

**CITY OF GOLDEN PLANNING STAFF REPORT
FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD AGENDA**

CASE NO: HPB 08-17 **MEETING DATE:** December 1, 2008

APPLICANT: Eileen Banks, Roy Banks, Bob Banks

REQUESTED ACTION: Certificate of Appropriateness Review for Relocation or Demolition at 711 12th Street

EXHIBITS: Vicinity Map, application, information from 2001 historic designation request and action.

BACKGROUND

An application has been submitted to the City of Golden Historic Preservation Board to consider the relocation or demolition of a commercial structure initially constructed as a single household residence at 711 12th Street. Although there is not an immediate plan to remove the structure, the owners seek HPB support for such potential action.

Pursuant to Section 18.58.075 demolition (or relocation) of a historic site or structure requires a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) review from the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) prior to issuance of a demolition permit. HPB should review the potential relocation or demolition of the structure, and be ready to discuss possible alternative courses of action.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The property at 711 12th Street was designated as a historic site by Ordinance 1541 in 2001. The designation materials and application are attached. As noted in these materials, this structure is one of the very few remaining structures from the downtown core, and is one of the earliest brick structures in the community. Based upon verbal indications from the owner, and the inclusion of the property in a conceptually discussed redevelopment proposal for the adjacent lot to the east, it appears that the owners now wish to remove the structure and to add their property into a proposed new building. Staff believes that the discussion of the owner's reasoning will be an important part of the December 1st discussion

While the owner's application form indicates a desire to relocate the structure, staff recommends that the request be treated as a demolition request in that if the structure can be moved, it will substantially affect its historic integrity, and also since such relocation offers are rarely found to be feasible and successful. It should also be noted that the City does not have property suitable for such relocation. This question is often asked, and an objective analysis shows that such structures as this are not appropriate or desirable for the Clear Creek History Park, and do not make sense for other City parcels.

DISCUSSION OF COA REVIEW CRITERIA AND STAFF COMMENTS

The Historic Preservation Board most often addresses additions or changes to an existing structure. In order to appropriately address demolition in a historic district, it is instructive to review the specific code criteria and purpose for the review. Section 18.58.060(3) contains the criteria for changes to or demolition of existing structures.

According to Section 1.4.e of the Golden Historic Guidelines, “The demolition of historic structures should be undertaken only when all options for repair, reconstruction, or relocation have been considered.” The Board should consider each of the following steps during a Certificate of Appropriateness review for removal of the existing structure:

- 1. Designation Status** – In the cases of structures in a historic district, the first question is whether it is a historically contributing structure. For structures that are found to be non-contributing, HPB typically has no reason to object to demolition. For individually designated structures, this is a moot item. The subject structure has already been determined to have historic significance to the community, and therefore by definition should not be removed unless it is infeasible to retain.
- 2. Condition of the building** – Second, if the Board decides that the structure is contributing to the historic district or is historically significant by virtue of individual designation, then it must be determined whether it can be repaired or restored. *In this case, the owner is not arguing that the building should be removed due to the extent of deterioration or physical condition of the building, but rather is arguing that they do not find the location suitable for the structure given prior and potential changes on adjacent lots.*
- 3. Economic Infeasibility** – Third, if the building being considered for demolition is both historically significant and repairable, the appropriate evaluation is whether it is economically feasible to repair. *With repair and restoration costs not being an issue at this time, this discussion also seems moot.*

Given the above analysis, and lack of substantial detail from the owner as to why they desire to remove the structure, there does not appear to be any compelling justification for HPB to support the loss of this resource. It appears that the December 1, 2008 meeting is a good opportunity to start the discussion about the owner’s request and alternative courses of action.

RECOMMENDATION

Undoubtedly this request will be difficult for the Board. While certain high profile downtown buildings have been preserved over the years, others have been removed for a number of reasons. In the end, it will be the owner's decision whether or not to remove the structure. With that in mind, HPB does have a few options.

- If the information submitted by the applicant is compelling and meets the Board's criteria for establishing the appropriateness of removal, the Board could approve the applicant's request for relocation or demolition.
- If the Board feels that there is a specific type of information or inspection that could occur quickly and lead to a decision, you may wish to simply continue the case to the next regular meeting prior to making a ruling on the merits of the request.
- Thirdly, if the Board does not accept the applicant's information, and wants to assure that demolition will at least be delayed until the feasibility of the redevelopment project is further discussed, and to allow the maximum amount of time to pursue relocation, the stay of demolition authorized by Chapter 18.58 of 180 days (perhaps with a review after 90 days) may be appropriate.

The draft motion, below, is drafted for the official delay of up to 180 days. If the Board wishes to simply continue until January 5, 2009 for more discussion, a simple motion to that effect listing the purpose of the continuance would be in order.

DRAFT MOTION

Mr. Chairman, in regard to case HPB 08-17, I move that the Historic Preservation Board adopt the following findings concerning a Certificate of Appropriateness review for the demolition or relocation of the existing structure located at 711 12th Street.

1. Eileen Banks, Roy Banks, and Bob Banks have submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness application in accordance with the requirements of the Historic Residential Guidelines.
2. The property was properly posted in accordance with Section 18.58.035.
3. Based on the criteria in 18.58.075 of the City of Golden Municipal Code, HPB can not support either the relocation or the demolition of the existing historic structure. The owner has not submitted any compelling reason for its removal.
4. Based on the above findings, HPB directs the Chief Building Official and Planning Director to withhold any and all permits for demolition on this site for 180 days (with a

review on _____) to study the feasibility of alternative means for preserving the structure, including:

- Plan modifications
- Alternative uses
- Relocation

5. Any person aggrieved by this decision of the Historic Preservation Board may file a written request to the City Manager, within 15 days of this date of the decision, requesting City Council to review said decision in accordance with Section 18.58.080 of the City of Golden Municipal Code. The owner has a further right of appeal directly to City Council at any time in the 180 day period.