 foot easement, and he is
24 wondering how absolute that is. He understands that it is not the intention or desire to have the
25 alley go through the Carlson lot. He is concerned that if the alley does run through the lot, they
26 would potentially be losing about a third of the lot for all of the buildings.
27

28 Mr. Bestall said they share that concern, and they did not submit the plan in that way. They
29 submitted an easement along the back of the lots for utilities and a driveway that ran to the edge
30 of the Carlson lot so that the lot itself would maintain its integrity. He has mentioned to Senior
31 Planner Hewett-Apperson that they are going to go back to try to discuss this with Public Works
32 and Planning. He said if they are able to restrict the daily access to Lot 6 it would make a
33 tremendous difference for the integrity of the Carlson Farm.
34

35 Mr. Bestall suggested that if the Commission wanted to approve the historic designation
36 compactness with a condition to restrict driveway access to Lot 6, it would certainly help the
37 applicant's case.
38

39 Commissioner Sibley asked for clarification on where the driveway would be located for the
40 Carlson Farm without the alley way running all the way through the lot.
41

42 Mr. Bestall said there is a need to have a driveway for this lot and still keep the way that the
43 historic buildings are in relation to each other. He pointed out the equipment shed on the site
44 plan, which is a large long carport. He thinks that accessing the property through that area by the
45 owner of the Carlson Farm could work as a driveway, and there would also be opportunities
46 there for water and sewer from a utility perspective. He mentioned that the easement on the

1 Carlson lot could also be used as a driveway or an emergency vehicle access, depending on fire
2 code requirements. He pointed out on the powerpoint slide where the water and sewer is looping
3 down from a utility perspective into the fourth filing property and they are doing a cooperative
4 effort with them and their current efforts. He said their goal was to get proper access for the
5 owner of the Carlson lot and to try to maintain the integrity as much as possible.

6
7 Chairman Lane said that back in April 2021, they had talked about the eastern part of the
8 property as a conservation area. In moving the landmark designation from the property to just the
9 buildings, he is concerned that someone could come in and do something different with the
10 property or make significant changes. He asked Mr. Bestall if they would be open to a
11 conservation easement on Lot 6 once the buildings are moved to protect the property.

12
13 Mr. Bestall said that they were thinking that Lot 6 would be designated as a local historic
14 property and weren't thinking of just the individual buildings as staff presented. They would
15 consider a conservation easement.

16
17 Chairman Lane said the Commission has already issued a preliminary COA. He asked if the
18 applicant would be coming back to the Commission to review a final site plan for a COA that
19 would show the proposed locations of the buildings.

20
21 Senior Planner Hewett-Apperson said that could be a condition of this particular process.

22
23 Chairman Lane mentioned that in the April hearing they had talked about asking for architectural
24 drawings. He said once the Commission approves the design guidelines for the property, and a
25 lot gets developed and a home is designed, that review would then happen strictly with the new
26 HOA and would not come back in front of the Commission.

27
28 Mr. Bestall said that is correct, and asked Chairman Lane if he is suggesting to come back to the
29 Commission with an exhibit like the site plan being presented.

30
31 Chairman Lane feels that it would be appropriate to bring the proposed site plan for Lot 6 back to
32 the Commission for review.

33
34 Mr. Bestall said there are some refinements to do in terms of the access on the south side of the
35 property, but they believe the plans presented are very close to a final site plan and they could
36 include an exhibit with the COA.

37
38 Chairman Lane said he would like to see a formal document and possibly a condition that staff
39 must review the final site plan for some level of check before signing off on the plan.

40
41 Mr. Bestall said that the site plan is actually the preliminary plot that they have submitted and he
42 created the sketch to make it easier to read, and there is a CAD drawing in process.

43
44 **Public Hearing**

45
46 Chairman Lane opened the public hearing.

1 No one wished to speak.

2

3 Chairman Lane closed the public hearing.

4

5 **Further Discussion by the Commission**

6

7 Commissioner Sibley said if this project moves forward she likes the idea of the architectural of
8 the different examples shown, and the idea of the historic property linking and blending with the
9 surrounding neighborhood. She is concerned that if the Commission were to approve this
10 proposal, the historic buildings might be crowded up against lot 5. She asked if the Commission
11 would have any input on what the setbacks might be to the property lines or how large the houses
12 would be next to the barn and the buildings. She asked if that would be determined by the
13 Commission or by City Planning and Zoning.

14

15 Chairman Lane asked what the setbacks would be on the new lots.

16

17 Senior Planner Hewett-Apperson said the setbacks would have to meet the City standards.

18

19 Planning Director Van Nimwegen said that setbacks would be tied into the same plan
20 development as the Prospect development.

21

22 Chairman Lane said it is likely that the building on Lot 5 will have a fairly small setback on the
23 eastern edge. He mentioned that in the original application there was an alley instead of Lot 5
24 and there was more space between the buildings.

25

26 Chairman Lane summarized what the Commission is being asked to act on; an approval of the
27 design guidelines as proposed, and an amendment of the landmark designation from the entire
28 property to Lot 6 as a whole rather than specific buildings. He asked the Commissioners if they
29 had any concerns about the guidelines.

30

31 Commissioner Jacobi said he does not have any specific concerns about the guidelines as
32 presented. He made a motion to change the landmark designation from the original full lot to just
33 Lot 6 with the moved buildings on the site.

34

35 Chairman Lane asked staff if the amendment of the landmark designation and the approval of the
36 design guidelines should be voted on as two separate items.

37

38 Senior Planner Hewett-Apperson said that staff recommends that the Commission addresses
39 these as separate line items.

40

41 **Amendment to Landmark Designation**

42

43 **Motion**

44 **COMMISSIONER JACOBI MOVED TO AMEND THE LANDMARK DESIGNATION**
45 **FROM THE ORIGINAL FULL PROPERTY TO JUST LOT 6, WITH THE BUILDINGS**
46 **MOVED ONTO THE SITE AS PRESENTED, PER THE REQUIREMENT OF THE**

1 **ORIGINAL CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPROVAL. COMMISSIONER**
2 **SIBLEY SECONDED THE MOTION.**

3
4 Chairman Lane requested a friendly amendment to the motion to recommend that the applicant
5 strongly consider a conservation easement on Lot 6, and to note that as a Commission they do
6 not support the creation of an alley through the access easement as proposed on the south side of
7 Lot 6. Commissioner Jacobi accepted the amendment.

8
9 Vote

10 **MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 4-0.**

11
12 Design Guidelines

13
14 Commission Jacobi is concerned that when they put lots 1-5 on the property, they are going to be
15 smaller lots. He said he is not sure how they are going to make a house fit on a smaller lot that
16 would fully meet the requirements, but thinks that would be the purview of architects and
17 planners. He does like the design guidelines as presented.

18
19 Motion

20 **COMMISSIONER JACOBI MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION SUPPORT THE**
21 **GUIDELINES AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER HARDIES SECONDED THE**
22 **MOTION.**

23
24 Vote

25 **MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 4-0.**

26
27 **7. New Business**

28
29 No new business.

30
31 **9. Prior Business**

32
33 **A. Dickens Barn / Zlaten Property Update**

34 *Action Requested: Information/Discussion*
35

36 Senior Planner Hewett-Apperson spoke to the Commission about the following:
37

38 Staff continues to work with the applicant and they will be meeting with the Parks and
39 Recreation Advisory Board on September 12th for further discussion on saving the Dickens Barn.
40

41 **B. Historic Preservation Plan / Survey Plan Update**

42 *Action Requested: Information/Discussion*
43

44 Senior Planner Hewett-Apperson spoke to the Commission about the following:
45

46 Staff continues to work on this. They have had some staffing challenges and workload issues.

1 Chairman Lane mentioned that at the last HPC meeting the Commission had asked about the
2 non-competitive grant application being completed by this month's meeting. He said it would be
3 great to get some momentum on the surveys.

4
5 Senior Planner Hewett-Apperson said staff has been working on getting this grant application
6 completed.

7
8 **C. HPC Code Amendments**

9 *Action Requested: Information/Discussion*

10
11 Planning Director Van Nimwegen spoke to the Commission about the following:

12
13 There will be another joint session meeting with City Council. The Mayor has asked staff to look
14 at the calendar to propose a date for this meeting. Council is in the middle of budget planning
15 through this month. He doesn't think the meeting will be scheduled in September, and staff will
16 let the Commission know as soon as they arrive at a date for the meeting.

17
18 Chairman Lane feels that the first discussion with City Council back in August was very helpful
19 to have Council and the City Attorney's office more on the same page.

20
21 **10. Comments from HPC Commissioners**

22
23 No Comments.

24
25 **11. Comments from City Council Representative**

26
27 Council Member Aren Rodriguez thanked the Commissioners for their service, and commented
28 that it was good to see everyone.

29
30 **12. Adjournment**

31
32 **Commissioner Sibley moved adjournment of the meeting. Commissioner Jacobi seconded**
33 **the motion. No one was opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 6:28 p.m.**

34
35 Respectfully Submitted,

36
37
38
39 HPC Chairperson/Vice-Chairperson

40 my/jh 09/01/22

41