



**TOWN OF CASTLE ROCK**  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD**  
 April 1, 2009  
**Regular Meeting**  
**MINUTES**

Time	Item	Note
<u>6:00:45 PM</u>	Call to Order	Chair Dempsey called the meeting to order.
<u>6:00:48 PM</u>	Roll Call	<p><b>Board Members Present:</b> Shawn Dempsey, Fleeta Nockels, Lionel Oberlin, Leann Breitreutz, Dave Hieronymus, Fred Edison and Derald Hoffman</p> <p><b>Board Members Absent:</b> Rob Christopher, John Magee</p> <p><b>Town Council Liaisons Present:</b> Ryan Reilly</p> <p><b>Staff Members Present:</b> John Olson, Planner I Heather Day, Planning Manager Erin Sweeney, Recording Secretary</p>
<u>6:01:12 PM</u>	Meeting Certification	Ms. Sweeney certified that the meeting had been properly noticed in accordance with the open meetings law.
<u>6:01:20 PM</u>	Approval of Minutes	<p><u>Fred Edison</u>: Asked for clarification on one of his comments on page two at bottom from March 4, 2009 minutes. Clarification made; the response to the question of “what was there before?” with “is completely gone” does not make sense and will be stricken from the record.</p> <p><u>Fleeta Nockels</u>: Moved that the minutes be approved as printed; Dave Hieronymus seconded the motion. Vote 7-0 for approval.</p>
<u>6:05:28</u>	Unscheduled Public Appearances	None
<u>6:05:39PM</u>	Scheduled Public Appearances	None

<p><u>6:05:42 PM</u></p>	<p>Town Council Update</p>	<p><u>Council Member Ryan Reilly:</u> Something that came before Town Council and Planning Commission last month and is an interesting historic opportunity for the Town. There are 25 acres of land located in the County, currently zoned agricultural in between the two railroad tracks on Liggett Road, and due west of the Town's Utilities Department. They want to annex into the Town because of some zoning changes the County wants to do. They have a business and would like to keep the business there, and there is also a historic home on the property. As part of annexation they will have to do a historic survey.</p> <p><u>Question:</u> Is it the Scott Farm?</p> <p><u>Council Member Ryan Reilly:</u> It is not the Scott Farm; this parcel is north of the marina. Do you know where Hwy 85 heads east on to Black Feather and then Liggett heads off? It is right at that junction, just due west behind the cement plant.</p> <p>They came to Council and Planning Commission with a sketch PD to see if we would be willing to annex them. We told them that we would not be opposed to it, but they would have to go through the process. Enforcement of the County zoning creates the potential for the business to have to go away; as the property is zoned Agricultural and they are using it for construction storage.</p> <p>Regarding annexation, we could allow them to continue to operate and when they are ready to develop the site, then come in with a different zoning. Also, the home would add to the historic structure inventory.</p> <p>There are two properties located in the County, the Scott-Walker property and the Zem-Clingman property and as we were working with them to secure trail easements along Plum Creek, they asked us if we wanted to buy their entire property, which we agreed to. There will be trail and open space opportunities, as well as enough land for future Town facilities.</p> <p><u>Question:</u> Does anyone know any history about the house? The history of the house is not known, but there is a private Burlington Northern Railroad surface crossing.</p> <p><u>Question:</u> Is there potential for moving other structures there?</p> <p><u>Council Member Ryan Reilly:</u> Possibly.</p>
--------------------------	----------------------------	---

		<p><u>Question:</u> Did the Town secure the last access piece for the Plum Creek Trail?</p> <p><u>Council Member Ryan Reilly:</u> They are still in condemnation court.</p> <p>It is not known whether there are any archeological findings for the old New Memphis in this area.</p> <p><u>Lionel Oberlin:</u> Said he thought the construction of I-25 had destroyed anything remaining of the Town of New Memphis.</p>
<p><u>6:16:09 PM</u></p>	<p>Public Hearing Items</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><u>6:16:12 PM</u></p>	<p>Discussion Action Items</p> <p>Historic Preservation Ordinance Update John Olson</p>	<p><u>John Olson:</u> I would like to provide an update on the Study Team. As you are aware, at Council's request, the expanded Study Team began meeting on the economic impacts of the ordinance and to discuss ways to promote economic development while retaining Town character. During the first few meetings, staff began by explaining the ordinance as is outlined by the HP Plan. Throughout these meetings, there has been extensive concern regarding the Conservation Areas, as well as the binding review within these Conservation Areas. Specific concerns are that they single out specific property owners and they impose regulations similar to a Historic District without due process. Since the Conservation Areas have been the biggest area for contention in the Team discussion, staff proposed the question to the Team, "what happens if the Conservation Areas go away?"</p> <p><u>Heather Day:</u> We were watching and listening to what the Study Team was talking about and we were starting to hear this, so we were echoing back to the Team what we were hearing them say.</p> <p><u>John Olson:</u> The Team discussed a possible alternative to the Conservation Areas that included creating a design review board comprised of 3 DDA members, 3 Historic Preservation Board members, and 3 Planning Commissioners. This would allow the design review board to review all designs and demolitions, excluding landmarked properties in the Downtown. The proposal also stated that the Board would continue to do its design review in the Craig and Gould area, and review demolitions, as well as review any proposed historic districts. These are not decisions and are only being discussed at this time.</p>

The group also suggested that the implementation of the HP Ordinance should not be done in isolation and they recommended that the Downtown Plan be done concurrently with this Ordinance implementation.

The Team unanimously agreed that staff should outline these alternatives at the next scheduled Team meeting on April 8<sup>th</sup> and create a work schedule. Right now the Team is looking at April 28<sup>th</sup> to report these alternatives back to Council and we are looking at representatives from each group such as Chair Dempsey, Mark Williams, who is the Chair of the DDA, and Barbara Dash who is the Chair of the Planning Commission. If Council tells us to proceed, staff will have to do more outreach and research on these alternatives.

Overall, what this means is there is a possibility that the Study Team will recommend to Council to amend the HP Plan to look at alternatives. One of these might be that the Conservation Areas may go away. It also means that the Study Team will be transitioning and discussing ways to promote economic development as is envisioned in the Downtown Plan. This may involve bringing in our Long Range Project Manager, Marty Hudson, who has an extensive background implementing downtown zoning. He would propose economic alternatives that would help create a balance between economics and preservation.

Chair Dempsey: The concept is a review board with 3 members from the Historic Preservation Board, DDA Board, and Planning Commission Board coming together to review demolitions and in-fill development for a package concept, with a binding review.

Question: What is the difference between having a binding review from this Board or a binding review from that Board?

Chair Dempsey: One of the sticking points is they don't like the idea of us having that kind of power by ourselves, so it would be spread out more among the Boards.

Question: Is the Planning Commission appointed or elected?

Heather Day: Town Council appoints The Planning Commission.

Vice Chair Nockels: Their argument that we are appointed and therefore should not have any power doesn't make sense because the Planning Commission has power.

Heather Day: This is just a concept. Feedback should go back to Shawn so he can report back to the Team and the staff; we can hear you too.

Dave Hieronymus: One of the things a couple of the DDA Board members have talked to me about is they think the Historic Preservation Plan is going the wrong way. They think rather than establishing districts, that we should identify the real jewel contributors in downtown Castle Rock and expend Historic Preservation energy on getting those buildings fixed. Those are the comments I have received.

Chair Dempsey: I have received the same type of comments.

Dave Hieronymus: It is pretty clear from their comments that they do not want Conservation Areas. In fact, if Craig and Gould became a historic district, it would have to be done with the owners in accordance with the process that the Town is now instituting on how to become a historic district. There is misinformation on the Team that the Historic Preservation Plan forms a historic district in Craig and Gould, which it does not. We told them that was not the purpose and if the property owners in Craig and Gould want to create a historic district that we would support that initiative, but that it was the owners of the property and is not something that this Board or the Town can unilaterally say, "now you are a historic district," so there is misinformation and anxiety over binding review among the Team. If this 9-person Board has binding review I don't see what their concern is, but it appears the binding review issue is a major concern for them.

Vice Chair Nockels: So it is fine as long as it is powerless?

Dave Hieronymus: They would prefer that things stayed the same. Even a step back from that, right now even though we do not have binding authority we do have input on in-fill throughout all of downtown. What a lot of the members of the DDA are saying is we shouldn't have input.

One of the things I wanted to bring up tonight is, what is the purpose of this Board? Are we supposed to shepherd historic preservation, or are we supposed to approve little additions that come into Craig and Gould? If we are supposed to shepherd historic preservation, then we need enough input into historic preservation to take that charge. Do we as a Board have no influence or say in what gets

historically preserved or not?

You have 3 representatives from the DDA Board and 3 representatives from the Planning Commission, and 3 members of Historic Preservation, so what if the Masonic Lodge, which I think is one of the jewels that needs to be saved, comes up for demolition so that something else could be built, and that vote swings 5 to 4, it's gone. This is an appointed Board with relatively similar interests. There is an inherent power in the 9-person board where historic preservation may not be their top priority. Their top priority might be economic development and money can tend to drive that thought. I am leery of that. They are afraid this board will never let any development happen in those Conservation Areas.

Vice Chair Nockels: Remember our word isn't final anyway.

Lionel Oberlin: Couldn't there be an appeal to Town Council?

Dave Hieronymus: Yes, but we will get back into the 203 Perry Street frame of mind if we aren't careful. If we recommend binding, and we say you can't tear down the Masonic lodge and it heads up to Ryan's group...then Town Council is headed out on a plank if they overrule us and say you can tear down the Masonic lodge. The building that's going to come up and that draws this whole issue is the City Hotel. This is prime acreage downtown and will be presented to us that although it is a historic building it is in such dilapidated condition that we can't save it. The DDA does not see Perry Street as a historic street, but rather for development.

Chair Dempsey: They are definitely against any in-fill design review input we have. If you look at the structures on the walking tour, they don't consider half those buildings as historic.

Dave Hieronymus: From the comments I have gotten, eventually, the DDA will approach this Board about reversing the decision on 203 Perry St. The reason is the building will continue to dilapidate to the point of not being saved.

Leann Breitreutz: When we stormed through all of that, we really thought that's what would happen. The writing was on the wall and if she couldn't have her own way she was just going to let it sit there, and it will get to the point where nothing can be done.

Dave Hieronymus: Currently, it is for sale for \$500,000. You can't make ends meet with that kind of a land cost, knowing that you have to renovate the house, so it will sit there for a long time like that and she can always come back and say it's for sale.

I'm concerned that the Historic Preservation Plan is going to undo historic preservation based on this committee's direction. It is very frustrating to sit in on those meetings because there is a great tension between economic development and historic preservation, and they don't see them as interlocked. In fact, John did a good job by bringing in an expert who said that historic preservation could generate economic development.

Leann Breitreutz: The Study Team completely ignores the feelings or comments made by the Historic Preservation Board.

Heather Day: I think the last meeting was very different. I know not everyone was present at the last meeting, but Shawn can speak to this. I felt a change in the room.

Chair Dempsey: I think they were coming together a little more with discussion on the historic side as well as the business side. I think that came about as a result of us putting on the table the possibility of rethinking the whole Conservation Area.

My only concern is that the community had great input into the Historic Preservation Plan. There were a hundred people who put that Plan together and do we as a team of 18 or so, undo all of that? If so, what is our outreach going to portray? Will it say the outreach done 2-3 years ago wasn't good enough because now we are redoing it? I can see us getting backlash from the community asking why we bothered to go through this a few years ago.

Dave Hieronymus: I agree with them that we identify the real jewels and we go about saving them; I think we need to do that no matter what, but I think there are other things we can do to bridge the gap between historic preservation and economic development.

Chair Dempsey: John, Marty and Barbara Darden did a great presentation a couple of weeks ago on infill development and historic preservation and how the two go hand in hand, but other than those of us on the Historic

Preservation Board, I think it still went in one ear and out the other.

Question: Does the Planning Commission have binding review?

Heather Day: They do over some things. Most of their development review decisions are recommendations to Council, but they do have some authority such as Skyline Ridgeline, variances, and some smaller development plans, but most of their items are recommendations to Town Council in terms of Final PD Site Plans, Planned Development Site Plan, or rezoning.

Dave Hieronymus: Do you think that if we can get past the binding issue, possibly create a compromise? I'm not in favor of the 9-person team, especially if it's slighted heavily towards economic development and then historic preservation is not going to get a second look, but again, that's politics.

Fred Edison: I think it's stacked against historic preservation. You might get a 5-4 vote, but I think it's always going to be a 5-4 vote in favor of development.

Dave Hieronymus: Then do we talk about a different make up of the Board, or come up with a more distributed membership for this Downtown review? Maybe it's 9 people representing different viewpoints from the community so there's a wider range. We can say we like the 9 person binding review, but we think it should be 2 people from historic preservation, 2 people from the DDA, 2 people from the Chamber of Commerce, 2 people from the Historical Society, to balance it out and create a 9-person Board that is more diverse, rather than 3 from the DDA Board. Their agenda is pretty set and they have a mission.

Question: Is 9 a workable number to decide things?

Heather Day: Typically, there is an odd number so you avoid ties.

Dave Hieronymus: If the 9-member Board is binding and all downtown things go through that, then what does this Board review, just Craig and Gould?

Heather Day: Landmarking, demolition review, design review and Craig and Gould.

John Olson: Demolition certificates for landmarks, historic district formation process

Shawn Dempsey: We aren't locked into this decision; we have other alternatives

Dave Hieronymus: Are you all comfortable with the 3-3-3 or split it up more?

Fred Edison: I think split it up more or have more than 9. I see the 3-3-3 as a tough go.

Dave Hieronymus: What other downtown groups are there? There's the downtown Merchant's Association and the Chamber of Commerce. What other groups are there?

Heather Day: We've looked at other cities to see what they do. Georgetown had a model that was most similar to that with 3 Historic Preservation Board, 3 downtown, and 1 Planning Commissioner. There were other groups who didn't have any Planning Commissioners. There are different models; everyone does it slightly different, but the Historic Preservation Board really wears the hat as advocate for historic preservation, landmarking, district formation, but when you get into the trickiness of how to do infill development, especially if there is a DDA or Downtown Development Authority of some kind, this changes the mix, so a lot of the cities had something like this Design Review Board. Again, the makeup of it is very flexible, but maybe we could talk about the concept of the makeup of the Conservation Areas and the criticism that seems to be targeted there.

Dave Hieronymus: I think this Board has given up on the concept of the conservation areas. We don't have a problem with Shawn going back in there and saying that the conservation areas can be removed from the plan. I think they are gone anyway.

Shawn Dempsey: If the conservation areas are gone are we back to all of downtown again?

Dave Hieronymus: What I'm hearing is if the conservation areas are gone, then the Design Review Board would review all downtown. The conservation areas would come out of the Historic Preservation Plan, a border would go in showing what is considered downtown, and that becomes reviewable by the Design Review Board. Then the Design Review Board is binding over all of downtown whether you are a

contributing building or not.

Shawn Dempsey: Is there an alternative then to the 9-person review board and still get rid of or modify the conservation areas?

Dave Hieronymus: If I put on my developer hat, that's so much harder than the conservation areas because now, as an architect, if I want to remodel one of the new buildings on Wilcox it's going to be so much more difficult to get it approved. Where it wasn't in a conservation area before, now it will have to go to the design review board and that is binding. In essence they are asking for more regulation than what we are proposing. That's going to be harder for me as an architect to get a project through Town than it would be in a conservation area because conservation areas are very limited.

Heather Day: I think the concept behind the design review goes hand in hand with the fact that they are looking at design standards and development standards for downtown. Similar to what you use right now, the F.R.E.S.H. standards, they are looking at doing that as an overlay for downtown. So, this same study group that was formed to look at the historic preservation amendments could have an extended life. They would help figure out how you do design review standards and development standards downtown and that design review board uses that criteria to make a decision about what the correct kind of infill is. It is balanced with the historic preservation.

Another alternative could be that the DDA does all of the design review, comes up with the design standards, and ultimately has say over everything downtown and historic preservation is out of the picture in terms of infill development. Even though it didn't seem like we had recognition that there are economic benefits to historic preservation, we are starting to hear that folks know that historic buildings are important to downtown. I think the concept of the conservation areas is the folks that own properties within them don't like the fact that they are targeted on a map. They don't like that fact that they are singled out and that they are isolated and treated differently. So, in some ways to have the entire downtown area blanketed, as it is now, it is better than being targeted on a map.

Shawn Dempsey: Even after our discussion last week, I don't think some of them realize that we're talking about

going to all of downtown and I have a feeling that will be a point of contention going forward.

Dave Hieronymus: When you draw the map around downtown you might get those same people saying, "Why am I being singled out on a map? Because I'm downtown?"

Shawn Dempsey: That's what I'm anticipating.

Heather Day: Maybe. But those same folks voted to form the DDA last November so there was recognition by the property owners that they were unique and wanted to be different. I think the DDA wants to have some say on what happens.

Shawn Dempsey: Mark Williams brought up that the DDA is looking at hiring a consultant in historic preservation and economic development to determine how you merge the two.

Fred Edison: I have a question about an old document, the *Castle Rock Style*. Does this determine how infill is put in the Town?

Dave Hieronymus: No, but that's one of the things Town staff quotes when a project is submitted for review. They want your project to comply with *Castle Rock Style*.

Shawn Dempsey: They passed this out to everyone at the Study Team meeting.

Fred Edison: I would think that would guide infill.

Shawn Dempsey: The Study Team talked about bringing that into some sort of overlay district.

John Olson: One of the problems that our group pointed out was that we had too many booklets for design review and it very broad, and wasn't very tangible. At this point, now that we have both groups from the economic side, as well at the preservation side, together we can create those tangible design standards that won't be so broad.

Question: What are the booklets?

John Olson: 1) *Castle Rock Style*, 2) *Castle Rock Design*, 3) *the F.R.E.S.H. Standards* in the HP Plan, and 4) the *Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation*. It's very broad and it makes it very difficult for staff to outline all of this because of the different design suggestions. The good thing

coming out of this is that we'll be able to pull from these different documents and come to a common solution as far as these standards, both from the economic side and the preservation side. This is where the Downtown Plan and the Historic Preservation Plan cross over because they both outline the creation of development standards. This also furthers our 20/20 vision to preserve Town character while at the same time have logical infill development.

Dave Hieronymus: I think that is efficient to combine them some because they are confusing. The Town has a number of regulations that are contradictory.

Leann Breitreutz: It would be nice if they were all put together, but again that's time and money. It would take a long time to combine them and put into one.

Dave Hieronymus: I think you'll see a different group of people wanting to participate in the committee when it comes time to developing those design standards. You'll have a different group of interests from the DDA that wants to be involved in the committee because they'll want to make sure that it's economically feasible. They'll have a different agenda than the DDA.

Heather Day: The one good thing about the committee, everyone is seated at the table every Wednesday night and everyone is talking to each other. I know it's difficult and I know it's hard. Things like this aren't easy. It's hard for communities to go through growing pains where they try to figure all this out. If it were easy then it probably would've already been done. We're trying to take these two Plans, the Downtown Plan and the Historic Preservation Plan and implement them both.

John Olson: It's interesting because we've seen some of the concerns of the Study Team eroding as we've gotten further into our dialogue and we're seeing more of that. Is it possible that we're going to have a complete consensus? No. But I think we're going to have that middle agreement at some point and that's the goal.

Dave Hieronymus: In summary, what do we tell Shawn?

Shawn Dempsey: I've got another question. If we were trying to get away from the 9-person design review committee, is it possible to do zoning overlay or specifically infill, and then demolitions still come before the Historic Preservation Board?

Heather Day: I think that's definitely something you can throw out in terms of maybe a two-step process. It could be demolition review comes here and then infill goes to the Design Review Board. The only thing I throw back is you all had a tough time yourselves with 522 Perry and not wanting to let that building be demolished without knowing what was going to go in there. So sometimes it's hard to have that dialogue of figuring out what's right for the community and having that balance if you can't have that conversation about demolition and infill. But, you could propose that a recommendation could come out of here and go to the design review board. The design review board could be a recommending body to Town Council, but then you've got a different make-up there at Council. I think there are a lot of different models if you want an alternative to the conservation areas. There is a lot of flexibility to the make-up of the Design Review Board.

Dave Hieronymus: I think downtown as a zone is a hard zone because where do you draw the line? You have everything from courthouses to residences to businesses. It's so diverse that zoning doesn't become a very specific tool. Zoning is a better tool when it's going to become a residential area or it's a commercial area. You're in the downtown zone and the uses are: residential, commercial, business, industrial, etc... Pretty soon the zone has no power.

Heather Day: It was talked about at one point, "Do we rezone everything downtown and have a new zone district that is mixed use?" What's being talked about now is an overlay where you say, "You've already got what you've got and now we're going to loosen things up. We're going to allow more diversity in terms of uses. We're going to loosen up the parking standards and we're going to have some design standards that tell you how your building is going to have to look when you want to renovate or rebuild or do the infill." So it's really more like an overlay than a rezone.

John Olson: One exciting suggestion from the DDA is that economic incentives from the DDA can be used for preservation projects. Right now given the rough economic climate I think that's essential. We are short on funding; local grant funding is in danger. I know at the state level it's really competitive for awarding grants because the state is suffering budget issues and I know the SHF Fund has been dramatically reduced this last year. The DDA will come into play with preservation. They want to offer incentives to help

rehabilitate structures.

Dave Hieronymus: From what I heard the DDA is interested in renovating the Masonic Lodge.

Shawn Dempsey: I heard they want to use it as their office.

Dave Hieronymus: They want the lower level as their offices, with the Masonic activities upstairs. There are some positives. So what are you going to tell them? (Speaking to Shawn Dempsey.)

Shawn Dempsey: The primary thing is the imbalance of power on this new subcommittee and that we're only a third of it. We could end up being out voted every time.

Dave Hieronymus: Do we want to suggest the downtown overlay?

Shawn Dempsey: Do we definitely state that we agree the conservation areas should be rethought or go away altogether?

Dave Hieronymus: Is that something that you need a show of hands? Are we giving up the conservation areas?

Fleta Nockels: Who thought up the conservation areas?

John Olson: It was Jeff Brasel and the concept behind it was that it was thought of as a concession between creating a focus on the Board instead of having the Board focus on the whole downtown area.

Fleta Nockels: I thought it was a concession to economic development to begin with and obviously the economic developers don't like it.

Heather Day: I've heard that even though this group believes that a lot of outreach occurred, and maybe it did to some folks, I hear that the property owners downtown weren't asked and the folks in the conservation areas weren't consulted. The vehement reaction we are getting feels like they weren't on board with it.

Shawn Dempsey: I know that is what they are saying, but I know the outreach was made and they didn't participate or at the time, didn't find it necessary to say anything.

Heather Day: Yes, it would have been a lot easier to have

this conversation when we were trying to do the HP Plan.

Leann Breitreutz: As I remember when these conservation areas came about, we were just told that these areas were being created. I don't remember a lot of conversation pro and con on them.

Shawn Dempsey: I think a lot of those conversations happened during the Historic Preservation Plan Study Team at the time.

Dave Hieronymus: When the Plan came to us it was "This is the way it is."

Shawn Dempsey: I remember a lot of us having issues.

Dave Hieronymus: We had issues with the conservation areas also.

Fleta Nockels: My impression was that it was thrown out to the economic community to make us less threatening.

Fred Edison: Are we backing up too far to ask the DDA to give us their specific points as to why they don't like the conservation areas?

John Olson: They feel that people within these conservation areas are being singled out and this regulation is a burden to them.

Heather Day: They see it as equivalent to a district and is no different than creating an historic district on top of them without their agreement.

Fred Edison: They can't be convinced that it could be to their benefit too.

Shawn Dempsey: They think the conservation area boundaries were drawn arbitrarily and has incorporated historic properties, as well as properties that are not historic, such as in the Wilcox School District there are a few buildings, as well as the Victorian strip mall. In fact, the owners of those properties have been involved in some of the most heated discussions.

Fleta Nockels: It certainly is not a conservation type of building at all.

Dave Hieronymus: It's in the area, so it's identified in the

area.

Fleta Nockels: I can see giving on conservation areas, because I don't think they are defensible if they are taking in non-historic buildings.

Dave Hieronymus: I don't think you can have a historic district or conservation area, and maybe you can, where every single building is historic.

Fleta Nockels: No, but the Victorian Center and that area is not our purview at all.

Shawn Dempsey: The idea of conservation areas is that it's not as restrictive as a historic district would be, but it helps guide infill to preserve historic context.

Fleta Nockels: We could shrink our conservation areas to the true historic buildings and toss out the ones that don't matter.

Shawn Dempsey: But there will still be non-historic buildings included.

Fleta Nockels: They do not want to bargain. They just want us to get out of the way.

Lionel Oberlin: What I'm hearing is that TV broadcasts will have to be rewritten about downtown historic Castle Rock if we get too far out from our goals. The term historic Castle Rock is one of the reasons I moved here or what brought me to look here to find a place to live.

Fred Edison: I think that is one reason why we fight for keeping historic Castle Rock.

Heather Day: The DDA sees it as they have money and the ability to rehab these buildings. They care as much about saving the gems or jewels, the buildings they see as vital to downtown, as everyone. That's their perspective. I don't know where it goes beyond that in terms of other buildings beyond the gems and the jewels and how they might prioritize that money, and how rehabilitation of those buildings could change the character. I can argue both sides of that. I have heard the recognition that the uniqueness of Castle Rock is driven by the historic buildings downtown.

Shawn Dempsey: I have talked to many of the Study Team and they legitimately have an interest in historic preservation,

but I think it's in specific buildings or a handful of buildings and they don't seem to be interested in the infill development or our input of preserving the historic feel. Barbara Darden made a good point that Parker went through this and said they preserved their individual historic buildings, but didn't control the infill.

Dave Hieronymus: In going back to my initial question, at least what we get with the 3-3-3, if it goes that way, we're getting 3 members on a board with a binding review and that's 3 members from us, 3 members from Planning Commission, and 3 members from the DDA, so that's 3 more than we have now. For example, if you have 3 members of the Historic Preservation Board saying you cannot demolish the City Hotel, it must be fixed, and it is binding, then you really have a tool and this Board has a purpose, if it's no more than those 3 people who come back every month and say we won one or lost one.

Shawn Dempsey: We could end up redefining our purpose and we could get some real preservation done.

Dave Hieronymus: I would give up the conservation areas for real preservation.

Fred Edison: How would it be to have 2 residents on the review board?

Fleta Nockels: I think the 3-3-3 is bad news and there has to be something a little more in our favor.

Fred Edison: I think it should be made to where it is more impartial or objective.

Heather Day: I think that's what the thought was with the Planning Commission. Barbara Dash was part of the Historic Preservation Plan team process. I work with the Planning Commission on a regular basis and they are very professional, balanced, and objective group. Of course, this is the group that exists today. They are used to doing development plan review. If you don't have the Planning Commission or Town Council, then the question becomes, is it the Chamber, the Historical Society, a downtown property owner, or a Craig and Gould resident? Any other mix makes it go one way or the other.

Fleta Nockels: The Planning Commission is probably as impartial as you're going to get and they are used to controversy.

		<p><u>Heather Day:</u> They are used to doing site development review and they are made up of working professionals, landscape architects and planners.</p> <p><u>Shawn Dempsey:</u> Also Barbara Dash has been involved with the Master Plan, and the work on the Master Plan shows they are interested in promoting historic preservation of the Town.</p> <p><u>Dave Hieronymus:</u> I would rather give up the conservation areas to preserve the historic buildings and if that's what we have to do, then I think it is a good decision as a Board. Are you good with that, Lionel?</p> <p><u>Lionel Oberlin:</u> Yes, I am.</p> <p><u>Shawn Dempsey:</u> Should we take an informal vote, possibly a show of hands in favor of Leann and me going back to the Study Team to tell them we are in favor of the conservation areas going away or being modified, as long as the focus was still on the historic preservation depending on how we want to address infill?</p> <p><u>Fleta Nockels:</u> And we still think there should be an appropriate stand on infill. I don't think we want to back down on that.</p> <p>(Note: There was an informal show of hands, but no official vote taken.)</p> <p>The next Study Team is a week from tonight.</p>
<p><u>7:14:20 PM</u></p>	<p>203 Cantril Street Discussion</p> <p>Hammer House</p>	<p><u>Dave Hieronymus:</u> I did some research on Lionel's house. We looked into his foundation and it is a combination of concrete foundation wall and stacked rhyolite that is failing. The northeast corner of the house is slipping into the foundation and needs to be stabilized. It will probably be fine through the summer. I would worry about it going through a couple more years, but it does need to be stabilized fairly quickly.</p> <p>In the process of doing that, we discovered that some of the electrical wiring passes through that area, so the wiring has to be moved out of the way to shore the floor and this was discussed with the Town of Castle Rock Building Department. Lionel has the only functioning tube and knob electrical system left on the planet that is incredibly dangerous. The electrical wiring is continuous throughout</p>

the house and it needs to be rewired to be safe. That is more urgent to me than the foundation because electric fires are not timed with the weather.

John and I started to put a grant application together and Barbara Darden was going to take it, but she did not think she could get the grant application ready by the April 1<sup>st</sup> deadline, which is today, so she did not want to submit the application when it was not feasible to get the grant. The next grant is coming up in October. We are hoping to get some estimates on fixing the electrical. She did indicate there is always a temporary solution or you could choose to do nothing, but that is difficult with an electrical system. We do have a recommendation letter from Lucia and the Historical Society that will be a part of the grant request, but if there is something we can do to help save the Hammer House's electrical system with a grant from the Town or something we can do in the meantime, even just to change out some of the more dangerous components that are downstairs, would probably be good for this Board to get behind as a Historic Preservation project. If we lose this house to a fire, we would lose the only residential house that is on the historic registry.

Fleta Nockels: How much was the estimate on the electrical work?

Dave Hieronymus: When you look at the total amount that needs to be done on the house, I figured about \$9,800 for the foundation work and \$15,000 for the electrical work, but there are some other costs to be considered such as restoring the landscape around the house, so I figured those costs in there as well. The Town needs some structural engineering done on the foundation by a licensed structural engineer and not a licensed architect. He also needs some other professional consulting services done such as a soils test, etc. So this Board needs to come up with a plan to save the Hammer House.

Leann Breitreutz: I think it's important to have this done.

Shawn Dempsey: Is there anything we can tie into the month of May being Historic Preservation month?

Dave Hieronymus: Possibly have volunteers from the community who could help out with this. John, is there \$15,000 in funds available to save the Hammer House?

Heather Day: The line item in the budget was already

reduced once with the initial round of budget reductions and I know that it has been looked at again. I can check with the Finance Department again, but it could be going away with the next round of budget reductions.

Dave Hieronymus: What would we need to do as a Board? Is there a letter we need to write to Mark Stevens or the Mayor? Is it a project we want to get behind as a Board and if so, what are the funds available, and what do we need to do to help secure those funds?

Leann Breitreutz: This needs to be acted on fairly quick.

Dave Hieronymus: The house has been functioning as is since the early 1920's, but it is not grounded.

Shawn Dempsey: I think it is something we want to get behind. How do we go about getting the funds?

Heather Day: The way the Code reads, the grant has to be acted on by Council so this group makes a recommendation. It would be very helpful if there were a consensus tonight from the group that this is where you want to spend that money and prepare a letter signed by the Chair outlining the Board's action that I could take to the Finance Department.

Dave Hieronymus: Moved that the Historic Preservation Board write a letter in support of redoing the electrical in the Hammer House as the Historic Preservation Board's project, and use the \$15,000 of budgeted funds for this project. Seconded by Fleta Nockels.

A roll call vote was taken as follows:

Fred Edison, yes, Leann Breitreutz, yes, Fleta Nockels, yes, Shawn Dempsey, yes, Lionel Oberlin, recused himself, Dave Hieronymus, yes, Derald Hoffman, yes. Passed with a vote of 6-0 and 1 abstention, in favor.

Fleta Nockels: Lets be thinking ahead about a money raising campaign for historic preservation and possibly have some ideas by our next meeting.

Shawn Dempsey: Yes, we need to be thinking of that anyway in case Heather reports back that we have more of a reduction in funds.

John Olson: It is also required that a cash grant match the requirement of the local grants, so I think we should have some type of grassroots effort to find other ways that we

		<p>could come up with that match. Possibly staff and the Board can come up with some creative solutions.</p> <p><u>Fred Edison</u>: Does the museum have some structural damage too?</p> <p><u>Lionel Oberlin</u>: Yes it has a lot of cracks that are worsening.</p>
<u>7:27:36 PM</u>	Board Member Items	<p><u>Shawn Dempsey</u>: Regarding 522 Perry about them not having a plan, in the minutes from November 1<sup>st</sup> that I read at the last Study Team a few weeks ago we discussed that part of the new ordinance would include as part of the demolition review that a demolition permit would not be issued until a building permit for the new project is ready to be issued and the applicant is able to demonstrate that he or she has secured funding. We don't have that right yet, but I thought it was interesting that we had discussed that 2 years ago.</p>
<u>7:28:50 PM</u>	Staff Items	<p><u>John Olson</u>: John Magee submitted his resignation as a Board member due to family issues. He was also up for renewal this month. We will be putting out an ad for a new Board member to take his position.</p> <p><u>Heather Day</u>: Applications are due at the end of the month.</p>
<u>7:30:48 PM</u>	Motion to Adjourn	<p>Dave Hieronymus motioned to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by a Chair Dempsey.</p>

Minutes approved by the Historic Preservation Board on May 6, 2009, by a vote of \_\_\_\_\_ in favor of, \_\_\_\_\_ opposed, with \_\_\_\_\_ abstention(s).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Shawn Dempsey  
Historic Preservation Board Chair

Historic Preservation Board Minutes  
April 1, 2009