HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD

Thursday, October 1, 2015 – 6:00 p.m.
Commissioners Hearing Room
Third Floor of the Boulder County Courthouse

AGENDA

1. Citizen participation for items not otherwise on the agenda

2. Approval of minutes from previous meetings

3. Landmark:
   a. **HP-15-0002: Hansen Cabin**
      - Request: Boulder County Historic Landmark Designation of the cabin
      - Location: 16 Washington Street, Allenspark, in Section 26, Township 3N and Range 73 of the 6th Principal Meridian
      - Zoning: Mountain Institutional (MI) Zoning
      - Applicant: Allenspark Community Church

4. Referrals:
   a. **SU-14-0009: Butte Blacksmith LLC SU/SSDP**
      - Request: Special Use and Site Specific Development Plan for multiple principal uses which generate over 150 average daily trips including a Vehicle Sales Lot, Vehicle Service Center, General Industrial (outdoor storage and recycling of junk vehicles), and a Single Family Dwelling. The application proposes to build an 11,700 sq. ft. building and earthwork in excess of 500 cubic yards.
      - Location: At 6095 Valmont Road, at the northwest corner of Valmont Road and N 61st Street, in Section 22, T1N, R70W.
      - Zoning: General Industrial (GI) Zoning District
      - Applicants: Gary and Debbie Chambers, Butte Blacksmith LLC
      - Agent: Rosi Dennett, Front Range Land Solutions
   b. **SPR-15-0103: Corruccini Residence**
      - Request: Alterations to an historic structure including an addition
      - Location: 785 Flagstaff Road
      - Zoning: Forestry (F) Zoning
      - Owners: Corruccini Family LLC
      - Agent: Stephen Sparn

5. Other Business
HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD

Thursday, October 1, 2015 – 6:00 p.m.

Third Floor Hearing Room
Boulder County Courthouse

STAFF PLANNER: Denise Grimm

Docket HP-15-0002: Hansen Cabin

Request: Boulder County Historic Landmark Designation of the cabin
Location: 16 Washington Street, Allenspark, in Section 26, Township 3N and Range 73 of the 6th Principal Meridian
Zoning: Mountain Institutional (MI) Zoning
Applicant: Allenspark Community Church

PURPOSE

To determine if the nominated property qualifies for landmark designation, determine if the application is complete, and formulate recommendations for the Board of County Commissioners.

BACKGROUND

An application for landmark designation of the cabin has been submitted by the owners, Allenspark Community Church. The landmark application is for the historic cabin only. An historic site survey was completed on the cabin in 2000 and it found that the cabin is eligible for local landmark status.

The one-story log cabin was built in 1921 by Andrew Hansen in an Eclectic style. The cabin was constructed of fire-hardened logs from an 1894 forest fire and is believed to be one of three in Allenspark built from such logs. Andrew Hansen built the cabin for his bride, Edith.

Edith was the daughter of Frank and Mary Gay. Frank Gay was important to the development of Allenspark as a summer destination as he built several cabins and then recruited people from the Midwest Plains to buy property in Allenspark.

Andrew Hansen helped establish Allenspark as a tourist destination when he brought ski promoters to the area and organized international ski jump competitions in the 1920s. Andrew also ran the Park Supply Store and designed and built the Episcopal church.

The cabin remained in the Hansen family until the early 1970s when its ownership changed hands a couple of times before Kent and Jean Lemmons left it to the Allenspark Community Church in 1995.
The application for landmark status has been completed on behalf of the church by Edie DeWeese, granddaughter of Andrew and Edith Hansen and Allenspark historian.

The cabin has retained a lot of its original features including the fire-hardened logs with charring that can still be seen, the half-timbered detailing with historic building paper on the front-facing gable, and the original window and door openings. However, the cabin lost its original windows and French doors in 2011 when the owners prepared to demolish the structure. Currently, there is just plywood covering the openings. The half-timbered detailing was removed from the gable of the porch since 2000, the front door was replaced years ago, and two small additions were placed on the rear of the cabin in the 1960s.

A stop work order was placed on the unapproved demolition process in 2011 and the cabin has sat vacant since. New management at the Allenspark Community Church is amenable to working with and landmarking the cabin.

**SIGNIFICANCE**

The historic site survey completed in 2000 found that the cabin is eligible for local landmark status under Criteria 1, 4 and 8. The landmark application adds Criterion 3.

The property qualifies for landmark designation under Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 8.

Criterion 15-501(A)(1) The character, interest, or value of the proposed landmark is part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the county;

The cabin is significant as an example of the development of Allenspark as a vacation destination.

Criterion 15-501(A)(3) The identification of the proposed landmark with a person or persons significantly contributing to the local, county, state, or national history;

The cabin is significant for its association with Andrew and Edith Hansen, who contributed to the early development of Allenspark.

Criterion 15-501(A)(4) The proposed landmark is an embodiment of the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, method of construction, or the use of indigenous materials;

The cabin is significant because it was constructed of fire-hardened logs from a local forest fire.

Criterion 15-501(A)(8) The relationship of the proposed landmark to other distinctive structures, districts, or sites which would also be determined to be of historic significance.

The cabin would likely be a contributing feature to an Allenspark historic district if such a district were created.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Advisory Board APPROVE and recommend that the BOCC approve **HP-15-0002: Hansen Cabin** under Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 8 subject to the following conditions:
1. Alteration of any exterior feature of the structure will require review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness (CA) by Boulder County (note: applicable county review processes, including but not limited to Site Plan Review, may be required).

2. Regular maintenance which prolongs the life of the landmark, using original materials or materials that replicate the original materials, will not require review for a Certificate of Appropriateness, provided the Land Use Director has determined that the repair is minor in nature and will not damage any existing architectural features. Emergency repairs, which are temporary in nature, will not require review (note: Depending on the type of work, a building permit may still be required.)
The user agrees to all Terms of Use set forth by Boulder County. For Terms of Use, please visit: www.bouldercounty.org/mapdisclaimer
The user agrees to all Terms of Use set forth by Boulder County. For Terms of Use, please visit: www.bouldercounty.org/mapdisclaimer
Historic Landmark Nomination Form

Name of Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Name</th>
<th>Hansen cabin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Names</td>
<td>Lemmons cabin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historical Narrative**

(Continuation sheet 1)

Location of Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address(s)</th>
<th>16 Washington St. (previously 26 Washington St.), two doors south of the Allenspark Community Church.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Allenspark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>80510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Ownership:</th>
<th>□ Public</th>
<th>X Private</th>
<th>□ Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category of Property:</td>
<td>X Structure</td>
<td>□ Site</td>
<td>□ District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Resources Within the Property (sites and districts only):

| 1 | Contributing Resources | 0 | Non-contributing Resources |

**Narrative Describing Classification of Resources**

The Hansen cabin is a one-story log structure built as a residence. No other buildings are on the site.

Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Functions</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Form: H/01 • Rev. 08.27.10 •
Statement of Significance

Boulder County Criteria for Designation (check all that apply):

X The character, interest, or value of the proposed landmark as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the county;

□ Proposed landmark as a location of a significant local, county, state, or national event;

X The identification of the proposed landmark with a person or persons significantly contributing to the local, county, state, or national history;

X The proposed landmark as an embodiment of the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, method of construction, or the use of indigenous materials;

□ The proposed landmark as identification of the work of an architect, landscape architect, or master builder whose work has influenced development in the county, state, or nation;

□ The proposed landmark's archaeological significance;

□ The proposed landmark as an example of either architectural or structural innovation; and

X The relationship of the proposed landmark to other distinctive structures, districts, or sites which would also be determined to be of historic significance.

Areas of Significance

The Hansen cabin meets designation criteria numbers 1, 3, 4, and 8. It represents the change from mining to year-round residences and vacation cabins during the post-World War I era in Allenspark, and is identified with The Hansen and Gay families who were significant Allenspark's early history. The style of the Hansen cabin is unusual for a log cabin and was influenced by the Craftsman movement. The cabin is central to the original Mack homestead and the 1896 town plat of Allenspark and contributes to the value of a possible Allenspark historic district.

Period of Significance

Post World War I, mid-Twentieth century

Significant Dates


Significant Persons

Andrew & Edith (Gay) Hansen; Frank & Mary Gay; Frank Andrew Hansen

Bibliographical References


Oral History, Mary Gay Hansen (DeWeese) Baker, 1987,
Boulder’s Carnegie Branch Library for Local History
### Geographical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Description of Property</th>
<th>(Lots 4, 5, &amp; north half of 6, Block 7, Allenspark town plat), acct. # R0057884</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Description</td>
<td>NE¼ of SE¼, Section 26, Township 3N, Range 73W, Parcel #119726407003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Justification</td>
<td>Boundary encompasses original cabin site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Property Owner(s) Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Allenspark Community Church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Allenspark (PO Box 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jblev22@gmail.com">jblev22@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>80510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>303-747-2821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preparer of Form Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Edie DeWeese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Allenspark (PO Box 242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:deweese.edie@gmail.com">deweese.edie@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>80510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>303-747-2927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Photos, Maps, and Site Plan

(Continuation sheet 4)

### For Office Use Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket Number</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessor ID</th>
<th>Application Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Allenspark is a park in the geographical sense—it is a high meadow surrounded by mountains. While it was first visited by Native Americans and later by trappers, Allen's Park—now spelled Allenspark—got its name from a miner who built the first cabin in the area.

During the Colorado Gold Rush of 1859, Allenspark's namesake, Alonzo Nelson Allen, left his family in Columbus, Wisconsin, to seek his fortune in the Kansas/Nebraska Territories that became Colorado. He settled on the St. Vrain River, on the south edge of the current city of Longmont, Colorado.

Allen prospected and ran cattle in the Allenspark area and built a cabin there in 1864. The cabin burned down in 1894, the year Allen died.

The unincorporated village of Allenspark is situated in the north-west corner of Boulder County on a portion of land originally homesteaded by George Mack. After his homestead patent was granted on January 7, 1895, Mack sold some of the land to the Allens Park Land and Townsite Co. on May 9, 1896. The land company filed a plat for the village on May 23, 1896, and began selling small building lots.

In the late 1890s, most residents of the Allenspark area were farmers or ranchers, but by the early 1900s there was a resurgence in gold fever. The Clara Belle Mining and Reduction Co. attracted investors from as far away as Omaha, Nebraska, for what turned out to be a folly. Meanwhile, tourism was booming, and farmers and miners alike found a better income catering to tourists during the summer months. By 1896 the village boasted a hotel, general store, and post office.

The village of Allenspark began to grow when summer people bought land and built cabins from around 1900 to 1920. Many people came up the South St. Vrain canyon from Longmont, and a number came from as far away as Kansas and Oklahoma in that initial burst, led by Frank V. Gay, an insurance man from Clay Center, Kansas. Most of the cabins from this era are of frame construction with Ponderosa-pine slab siding.

Allenspark remained primarily a summer destination until improved roads and modern technology made mountain living easier than it used to be. Now, many people live year-round in the Allenspark area.

Skiing was popular in the Allenspark area in the 1920s and 1930s, when international ski jumping competitions were held. Jumps and ski courses included the Willow Creek Slide, Thelma Slide, Butter Bowl, Haugen Slide, and Point-O-Pines. The Rock Creek Ski area was developed after World War II and operated until 1952. Cross-country skiing is still popular, especially on Rock Creek and in Wild Basin.

The greater Allenspark area extends beyond the village to include the small communities of Ferncliff, Tahosa Valley, Meeker Park, Peaceful Valley, Raymond, and Riverside, and is defined by the boundaries of the Allenspark Fire Protection District.

The family associated with the Hansen cabin are Frank and Mary Gay, their daughter Edith, who married Andy Hansen, and the Hansen children. Andy Hansen built the cabin for Edith after their wedding on
September 1, 1920. Their first child, Frank Andrew, was born in June of 1921, and appears along with the cabin construction project in monthly photos sent back to family in Kansas. By Frank Andrew’s first Christmas in 1921, the family was living in the cabin, as shown in a photo in this packet. Boulder County Assessor’s estimate of a 1917 build date is incorrect.

The Gay family was very instrumental in promoting Allenspark as a summer resort. In the early 1900s they built a cabin south of the Hansen cabin where they summered for the rest of their lives. Because Frank Gay was an insurance man with a district extending from Nebraska through Kansas and on to Oklahoma, he was in a unique position to spread the word about his new-found summer haven from the heat of the plains. In short order, the Gays built guest cabins to rent out, and convinced many people to buy lots in Allenspark and build their own cottages. The west end of the Allenspark town plat was built up entirely by Clay Center, Kansas, people. On the north, Cowbell Hill was jokingly called Oklahoma Hill, because all the cabins there were owned by folks from Oklahoma City.

By the time Edith Gay married Andy Hansen, the Gay family had opened the Park Supply Store, across from the school, and had begun Episcopal church services in their living room. Edith Gay taught the first Sunday school classes in Allenspark. Andy and another Allenspark founder, Oscar Rubendall, opened the Rubendall-Hansen garage shortly after World War I. They did car repairs, sold firewood, and constructed countless summer cabins, including that of Bishop Mize (Episcopal bishop, Kansas) and Kirsten Neilsen, whose cabin is now part of the Old Gallery complex.

After Andy and Edith were married, Frank Gay asked Andy to run the Park Supply Store. It was during this time that Andy arranged to sell Northland skis and brought Northland’s promoters, Anders and Lars Haugen, to Allenspark to set up a ski jump. Andy was an organizer and announcer for international ski jump competitions that were held in Allenspark in the 1920s.

In later years, the Hansen’s son, Frank Andrew, was instrumental in the formation of the Allenspark fire department. Their granddaughter, Edie DeWeese, carried on the family interest in community activities as an officer in the fire department, editor of the local newspaper, and organizer of historical preservation efforts. Through all these activities, and through the generations, the Hansen cabin was the heart of the family.
The Hansen cabin is located in the platted village of Allenspark, Boulder County, Colorado. It is situated on lots 4 and 5 of Block 7. The cabin is built of fire-hardened logs harvested by the designer/builder, Andy Hansen, from the 1894 forest-fire burn on the flanks of St. Vrain and Meadow Mountain south of Allenspark. Hansen used a horse and chain to “snake” logs out of an area called the “Pole Patch.” Fire hardening makes the logs very difficult to cut and nail, but results in wood that is highly rot resistant. Because of the challenges of using these logs, few cabins were built with them. The Hansen cabin is the earliest of only three residences in the platted Allenspark village built in this fashion.

The 724 square foot, one-story cabin stands on stone piers and has a gable roof with asphalt roofing. The original structure, as built, is approximately 30 feet by 20 feet, aligned east to west, with a shed-roofed addition (approximately 9’ x 24’), dating from the early 1960s, on the west end. The main structure had four large windows, three in the living room, dining area, and bedroom were of long, horizontal matching panels, while a French door in the living room was composed of two of the same panels standing vertically. A small log porch on the face of the building leads to the front door. A frame addition including a utility room, bathroom, and bedroom was added to the back of the structure in the early 1960s.

The cabin is significant because of its architectural integrity, its use of local materials and unusual design which was influenced by the Craftsman style and is the only one of its type in the village. The French doors on the front and unusually long side windows are unique for a log cabin. Structurally, it is completely unchanged other than the back addition. The majority of the residential buildings in Allenspark are of frame construction with Ponderosa pine slab siding. One other fire-hardened-log residence exists in the neighborhood and it has been significantly modified. The two other log cabins in the village are made from hewn-logs and date from the 1890s.

Since 1973, the Hansen cabin has been used as a residence, owned by Rick and Lynne Hartner, Lorne and Leslie Kermath, and finally by Kent and Jean Lemmons, who bequeathed it to the Allenspark Community Church upon their deaths. It has been vacant since 2010. In 2011, the Church prepared it for demolition, disconnecting power lines and removing all windows. A stop-work order was issued by Boulder County in 2011 and the cabin has been unused since then.

The Allenspark Community Church, historical society, and the greater community hope to preserve the Hansen cabin to represent local and church history.
Hansen cabin, 16 (26) Washington St., Allenspark
Hansen cabin, 1973 town plat map
Hansen cabin photos, 1921-1968

Cabin construction, 1921
Frank Andrew and Edith Hansen

East elevation, 1920s

West & south elevations, 1928

South windows, 1956

Interior, December 1921

South and east, 1968
COLORADO CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY
Architectural Inventory Form
(Page 1 of 7)

I. IDENTIFICATION
1. Resource number: 5BL8696
2. Temporary number: N/A
3. County: Boulder
4. City: Allenspark (vicinity)
5. Historic building name: Hansen Cabin
6. Current building name: Lemmons Cabin
7. Building address: 26 Washington Street
8. Owner name: Daniel M. Ostrowski
   Owner address: P.O. Box 413
   Allenspark, CO 80510

II. GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
9. P.M. 6th Township 3 North Range 73 West
   NW\% of SW\% of NE\% of SE\% of section 26
10. UTM reference
   Zone: 13
   A. Easting: 455200 Northing: 4448240
   B. Easting: Northing: 
   C. Easting: Northing: 
   D. Easting: Northing: 
11. USGS quad name: Allens Park, Colorado 1957; photorevised 1978
12. Lot(s): 6-8
    Block: 7
    Addition: Allenspark
    Year of Addition unknown
13. Boundary Description and Justification:
    This property consists of a single cabin. The property is located on the
    west side of Washington Street in the unincorporated community of
    Allenspark.

III. ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION
14. Building plan (footprint, shape):
    Rectangular Plan
15. Dimensions in feet: 480 square feet
16. Number of stories: One
17. Primary external wall material
    Wood / Log
18. Roof configuration (enter one):
    Gabled Roof / Front Gabled Roof
19. Primary external roof material (enter one):
    Asphalt Roof
20. Special features (enter all that apply):
    Porch
21. Official Eligibility Determination
    (OAHP use only)
    Date _____________ Initials _____________
    ___ Determined Eligible - National Register
    ___ Determined Not Eligible - National Register
    ___ Determined Eligible - State Register
    ___ Determined Not Eligible - State Register
    ___ Needs Data
    ___ Contributes to eligible National Register District
    ___ Noncontributing to eligible National Register District
22. Architectural style/ building type:
    Late 19th and Early Twentieth Century American
    Movements / Rustic
21. General Architectural Description

This Rustic-style cabin is located on the west side of Washington Street, south of the St. James on the Mount Church. The building is one story tall, and is supported by a low stone foundation. The ground beneath the cabin slopes gently downward from east to west. The cabin's walls are made of whole logs, with concrete chinking, and with whole vertical logs at the corners. The cabin is covered by a moderately-pitched front gabled roof, covered with brown asphalt shingles laid over 1x wood decking and 2x wood rafters. The rafter ends are exposed beneath the eaves, and there is false-half timbering in the upper gable end on the facade. There are a variety of window openings on the cabin's four elevations. On the east elevation (facade), there is a set of large 8-light casement or fixed-pane windows, located to the north of the entry door; on the north elevation, there is one 4x4 horizontal sliding window; on the west elevation, there is one 1x1 horizontal sliding window, one small single-light window, and a band of three 9-light windows; on the south elevation, there are two 8-light fixed-pane windows, and one large 9x9 horizontal sliding window at the west end. A painted blue and peach color wood-paneled entry door is located on the facade. This door, which features one upper sash light and an egg-and-dart top rail, opens onto an 8' by 7' wood porch. This porch features an open log railing, and vertical log posts which support a gabled porch roof. A secondary entrance is located at the west end of the south elevation, where there is a wood-paneled door.

23. Landscape or setting special features:
This property is located in the unincorporated community of Allenspark in northwestern Boulder County. Situated at an elevation of 8400 feet above sea level, Allenspark lies just a mile east of the Rocky Mountain National Park boundary, with Long's Peak and Mount Meeker not far to the northwest. The surrounding terrain is mountainous, marked by native pine and aspen trees, along with indigenous plants, grasses and wild flowers.

24. Associated buildings, features, or objects
n/a

IV. ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY

25. Date of Construction:
Estimate ca. 1919
Actual
Source of information:
Kent Lemmons

26. Architect:
n/a
Source of information:

27. Builder/ Contractor:
Andy Hansen
Source of information:
Kent Lemmons

28. Original owner:
Andy Hansen
Source of information:
Kent Lemmons

29. Construction History (include description and dates of major additions, alterations, or demolitions):
Boulder County Assessor records indicate that this cabin was built in 1949. However, Kent Lemmons, the cabin's resident, stated in an interview that the cabin was built by Andy Hansen in 1919. The cabin's Rustic style of architecture, log construction, and overall appearance, are all consistent with a circa 1919 date of construction. The Assessor date, therefore, is probably in error.

30. Original location: yes
Moved: no
Date of move(s): n/a
V. HISTORICAL ASSOCIATIONS

31. Original use(s): Domestic / Cabin

32. Intermediate use(s): Domestic / Cabin

33. Current use(s): Domestic / Cabin

34. Site type(s): Seasonal Residence / Residence

35. Historical Background

Information about this cabin was obtained primarily from Kent Lemmons, who was interviewed when the cabin was surveyed in September 2000. Mr. Lemmons indicated that this lot was purchased by Andy Hansen in 1918, and that Hansen constructed the cabin one year later, in 1919. Andy then lived here for many years. Later, this cabin was used as a Sunday school by the Allenspark Community Church, which is located to the north. The cabin eventually passed into the hands of Frank Hansen, and for a brief time in the late 1970s, it was owned by Rick Hartner. Mr. Lemmons indicated he had lived and worked here in Allenspark for the past two decades.

Allenspark Historic Background

The town of Allenspark was named for Alonzo N. Allen, who came from Wisconsin to what was soon to become Colorado, during the Pikes Peak gold rush. Traveling overland by covered wagon, Alonzo brought his family with him, and, along with many other recent arrivals, he initially had thoughts of striking it rich. In the early 1860s, Allen made his way up the South St. Vrain River, eventually staking a claim in the valley below Taylor Mountain, southeast of the town which would later bear his name. In 1864, Allen constructed a cabin for his family near present-day Ferncliffe, the stone chimney of which still remains. Allen prospected for gold in the region, but soon turned to other endeavors as well. Within a few years, he was buying and selling horses, and growing hay and running summer cattle on his land. Eventually, though, Allen left the rigors of the high country behind, and moved his family down the canyon and out onto the plains, settling in the Longmont area.

Some years later, in the early 1890s, the future townsite of Allenspark was homesteaded by George Mack. By June of 1894, Mack had proved up on his homestead claim which was made up of eighty acres comprised of the east half of the southeast quarter of Section 26, Township 3 North, Range 73 West. Two years later, Mack sold the land to George Pfeiffer who established the Allenspark Land and Townsite. Catering to miners who were beginning to drift into the region, Pfeiffer constructed a hotel, donated land for a schoolhouse, and opened a post office. The fledgling community of Allenspark had been born.

Mining activity remained sluggish until 1903 when the Clara Belle Mine was opened northeast of the townsite. The Clara Belle Mine was owned by the Clara Belle Mining and Reduction Company, with L.C. Tripp as President, Joe J. Lank, Vice-President, and W.W. McCollister, Secretary-Treasurer. Tripp and McCollisters were attorneys who had practiced law together in Nebraska. The mine and mining company was named for their wives, Clara Tripp and Belle McCollister. The Clara Belle never produced any significant quantities of gold, however, efforts to exploit it brought people into the region and was the impetus which established Allenspark as a legitimate town. The creation of Allenspark as a mining camp was also part of a regional mining boom which, from the 1870s to the early 1900s, saw similar mining communities established at such places as Jimtown, Balarat, Gresham, Sunshine, and Ward.
By the 1910s, Allenspark was becoming known, not as a mining town, but rather as a tourist resort. Eventually capitalizing on the town's close proximity to Rocky Mountain National Park, Allenspark's entrepreneurial citizens constructed rustic-style lodges and seasonal cabins to attract visitors and adventure seekers. Allenspark, in its beautiful mountain setting at the base of Longs Peak and Mount Meeker, offered such amenities as hiking, horseback riding, bird watching, fishing, hunting, and cross-country skiing. The community's largest and most famous rustic lodge was constructed in the early 1930s by Dick and Mildred Isles. Initially known as the Isles Trading Post, this resort later became the Allenspark Lodge.

In the years following World War II, Allenspark's population increased, however, the community's core spirit remained much the same. During the latter half of the twentieth century, the town's venerable citizens, its old-fashioned charm, and its rustic lodges and cabins, continued to cater to visitors attracted by the splendors of the nearby Rocky Mountain National Park and Roosevelt National Forest.

36. Sources of Information

"Boulder County, Colorado" [plat map]. Published in 1940 by the Rocky Mountain Map Company.

Boulder County Treasurer's Ledgers 39 and 40, on file at the Carnegie Library, Boulder, CO.


Marden Maps. Boulder County Ownership Plat, Map G1, 1953. Located at the Boulder Public Library, Carnegie Branch for Local History.

VI. SIGNIFICANCE

37. Local landmark designation:
   Yes
   No  xx
   Date of Designation: n/a

38. Applicable National Register Criteria

   A. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
   B. Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
   C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;
   D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield information important in history or prehistory;

   Qualifies under Criteria Considerations A through G (see Manual).
   xx Does not meet any of the above National Register criteria.

Boulder County Local Landmark Areas of Significance

xx 1-501-A (1) The character, interest or value of the proposed landmark as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the county.

1-501-A (2) The proposed landmark as a location of a significant local, county, state, or national event.

1-501-A (3) The identification of the proposed landmark with a person or persons significantly contributing to the local, county, state or national history.

xx 1-501-A (4) The proposed landmark as an embodiment of the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, or method of construction, or the use of indigenous materials.

1-501-A (5) The proposed landmark as identification of the work of an architect, landscape architect, or master builder, whose work has influenced the development in the county, state, or nation.

1-501-A (6) The proposed landmark's architectural, cultural, or archaeological significance.

1-501-A (7) The proposed landmark as an example of either architectural or structural innovation.

xx 1-501-A (8) The relationship of the proposed landmark to other distinctive structures, districts, or sites which would be determined to be of historic significance.

Does not meet any of the above Boulder County Local Landmark Areas of Significance.
39. Area(s) of Significance:

   Architecture; Entertainment / Recreation

40. Period of Significance: ca. 1919-1952

41. Level of Significance:
   National: 
   State: 
   Local: **xx**

42. Statement of Significance

This cabin is historically significant for its association with Allenspark's development as a rustic tourist resort during the first half of the twentieth century. The cabin is also architecturally notable for its Rustic architectural style. Due to a small loss of integrity, the cabin's significance in these regards is probably not to the extent that it would qualify for individual listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The cabin, though, should be considered eligible for individual local landmark designation by Boulder County under Boulder County Criteria 1-501-A-(1, 4 and 8). The cabin would also be considered a contributing resource within a potential Allenspark Historic District. (No such district currently exists.)

43. Assessment of historic physical integrity related to significance:

This cabin displays a relatively high level of integrity relative to the seven aspects of integrity defined by the National Park Service and the Colorado Historical Society - location, setting, design, workmanship, materials, feeling and association. An apparent shed-roofed addition to the original cabin appears to be more than fifty years old, and is compatible with the structure's original Rustic style of architecture.
VII. NATIONAL REGISTER ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT

44. National Register eligibility field assessment:
   Eligible:
   Not Eligible: xx
   Need Data:

   Boulder County Local Landmark eligibility field assessment:
   Eligible: xx
   Not Eligible:
   Need Data:

45. Is there National Register district potential?
   Yes: xx
   No:
   Discuss: Historic properties in Allenspark may have the necessary significance and integrity to qualify as a National Register historic district. This cabin would be a contributing resource within such a historic district.

   If there is National Register district potential, is this building:
   Contributing: xx
   Noncontributing:

46. If the building is in an existing National Register district, is it:
   Contributing: n/a
   Noncontributing: n/a

VIII. RECORDING INFORMATION

47. Photograph numbers:
   Roll: CM-169
   Frame(s): 22-24
   Negatives filed at: Boulder County Parks and Open Space Department
   2045 13th Street
   Boulder, Colorado 80306


49. Date: September 7, 2000

50. Recorder(s): Carl McWilliams

51. Organization: Cultural Resource Historians

52. Address: 1607 Dogwood Court
   Fort Collins, Colorado 80525

53. Phone number: 970/493-5270
26 Washington St., Allenspark, Boulder County, Colorado
(Approximate Scale: ¼ inch = 5 feet)
HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD

Thursday, October 1, 2015 – 6:00 p.m.

Third Floor Hearing Room
Boulder County Courthouse

STAFF PLANNER: Denise Grimm

Docket SU-14-0009: BUTTE BLACKSMITH LLC SU/SSDP

Request: Special Use and Site Specific Development Plan for multiple principal uses which generate over 150 average daily trips including a Vehicle Sales Lot, Vehicle Service Center, General Industrial (outdoor storage and recycling of junk vehicles), and a Single Family Dwelling. The application proposes to build an 11,700 sq. ft. building and earthwork in excess of 500 cubic yards.

Location: At 6095 Valmont Road, at the northwest corner of Valmont Road and N 61st Street, in Section 22, T1N, R70W.

Zoning: General Industrial (GI) Zoning District

Applicants: Gary and Debbie Chambers, Butte Blacksmith LLC

Agent: Rosi Dennett, Front Range Land Solutions

PURPOSE

The role of the Historic Preservation Advisory Board (HPAB) is to serve as a referral body to review and comment on development proposals which could affect historic properties eligible for landmark designation as determined by HPAB. First a determination should be made related to the eligibility of the property and then to review the proposed development in terms of its effect on the eligible resources.

BACKGROUND

Staff has received an application for a Special Use and Site Specific Development Plan for multiple principal uses which generate over 150 average daily trips including a Vehicle Sales Lot, a Vehicle Service Center, a General Industrial (outdoor storage and recycling of junk vehicles), and a Single Family Dwelling. The application proposes to build an 11,700 sq. ft. building and earthwork in excess of 500 cubic yards. It also proposes to pave most of the property up to the lot lines.

The historic Valmont Blacksmith Shop is situated on the parcel and alterations to it are included in the proposal. An historic site survey was completed on the Valmont Blacksmith Shop in 1981. The survey lists a construction date of the 1870s and notes, “The structure is the only commercial establishment at the once thriving community of Valmont to still retain its integrity as an historic site.” County Assessor records date the structure to 1900 but county construction dates are not
always correct. The historic shop has been modified over the years, most significantly by an addition to the west. The façade of the blacksmith shop has also been altered with the loss of the historic bay door and windows on the right, the addition of a single door and a small window, as well as different siding. However, despite the additions and reconfiguration of doors and windows, the original form of the blacksmith shop is still evident and includes an historic window on the left side of the façade.

On March 8, 2013, a subcommittee of the HPAB conducted a site visit of the property. They agreed that the blacksmith building was important and should be preserved.

A proposal was scheduled to be reviewed by HPAB on August 6, 2015, but it was pulled from the agenda by the applicant because they could not be present. The applicant and agent received the preservation staff recommendation before the item was pulled from the agenda and have responded to the original preservation staff recommendation. Both the August 6th staff recommendation and the responding letter dated August 19, 2015 are included in this packet. Preservation staff had recommended that HPAB recommend denial to the BOCC, but suggested conditions should the BOCC approve the docket. The main points of the preservation staff recommendation and the responding letter are as follows:

1. Preservation staff asked that the historic blacksmith shop be landmarked “and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for any modifications to the building. These should be more sensitive to the historic nature of the building. This would include, but aren’t limited to preserving the original materials where possible, using the same style of siding and materials instead of introducing new materials and maintaining or reestablishing original openings.”

   The agent did not respond to the request for landmarking but did respond that the proposal for the false front will be eliminated and that the siding will be replaced with “original type wood siding.”

2. Preservation staff was concerned about the loss of the rural character of the property and asked for at least a 20’ landscape buffer along both 61st Street and Valmont Road. The agent responded that they will include a “10’ grass buffer between the curb and parking lot adjacent to Valmont Road and 61st Street.”

No new drawings have been submitted with the revisions outlined in the August 19th letter.

**SIGNIFICANCE**

The property qualifies for landmark designation under Criterion 1.

Criteria 15-501(A)(1) The character, interest, or value of the proposed landmark is part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the county;

   The property is significant for its association with the early development of Valmont.

**DISCUSSION**

The proposal radically changes the site and the structure. While the zoning of the property is General Industrial, the neighborhood has maintained a sense of rural character and has not been developed to the level of intensity of similar properties in the city. The level of paving and development including a very large two story structure is over intensive for the site.

Numerous residents of the area have raised concerns regarding compatibility with the neighborhood and over intensive use of the site. Included in the packets are letters received thus far.
RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the HPAB finds the historic blacksmith building at 6095 Valmont to be eligible for landmark status.

Staff also recommends that the HPAB recommend denial of **SU-14-0009: BUTTE BLACKSMITH LLC SU/SSDP**. If Planning Commission and the County Commissioners do approve the docket we would ask for the following conditions to be met:

1. Landmarking the blacksmith shop building and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for any modifications to the building. These should be more sensitive to the historic nature of the building. This would include, but aren’t limited to preserving the original materials where possible, using the same style of siding and materials instead of introducing new materials and maintaining or reestablishing original openings.

2. Preserving at least a 20 foot landscape buffer along both 61st Street and Valmont Road (measured from the edge of right-of-way) to help preserve a sense of rural character. This should include vegetation to buffer the appearance of the site.
**INVENTORY RECORD**

**IMPORTANT**: COMPLETE THIS SHEET FOR EACH RESOURCE PLUS EITHER AN ARCHEOLOGICAL OR HISTORICAL/ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENT FORM.

### I. IDENTIFICATION
1. Resource No. **BL 471**
2. Temp. No. ]
3. Resource Name: Valmont Blacksmith Shop
4. Project Name: Boulder County Historical Site Survey
5. Category: Arch. Site, Hist./Archit. Structure
6. (For Arch. site) In a District: yes no X; Name NA

### II. LOCATION
7. Township LN; Range 70W; SW 1/4 of NE 1/4 of SW 1/4 of Section 22; P.M. sixth 8. County: Boulder
9. USGS QUAD: Niwot, Colorado; 7.5x15' Date 1967(71); Attach photocopy portion of Quad. Clearly show site. 10. Other maps NA
11. Dimensions 6EL x 7NS m 12. Area 42 sq.m (+4047 =) less than acre
13. UTM Reference: (One UTM centered on resource may be given for resource under 10 acres.)
   A. 111 29 870 [mE]; 4, 43, 1100 [mN]
   B. 111 [mE]; [mN]
   C. 111 [mE]; [mN]
   D. 111 [mE]; [mN]
14. Address: 6100 Valmont Road, east of Boulder Lot NA Block Addition

### III. MANAGEMENT DATA
15. Field Assessment: Eligible X Not Eligible Need Data
16. Owner/Address: Charles Christman, 6100 Valmont Road, Boulder, Colorado
17. Gov't Involvement: County State Federal Private ; Agency NA
18. Disturbance: none light moderate heavy total; Explain

### IV. THREATS TO RESOURCE
19. Water Erosion Wind Erosion Animal Activity Neglect Vandalism Recreation Construction; Comments NA

### V. MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
20. Management Recommendations NA

### V. REFERENCE
21. State/Fed. Permit Nos. NA
22. Photo Nos. BL25-20 on file at Colorado Historical Society Boulder Public Library
23. Report Title NA
24. Recorder: Manuel Weiss
25. Recording Date: 21 April 1981
26. Recorder Affiliation: Boulder County Historical Society Phone No. 441-3110

**Boulder County Parcel # 1463-224-00-015**
V. SKETCH MAP: Map all features and show the boundaries of the resources. Show all major topographic features, permanent modern features, and vegetation zones as appropriate. Give names of features, streets and addresses if known. Provide scale, key and direction. See attached aerial photograph. 600'-1", 1979

Scale:

Key:

N

True mag.

28) Location/Access: From Boulder (Canyon and Broadway) drive east on Canyon Boulevard 1.1 miles, turning north on 28th street 0.7 miles. Bear east on Valmont Road and drive 2.0 miles. The shop will appear on the north side of the road.

29) Boundary Description: NA

30) Boundary Justification: Limited to the extent of the structure.
ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORICAL COMPONENT FORM

IMPORTANT: USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE GREEN INVENTORY RECORD FORM FOR RECORDING HISTORIC STRUCTURES AND DISTRICTS. USE SEPARATELY FOR RECORDING STRUCTURES LOCATED WITHIN DISTRICT BOUNDARIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Resource No.</th>
<th>2) Temp No.</th>
<th>3) Name</th>
<th>4) Address</th>
<th>5) District Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-471</td>
<td></td>
<td>Valmont Blacksmith Shop</td>
<td>6042 Valmont Road, east of Boulder</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Resource No. 21-471  2) Temp No.  3) Name Valmont Blacksmith Shop  4) Address 6042 Valmont Road, east of Boulder  5) District Name NA

6) Condition:  
- Good  
- Fair  
- Deteriorated  

7) Original Use: blacksmith shop
8) Present Use: auto parts store

9) Original Site: Moved  
   Date(s) of Move:  
10) Unaltered  
    Altered  
    Explain: Rolled roofing has replaced cedar shakes in recent years. A new chimney and northwest addition have been built.

II. DESCRIPTION:  
11) Building Materials: wood
12) Construction Date: 1870's  
13) Architect/Builder: unknown
14) Architectural Style(s): vernacular

15) Special Features/Surroundings:
The simple, square shaped structure is built of shiplap pine with a gable roof. The building is presently surrounded by a car junkyard.

16) Archaeological Potential: Yes  No  Unknown  
    Explain:  

III. CULTURAL ACTIVITIES: Key the resource type (ie: house, barn, shed, school, church, etc) to the cultural activity theme and sub-theme category associated with it.

17) THEME: Commerce
18) SUB-THEME: Trades
19) TYPES: Blacksmith shop
IV. SIGNIFICANCE: Assess whether or not the resource has any historical or architectural merit by checking appropriate categories and justifying below. Include any relevant historical data.

20) Architectural Significance:
- Represents work of a master
- Possesses high artistic values
- Represents a type, period, or method of construction

21) Historical Significance:
- Associated with significant persons
- Associated with significant events or patterns
- Contributes to the significance of an historic district

In 1877, the town of Valmont, with a population of 100, could claim two blacksmith shops. It is thought that one of these establishments was purchased by Frank Polzin in 1906. Polzin soon expanded his trade to include the new horseless carriages, which were making their debut in the area. In 1933, his brother, William, took over the trade and operated the shop for ten more years.

The structure is the only commercial establishment at the once thriving community of Valmont to still retain its integrity as an historic site.

22) List Any Associated Cultural Group: NA

V. REFERENCES:

February 6th, 2012

Boulder County Land Use Department

2045 13th Street

Boulder, CO 80302

RE: Letter of Intended Use for 61st Street & Valmont Road

Dear Boulder County Land Use Department:

We would like to continue with the existing long term uses that have been allowed on this property which include car sales, auto recycling and used auto parts sales. We would also like to do improvements to this property including constructing a new building.

We enclosed a new ALTA/ACSM Land Survey Plat for this property. I penciled in where I would like to build a new shop. We understand that because of the 250’ setback for the Valmont Butte Natural Buffer Zone there is very little buildable area and we will need to go through “Special Use” and “Site Plan” reviews.

In December 2012 we purchased the property located at 3163 61st Street and 6095 Valmont Road, (the northwest corner of 61st and Valmont). Section 22, Township 1 North, Range 70 West. The property is composed of two parcels of land, Parcel A (described in deed recorded 9/21/1972 as Reception No. 036035) and Parcel B (described in deed recorded 9/21/1972 as Reception No. 036034). The property is within the County’s General Industrial zoning district.

Brief history for 61st and Valmont: This area was originally called Valmont City. Currently located on this 1.76 acre property is a 3100 sq. ft. auto repair shop that was built in 1901, a 1000 sq. ft. house that was built in 1959 and a 500 sq. ft. mobile home built in 1969. According to tax records (prior to 1949) James Stengel operated the “Valmont Garage” at this location until he sold it to the Christman’s in 1972. I have enclosed tax appraisal records with enclosed pictures documenting this. Prior to this it has been said that it was a blacksmith shop and prior to that it was a Wells Fargo stage stop.

In 1972 Debra and Charles Christman purchased parcel A from Glenn and Betty Martin and purchased Parcel B from James Stengel.

In 1972 Donna and Charles (hence the name “DC AUTO”) moved their licensed auto wrecking operation from 30th and Pearl onto this Valmont location. They were one of only a few licensed wrecking yards in Colorado; a special license is now no longer required in Colorado.
In the 80’s Donna and Charles changed their name to DC-Auto Sales and Parts to encompass their auto sales business

The Christman’s never lived in the house or mobile home but they continued to rent it out like the prior owners had done. In the later years one of the Christman children did rent it for a couple years. In December of 2012 the Christman’s had the current tenants move out prior to the sale to us.

After Charles Christman passed away in 2011 Doug Christman and Cindy Sullivan (son and daughter of Charles) continued with their auto repair, auto salvage, auto sales and parts sales up through January 2013.

We did perform an Environmental Phase 1 and Phase 2 site assessment prior to purchasing the property and we were delighted (and surprised) that it proved to be uncontaminated. We are in the process of continuing with cleaning up this property.

We are currently in the process of helping upgrade the Butte Mill Ditch that runs through the property by straightening their ditch, removing vegetation and installing a Class 3 48” and 42” reinforced concrete pipe. This was recommended by the Butte Mill Ditch President John Ellis and ditch rider Gene Sawhill.

We have been in discussions with Hal Donnelley (a long time Boulder engineer) regarding replacing the two existing septic tank/leach field systems. He believes that it would be best to abandon the two existing outdated systems and install just one larger more efficient system that would be able to handle the existing structures as well as our new proposed building. Hal will obtain all necessary permits from the County Health Department. We expect this to be done by September 2013.

Our current plan is to upgrade the exterior of the existing shop to make it look more “period correct” using appropriate colors and fixtures. We will obtain the necessary building permits to bring the structure up to current fire, health and safety standards as well as make the building more energy efficient and handicap accessible, but we will not be increasing the building footprint. Current plans would be to rent it out for an allowed general industrial use until a later date where we would use it as a sales office for car sales or recycled parts.

We intend to repaint the house and put a new roof on it and rent it to an employee.

We would like to replace the mobile home with a much newer and more energy efficient model because it would be more cost effective than repairing the current one. Replacing it with a newer unit would also improve the visual impact. We would then rent it to an employee.

We intend to store vehicles and parts in an organized and efficient fashion on this property

We also intend to obtain a building permit to construct a 12,000 to 20,000 square foot building (not to exceed a total of 25,000 sq. on the very far northwest corner of the property. This building would be built using the latest in energy efficient systems including solar panel roof systems. We will use this building for office space, auto repair, the dismantling of a Subaru’s, auto body and paint repair, the storage of parts in conjunction with the uses described above for the blacksmith building.
Please advise us as to the County Land Use Department staff's position on the uses described in this letter of intent. Thank you for your consideration.

Gary Chambers, Member, the Butte Blacksmith LLC

gary@superrepair.com

1309 Yarmouth Ave.
Boulder Co. 80304
970-531-2655
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OR TOWN</th>
<th>OWNER'S NAME AND ADDRESS:</th>
<th>Address of Property</th>
<th>INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James J. Stengel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Changes in Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>VOLUME</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>TYPE INSTRUMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Taxing Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FIRE</th>
<th>SANITARY</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Legal Description

Tr 724A 22-IN-70

### Land Value Adjustments

#### Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Number of Acres</th>
<th>Adjustment</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercantable Timber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals or Coal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RURAL LAND VALUE CALCULATION

#### Land Class | Acres | Unit Value | Total Value
--- | --- | --- | ---

#### Roads and Ditches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roads and Ditches</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Net Adjustments</th>
<th>Total Farm Land Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Summary

#### Description | Date | Amount
--- | --- | ---
| Original Cost (Improvements) | 19 | $ |
| Additions and Betterments | 19 | $ |
| Owner's Estimate of Value | 19 | $ |
| Private Appraisal Insurance | 19 | $ |
| Mortgages | 19 | $ |
| Advertised for Sale | 19 | $ |

### Summary of Values

#### Total Land Value

|---|---|---|

#### Total Buildings and Improvements: Total Land, Buildings and Improvements

| Date | Checked by |
|------|------------|-----------|
| 10/26/19 |           |

Measured by: 

Classified by: 

Date: 

Checked by: 

Date: 
August 19, 2015

Hannah Hippely  
Boulder County Land Use  
PO Box 471  
Boulder, CO  80306

Re: Chambers Special Use

Dear Hannah,

In preparation for your Docket Review Staff Meeting next week in which you will discuss the above-referenced special use application at Valmont Road and 61st Street, we would like to provide you with some feedback for your consideration. Based on discussions with you during your site visit on August 11, 2015 and review of the staff memo to the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee from Denise Grimm, the property owner would like to present the following adjustments to the application:

1. A 10 foot grass buffer will be added between the curb and parking lot adjacent to Valmont Road and 61st Street. This will result in a reduction of 9 parking spaces from the 21 parking spaces in the lot adjacent to 61st Street.
2. While the proposed building is well within the allowable 25,000 total square feet and 50 foot maximum height restrictions in the General Industrial zoning district, the building will be reduced in size by 10%.
3. Exterior lighting will be restricted to security lighting only after business hours (6:00 pm in winter and 6:30 pm in summer), to eliminate the typical ‘car-lot lighting’ that occurs in many car lots across the County.
4. The remodeling of the exterior of the blacksmith shop will be modified to eliminate the originally proposed false front and to replace the proposed siding with the original type wood siding.

These adjustments are in direct response to staff comments regarding intensity of use, maintaining the rural character and preserving the historical character of the blacksmith shop building. As you know, the area is not particularly ‘rural’ with semi-trucks running by all day long, concrete plants across the street and west on Valmont Road with many businesses to the west of that, and Keeter’s sand and gravel mining operation to the east of the subject property. In addition, the extensive mining of Valmont Butte across the street in the past that has created groundwater contamination issues in this area. This area has a long history of
industrial uses, and this property has been used for many years as a junk yard, auto repair and sales. The current property owner has committed significant resources to cleaning up the property and plans to continue the same high standard of clean operations he maintains at his current Subaru repair business north of Boulder.

Early on in this process, we invited staff and members of the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee to the site to discuss potential improvements to the blacksmith shop building, so that the appropriate preservation measures could be incorporated into the overall plan. Our recollection of the comments made by the committee members is somewhat different from staff’s reiteration, but the property owner is committed to maintaining as much historical integrity of the building as is possible. Unfortunately, the structure has been significantly modified and added on to over the years by previous owners with little regard to maintaining its historic character.

In summary, we believe the proposal is well within the parameters of the requirements specified in the Land Use Code for uses in the General Industrial zoning district and is in accordance with the approval standards for a special use review permit. This use will be an asset to the Valmont community and will continue to provide Boulder County residents with a much-needed service.

Thank you for your consideration, and please don’t hesitate to contact us if you have questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Rosi Dennett, AICP
Planning Consultant

Copy: Gary Chambers, Property Owner and Applicant
HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD

Thursday, August 6, 2015 – 6:00 p.m.

Third Floor Hearing Room
Boulder County Courthouse

STAFF PLANNER: Denise Grimm

Docket SU-14-0009: BUTTE BLACKSMITH LLC SU/SSDP

Request: Special Use and Site Specific Development Plan for multiple principal uses which generate over 150 average daily trips including a Vehicle Sales Lot, Vehicle Service Center, General Industrial (outdoor storage and recycling of junk vehicles), and a Single Family Dwelling. The application proposes to build an 11,700 sq. ft. building and earthwork in excess of 500 cubic yards.

Location: At 6095 Valmont Road, at the northwest corner of Valmont Road and N 61st Street, in Section 22, T1N, R70W.

Zoning: General Industrial (GI) Zoning District

Applicants: Gary and Debbie Chambers, Butte Blacksmith LLC

Agent: Rosi Dennett, Front Range Land Solutions

PURPOSE

The role of the Historic Preservation Advisory Board (HPAB) is to serve as a referral body to review and comment on development proposals which could affect historic properties eligible for landmark designation as determined by HPAB. First a determination should be made related to the eligibility of the property and then to review the proposed development in terms of its effect on the eligible resources.

BACKGROUND

Staff has received an application for a Special Use and Site Specific Development Plan for multiple principal uses which generate over 150 average daily trips including a Vehicle Sales Lot, a Vehicle Service Center, a General Industrial (outdoor storage and recycling of junk vehicles), and a Single Family Dwelling. The application proposes to build an 11,700 sq. ft. building and earthwork in excess of 500 cubic yards. It also proposes to pave most of the property up to the lot lines.

The historic Valmont Blacksmith Shop is situated on the parcel and alterations to it are included in the proposal. An historic site survey was completed on the Valmont Blacksmith Shop in 1981. The survey lists a construction date of the 1870s and notes, “The structure is the only commercial establishment at the once thriving community of Valmont to still retain its integrity as an historic site.” County Assessor records date the structure to 1900 but county construction dates are not always correct. The historic shop has been modified over the years, most significantly by an addition.
to the west. The façade of the blacksmith shop has also been altered with the loss of the historic bay door and windows on the right, the addition of a single door and a small window, as well as different siding. However, despite the additions and reconfiguration of doors and windows, the original form of the blacksmith shop is still evident and includes an historic window on the left side of the façade.

On March 8, 2013, a subcommittee of the HPAB conducted a site visit of the property. They agreed that the blacksmith building was important and should be preserved.

As mentioned above, the proposal includes alterations to the blacksmith shop. The narrative states, “the proposed exterior treatments of the existing and new structures are in keeping with the historical character of the blacksmith shop era,” however, the drawings of the proposed alterations show further modifications to the shop including the loss of the historic window and the addition of a false front and vertical siding.

SIGNIFICANCE

The property qualifies for landmark designation under Criterion 1.

Criteria 15-501(A)(1) The character, interest, or value of the proposed landmark is part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the county;

The property is significant for its association with the early development of Valmont.

DISCUSSION

The proposal radically changes the site and the structure. While the zoning of the property is General Industrial, the neighborhood has maintained a sense of rural character and has not been developed to the level of intensity of similar properties in the city. The level of paving and development is over intensive for the site.

While they are proposing to retain the historic Blacksmith Shop, they are proposing to further negatively impact its historic character by adding a false front and siding.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the HPAB finds the historic blacksmith building at 6095 Valmont to be eligible for landmark status.

Staff also recommends that the HPAB recommend denial of SU-14-0009: BUTTE BLACKSMITH LLC SU/SSDP. If Planning Commission and the County Commissioners do approve the docket we would ask for the following conditions to be met:

1. Landmarking the blacksmith shop building and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for any modifications to the building. These should be more sensitive to the historic nature of the building. This would include, but aren’t limited to preserving the original materials where possible, using the same style of siding and materials instead of introducing new materials and maintaining or reestablishing original openings.
2. Preserving at least a 20 foot landscape buffer along both 61st Street and Valmont Road to help preserve a sense of rural character.
MEMO TO: Agencies  
FROM: Hannah Hippely, Senior Planner  
DATE: July 13, 2015  
RE: Docket SU-14-0009

Docket SU-14-0009: BUTTE BLACKSMITH LLC SU/SSDP  
Request: Special Use and Site Specific Development Plan for multiple principal uses which generate over150 average daily trips including a Vehicle Sales Lot, Vehicle Service Center, General Industrial (outdoor storage and recycling of junk vehicles), and a Single Family Dwelling. The application proposes to build an 11,700 sq. ft. building and earthwork in excess of 500 cubic yards.  
Location: At 6095 Valmont Road, at the northwest corner of Valmont Road and N 61st Street, in Section 22, T1N, R70W.  
Zoning: General Industrial (GI) Zoning District  
Applicants: Gary and Debbie Chambers, Butte Blacksmith LLC  
Agent: Rosi Dennett, Front Range Land Solutions

Special Use Review / Site Specific Development Plan is required of uses which may have greater impacts on services, neighborhoods, or environment than those allowed with only Building Permit Review. This process will review compatibility, services, environmental impacts, and proposed site plan.

This process includes public hearings before the Boulder County Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners. Adjacent property owners and holders of liens, mortgages, easements or other rights in the subject property are notified of these hearings.

The Land Use staff, Planning Commission, and County Commissioners value comments from individuals and referral agencies. Please check the appropriate response below or send a letter. Late responses will be reviewed as the process permits; all comments will be made part of the public record and given to the applicant. Only a portion of the submitted documents may have been enclosed; you are welcome to review the entire file at the Land Use Department, 13th and Spruce, Boulder. If you have any questions regarding this application, please contact the Land Use Department office at (303) 441-3930 or via email at hhippely@bouldercounty.org.

Please return responses to the above address by August 17, 2015.

____ We have reviewed the proposal and have no conflicts.
____ Letter is enclosed.

Signed _________________________________ PRINTED Name____________________________
Agency or Address _________________________________________________________________

Please note that all Land Use Department property owner’s mailing lists and parcel maps are generated from the records maintained by the County Assessor and Treasurer Office. We are required to use this list to send notices to the “property owner” of land in Boulder County. If you feel that you should not be considered a “property owner,” or if the mailing address used is incorrect, please contact the County Assessor’s Office at (303) 441-3530.
Application Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Application Deadline</td>
<td>Application Deadline: First Wednesday of the Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Limited Impact Special Use</td>
<td>□ Sketch Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Limited Impact Special Use Waiver</td>
<td>□ Preliminary Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Site Plan Review</td>
<td>□ Final Plat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Site Plan Review Waiver</td>
<td>□ Resubdivision (Replat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Subdivision Exemption</td>
<td>□ Special Use/SSDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Exemption Plat</td>
<td>□ Rezoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 1041 State Interest Review</td>
<td>□ Road/Alignment Vacation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other:</td>
<td>□ Location and Extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location(s)/Street Address(es):</td>
<td>□ Road Name Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6095 VALMONT ROAD, NORTHWEST CORNER OF VALMONT ROAD + NORTH 61ST STREET

Subdivision Name

Lot(s) | Block(s) | Section(s) | Township(s) | Range(s) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>70 W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area in Acres | Existing Zoning | Existing Use of Property | Proposed Water Supply | Proposed Sewage Disposal Method |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL / RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>WELL</td>
<td>SEPTIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicants:

Applicant/Property Owner

GARY & DEBBIE CHAMBERS, BUTTE BLACKSMITH LLC  GARY@SCHURRUPAIR.COM

Mailing Address

1309 YARMOUTH AVE.

City | State | Zip Code | Phone | Email Address |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOULDER</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>80304</td>
<td>970-531-2655</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GARY@SCHURRUPAIR.COM">GARY@SCHURRUPAIR.COM</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicant/Property Owner/Agent/Consultant

Mailing Address

210 LINCOLN STREET

City | State | Zip Code | Phone | Email Address |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LONGMONT</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>80501</td>
<td>303-682-9729</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ROSI@FRASERLANDSOLUTIONS.COM">ROSI@FRASERLANDSOLUTIONS.COM</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certification (Please refer to the Regulations and Application Submittal Package for complete application requirements.)

I certify that I am signing this Application Form as an owner of record of the property included in the Application. I certify that the information and exhibits I have submitted are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that all materials required by Boulder County must be submitted prior to having this matter processed. I understand that public hearings or meetings may be required. I understand that I must sign an Agreement of Payment for Application processing fees, and that additional fees or materials may be required as a result of considerations which may arise in the processing of this docket. I understand that the road, school, and park dedications may be required as a condition of approval.

I understand that I am consenting to allow the County Staff involved in this application or their designees to enter onto and inspect the subject property at any reasonable time, without obtaining any prior consent.

All landowners are required to sign application. If additional space is needed, attach additional sheet signed and dated.

Signature of Property Owner

Date

Signature of Property Owner

Date

The Land Use Director may waive the landowner signature requirement for good cause, under the applicable provisions of the Land Use Code.

Form: P/01 • Rev. 01.14.13 • g://publications/planning/P01PlanningApplicationForm.pdf
The user agrees to all Terms of Use set forth by Boulder County. For Terms of Use, please visit: www.bouldercounty.org/mapdisclaimer
BUTTE BLACKSMITH LLC
Special Use

DEVELOPMENT REPORT

March 11, 2015

Applicant/Property Owner:
Gary and Debbie Chambers
Butte Blacksmith LLC
1309 Yarmouth Ave.
Boulder, CO  80304
gary@superrupair.com

Prepared by:
Rosi Dennett, AICP
Front Range Land Solutions
210 Lincoln Street
Longmont, CO  80501
303-682-9729
rosidennett@gmail.com
DEVELOPMENT REPORT

This report is written to correspond to the application submittal requirements in Section 3 and the special use requirements in Section 4-600 of the Boulder County Land Use Code.

Background

Butte Blacksmith LLC is the current owner of the property at 6095 Valmont Road located at the northwest corner of Valmont Road and North 61st Street in the Southeast Quarter of Section 22, Township 1 North, Range 70 West in Boulder County.

The subject property is located within Boulder County’s General Industrial zoning district which allows for auto repair and sales uses by right. The property consists of approximately 1.7 acres and has a long history of car sales, auto recycling, auto repair, new and used auto parts sales and residential uses.

The existing single-story shop of approximately 2,280 square feet is located in the southwest corner of the property and was built in the 1800s. The original wood-frame building was used as a stage coach stop and later as a blacksmith shop. With the advent of the automobiles, the blacksmith shop became Valmont Garage and several wood-frame/metal additions have been constructed over the years. The automotive repair shop was operated by James Stengel and is documented in a 1949 tax record. In 1972, Charles Christman moved his auto wrecking yard from 30th and Pearl Streets in Boulder to this location, and it was called DC Auto Parts and Sales.

The existing single-story residence of approximately 900 square feet is located in the eastern portion of the property and has been consistently occupied for years as a residence. An existing mobile home of approximately 530 square feet is located in the northeast corner of the property and has also been historically occupied as a residence.

The subject property is relatively flat with the Butte Mill Ditch traversing the property from west to east in a buried pipe. The northern property line is bordered by the old Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way (now owned by RTD), with North 61st Street on the eastern property line and Valmont Road along the southern property line. The property is surrounded by industrial and residential uses with Valmont Butte and Martin Marietta Materials’ aggregate business to the
south, residential and railroad car storage to the west, RTD and residential to the
north, and Boulder Ready Mix’s batch plant to the east.

County Comprehensive Plan designations on the subject property include the
buffer area for the Valmont Dike Natural Landmark and Natural Area (located
south of the subject property) and a Minor Geologic Constraint Area with Nominal
Geologic Risk.

Proposal Description

This is a request for approval of a special use for multiple principal uses that
collectively generate more than 200 Average Daily Trips as is required in the
General Industrial zoning district. In addition, more than 500 cubic yards of
material will be necessary to move as part of the grading plan to insure proper
drainage.

The proposed uses include Subaru automobile repair, recycling and sales of
used Subaru’s, parts storage and sales, and housing for the owners. The
existing shop will be upgraded with exterior improvements consistent with the
look of the early 1900s and will be used for parts storage and sales. The existing
dwelling will be upgraded to accommodate sales office space for the used cars.
The existing mobile home will be removed from the property.

The proposal includes construction of a new building of approximately 11,700
square feet located at the back of the property and behind the existing shop to
house the dismantling and repairing of automobiles. A residential unit will be
located in the upper floor of the building for the property owners. The building
will be constructed with energy efficient systems including roof mounted solar
panels. The exterior of the building will compliment the historic appearance of
the existing shop. A 6 foot-tall, wood privacy fence will screen the car storage
area as shown on the attached site plan. In addition, elevation drawings and
floor plans of the building and photo of the fence are attached.

Approximately 25% of the proposed use of the subject property will be for the
short-term storage and recycling of used Subaru’s. Used Subaru’s will be
purchased and either refurbished for resale or disassembled for parts. The
leftover shells and parts are hauled offsite to a metal recycler for the remaining
materials. The use is not a salvage yard with long-term storage of inoperable
vehicles. It is a recycling business. From January 2013 through December
2014, the applicant’s business in north Boulder has delivered and sold 283
stripped down Subaru’s to J & B Auto Crush located in North Denver. That
business crushes the Subaru’s. They are then melted down and reused to make
new products such as new Subaru’s. A photo of the existing Subaru business in
north Boulder demonstrates the neat and well-kept appearance of the business.
 Approximately 80% of the recycled Subaru parts inventory will be sold wholesale and 20% will be sold retail. Parts sold locally from Fort Collins to Denver will be delivered directly. Parts sold outside of the metro area will be shipped. The outdoor storage of parts and vehicles to be recycled will be located behind the privacy fence and will not be visible from public roads or adjacent properties.

The car sales lot for used Subaru’s will be located along Valmont Road and 61st Street, as shown on the Site Plan. The sales lot is broken up into two pods; one pod adjacent to Valmont Road with parking spaces to accommodate up to 48 vehicles and the other with 12 spaces. Customer parking is located in two areas; adjacent to the sales office on Valmont Road and in the northeast corner of the property off North 61st Street. Employee parking is located between the privacy fence and the new building.

New plantings will be located throughout the property including a mixture of deciduous and evergreen trees and bushes and shrubs as shown on the landscape plan. Specifically, the six existing deciduous trees near the existing house will remain and four 8 ft.-tall blue spruce trees will be planted along the perimeter of the property, and four 3 inch-caliper linden trees and three 8 ft.-tall blue spruce trees will be planted along the privacy fence that will screen the new shop.

Outdoor lighting will be minimized to consist of only what is necessary for safety purposes, and all light fixtures will be cutoff, down-casting fixtures in accordance with the County Land Use Code. The locations of wall-mounted and pole-mounted lights are indicated on the site plan.

A maximum of 17 employees will be located on the property, along with the two owners living in the residential unit. Five employees are needed for the sales use and twelve employees for the dismantling and repair use.

Construction and development funds are available to complete the proposed improvements in one phase with plans to commence construction immediately upon completion of the required County review processes.

**Water & Sewer**

The site and all structures will be served by a new commercial well permitted by the State Engineer’s Office and a County Public Health permitted individual septic system. The new commercial well permit (see attached application documents) has been approved by the State Engineer and will be constructed in accordance with State requirements. A new septic system has been designed (see attached letter from engineer Hal Donnelly) and will be reviewed by the County Public Health Department. The new septic system will be located in the northeast corner of the property as shown on the attached site plan. All required permits will be obtained prior to commencement of operations.
Access, Traffic & Parking

The existing access off Valmont Road will continue to be the primary access for the parts storage and sales building, and the existing 61st Street access will be the primary access for the auto body and repair use and residential unit as shown on the attached site plan.

The attached traffic analysis conducted by Matt Delich (a traffic engineer) indicates the proposed use will have minimal transportation impacts on Valmont Road, and no turn lanes are warranted.

The proposed parking plan, as shown on the attached site plan, is divided into multiple parking areas to minimize visual impacts and includes parking for staff and the public as well as spaces for the used car sales. Specifically, customer parking includes 3 parking spaces in front of the existing sales office building off Valmont Road and 9 spaces in the northeast corner of the property off North 61st Street. Employee parking consisting of 18 spaces is located south of the new building and behind the privacy fence (with access off North 61st Street). The remaining parking spaces shown on the site plan are divided into two areas for the used Subaru car sales; one with 46 spaces along Valmont Road and the other with 12 spaces along North 61st Street.

The parking lots and driveways will be paved asphalt, and the storage area behind the privacy fence will be gravel (as shown on the site plan). Curb and gutters are also indicated on the site plan.

Drainage and Grading

Existing drainage patterns are shown on the Preliminary Grading, Drainage and Erosion Control Plan prepared by Scott, Cox & Associates, Inc. The site generally slopes from the southwest to northeast at grades between 2% to 10%. The property drains via overland flow into the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way, ultimately being conveyed into the roadside drainage swale along the west side of 61st Street.

The proposed grades vary and are typically between 2% and 5% in the parking and drive aisles. Positive drainage will be provided around the proposed buildings. The maximum proposed slope for grading associated with the parking improvements is 2:1. A proposed concrete drain pan will convey drainage through the parking lot and across the driveway. The existing and proposed on-site drainage flow patterns are shown on the previously referenced plans. The plans show that the proposed drainage will be similar to the historic drainage patterns at the site.
The proposed grading will require approximately 200 cubic yards of cut and 1,650 cubic yards of fill (see grading calculations and letter prepared by Scott, Cox & Associates, Inc.).

Section 3-203.F Development Report Standards

a. Address list of adjacent property owners

The adjacent property owners are as follows:
To the south: Martin Marietta Materials Inc.
5959 Valmont Drive
Boulder, CO 80301

To the west: Veronica & Victoria Ibarra
6033 Valmont Road
Boulder, CO 80301

To the east: Boulder Ready Mix
3180 61st Street
Boulder, CO 80301

To the north: RTD
1600 Blake Street
Denver, CO 80202

b. Description of site features

The site is relatively flat with a gentle slope from the southwest to the northeast. No streams or lakes are located on or adjacent to the property, but Boulder Creek is located ¼ to ½ mile north of the property. Butte Mill Ditch traverses the property from west to east in an underground pipeline as indicated on the site plan. The sparse vegetative cover, a result of years of industrial uses, includes several cottonwood trees along the ditch corridor and a few trees adjacent to the existing structures.

c. Soil characteristics

According to the Soil Survey of the Boulder County Area by the United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service, the soils on this property are classified as Loveland soils. These soils are moderate: clay loam or sandy clay loam surface layer with moderate to low shrink-swell potential. Loveland soils have a water table depth at 2 to 4 feet.
d. **Flora and Fauna**

The subject property has been significantly disturbed over the years with periodic grading and years of outdoor storage of vehicles and salvage materials. The years of site disturbance have resulted in weedy plant species being introduced to the site and the crowding out of any native vegetation (which likely would have been mainly Blue Grama grass). The proposed landscape plan includes maintaining the six existing deciduous trees (a 26 inch-caliper crab apple tree, a 16 inch pear tree, a 24 inch apple tree, two 6 inch ash trees, and a 10 inch ash tree) and adding seven 8 ft.-tall blue spruce trees and four 3 inch-caliper linden trees. Surface areas not included in the parking areas and roadways will be planted in native grasses. No significant environmental resources are identified in the County Comprehensive Plan on the site with the exception of being in the buffer area of the Valmont Dike Natural Landmark and Area which lies to the south of the property on the south side of Valmont Road.

e. **Cultural Resources**

A possible archaeological travel route follows Boulder Creek approximately ¼ to ½ mile north of the subject property, but no significant archaeological resources are identified in the County Comprehensive Plan on this site. While the existing shop in the southwest corner of the property has an historical beginning as a stage coach stop and later a blacksmith shop, years of additions and neglect have significantly compromised the historical value of the structure. This was confirmed with a visit to the site by the County’s historical planner and two members of the County’s Historical Preservation Advisory Board. However, the proposed exterior treatments of the existing and new structures are in keeping with the historical character of the blacksmith shop era.

f. **Potential Radiation Hazard**

No known radiation hazards have been identified by the State or County Public Health Departments, but hazard mitigation measures will be taken if deemed necessary.

g. **Service Abilities**

No service providers have indicated a problem with the ability to serve this development. All required permits will be obtained by the appropriate agencies prior to commencement of operations.

h. **Financial Guarantees**

If the provision of financial guarantees is warranted for any of the proposed improvements, a bank-approved letter of credit will be provided as an attachment to the development agreement.
Section 4-602 Special Use Standards and Conditions

(1)  Except as otherwise noted, the use will comply with the minimum zoning requirements of the zoning district in which the use is to be established, and will also comply with all other applicable requirements;

The proposal will comply with the applicable sections of the County Land Use Code. The proposed uses are allowed in the General Industrial zoning district, and the new structure will meet the bulk requirements (such as setbacks and maximum building height). The existing buildings are located within the current road setbacks but are in compliance with the County’s nonconforming requirements. The existing buildings are only being upgraded, not expanded in square footage.

(2)  Will be in harmony with the character of the neighborhood and compatible with the surrounding area;

The proposed use will be in harmony with the mixture of industrial and residential uses along Valmont Road. The new shop will be located behind the existing shop and its low-profile design and exterior treatments will compliment the updated historical character of the existing shop. Visual impacts from public roads will be minimized by screening the recycling business with a privacy fence and trees.

(3)  Will be in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan;

The property is located within the Valmont Dike Natural Landmark buffer area, and the Comprehensive Plan identifies the single criterion for consideration of an area for Natural Landmark status is its visual and scenic prominence as a landscape feature. The proposed new structure will be located behind the existing shop building and at the farthest reach of the property and away from the Valmont Butte. The proposed improvements to the exterior of the existing buildings and other site improvements will increase the aesthetic value of the property which has been in a somewhat blighted state for many years.

(4)  Will not result in an over-intensive use of land or excessive depletion of natural resources;

The proposed use is consistent with the historical industrial use of the property, and the improvements are appropriately sized for properties located within the General Industrial zoning district.
(5) Will not have a material adverse effect on community capital improvement programs;

No community capital improvement programs will be affected by this proposal.

(6) Will not require a level of community facilities and services greater than that which is available;

The proposed well and septic service will not require greater community facilities and services, and all necessary permits will be acquired prior to commencement of operations.

(7) Will not result in undue traffic congestion or traffic hazards;

As described in the attached traffic analysis, the proposed use will not create undue traffic congestion or traffic hazards.

(8) Will not cause significant air, odor, water, or noise pollution;

The existing use does not create significant pollution. All outdoor lighting will be shielded with down-casting fixtures.

(9) Will not require amendment to the Regional Clean Water Plan;

The proposal will not require an amendment to the Regional Clean Water Plan.

(10) Will be adequately landscaped, buffered, and screened;

As previously stated, the existing structures will be upgraded and the shop buildings will have exterior treatments to compliment the historic era of the original blacksmith shop. The new building is located at the farthest reach of the property away from the public roads and behind the existing buildings. The low profile of the new building also minimizes visual impacts, and new plantings of trees and shrubs will be added throughout the property to break up the mass of the buildings. The automobile storage area for the dismantling and automobile repair use will be screened from public view with a 6-foot tall privacy fence.

(11) Will not otherwise be detrimental to the health, safety, or welfare of the present or future inhabitants of Boulder County.

Benefits to present and future residents of the County include additional jobs, increased tax revenue, promotion of recycling activities and provision
of much needed services for Subaru owners. The surrounding land owners and general public will appreciate the overall improved appearance of the existing property.
CONSULTANTS

Civil Engineer: Don Ash, PE
Scott, Cox & Associates, Inc.
1530 55th Street
Boulder, CO 80303
303-444-3051

Traffic Engineer: Matt Delich, PE
Delich Associates
2272 Glen Haven Drive
Loveland, CO 80538
970-669-2061
matt@delichassoc.com

Wastewater Engineer: Harold E. Donnelly, PE
4904 Prebles Place
Broomfield, CO 80023
303-926-5455

Wastewater Specialist: Joe Bath
2285 Brehm Road
Berthoud, CO 80513
303-859-5768
Jbath1150@gmail.com

Attorney: Joseph C. French
French & Stone, PC
2960 Diagonal Highway, #207
Boulder, CO 80301
303-449-3891
jcfrench@fsmlaw.com

Planner: Rosi Dennett, AICP
Front Range Land Solutions
210 Lincoln Street
Longmont, CO 80501
303-682-9729
rosidennett@gmail.com
December 12, 2014

Mr. Gary Chambers
6095 Valmont LLC
1309 Yarmouth Avenue
Boulder, CO 80304

Reference: 6095 Valmont Road – Boulder County, Colorado
Scott, Cox & Associates Inc. Project No. 13355B

Dear Mr. Chambers:

Scott, Cox & Associates, Inc. (SCA) performed cut and fill volume calculations for the grading improvements associated with the proposed commercial development located at 6095 Valmont Road in Boulder County, Colorado. These calculations are based on the site plans provided by you and the Grading, Drainage and Erosion Control Plan prepared by SCA.

Our calculations show the proposed site improvements will require approximately 200 cubic yards of cut and 1,650 cubic yards of fill. This earthwork volume does not include the exempt earthwork up to ten feet around the perimeter of the building foundations or the road base material for the proposed driveway. In accordance with Boulder County’s “Earthwork and Grading” Standards, the total estimated quantity of qualified material to be moved is 1,850 cubic yards.

Our calculations show all of the building foundation excavation and associated incidental backfill will require approximately 10 cubic yards of cut and 650 cubic yards of fill. This earthwork volume includes the non-exempt earthwork up to ten feet around the perimeter of the building foundations. Based on the County’s “Earthwork and Grading” Standards, the total estimated quantity of foundation material to be moved is 660 cubic yards.

The proposed driveway road base is also exempt per the Boulder County Standards.

Autodesk Civil 3D 2015 computer software was utilized to perform the cut and fill calculations.
Mr. Gary Chambers
6095 Valmont LLC
December 12, 2014
Page 2 of 2

Should you have any questions or comments, kindly give us a call.

Sincerely,

SCOTT, COX & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Donald P. Ash, P.E.
Chief Civil Engineer

Enclosures: Boulder County SPR Fact Sheet
Grading Calculation
Cut and fill calculations are necessary to evaluate the disturbance of a project and to verify whether or not a Limited Impact Special Review (LISR) is required. A LISR is required when grading for a project involves more than 500 cubic yards (minus normal cut/fill and backfill contained within the foundation footprint).
If grading totals are close to the 500 yard trigger, additional information may be required, such as a grading plan stamped by a Colorado Registered Professional Engineer.

Earth Work and Grading
This worksheet is to help you accurately determine the amount of grading for the property in accordance with the Boulder County Land Use Code. Please fill in all applicable boxes.
Note: Applicant(s) must fill in the shaded boxes even though foundation work does not contribute toward the 500 cubic yard trigger requiring Limited Impact Special Use Review. Also, all areas of earthwork must be represented on the site plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driveway and Parking Areas</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Fill</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 CY</td>
<td>1650 CY</td>
<td>1850 CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Berm(s)</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Fill</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 CY</td>
<td>0 CY</td>
<td>0 CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Grading</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Fill</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 CY</td>
<td>0 CY</td>
<td>0 CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Fill</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 CY</td>
<td>1650 CY</td>
<td>1850 CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If the total in Box 1 is greater than 500 cubic yards, then a Limited Impact Special Review is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Fill</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 CY</td>
<td>650 CY</td>
<td>660 CY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material cut from foundation excavation to be removed from the property: 0 CY

Excess Material will be Transported to the Following Location:

Excess Material Transport Location:
N/A

Narrative
Use this space to describe any special circumstances that you feel the Land Use Office should be aware of when reviewing your application, including discussion regarding any factors (listed in Article 4-806.2.b.i) used to demonstrate that the presumptive size limitation does not adequately address the size compatibility of the proposed development with the defined neighborhood. If more room is needed, feel free to attach a separate sheet.

Is Your Property Gated and Locked?
Note: If county personnel cannot access the property, then it could cause delays in reviewing your application.

Certification
I certify that the information submitted is complete and correct. I agree to clearly identify the property (if not already addressed) and stake the location of the improvements on the site within four days of submitting this application. I understand that the intent of the Site Plan Review process is to address the impacts of location and type of structures, and that modifications may be required. Site work will not be done prior to issuance of a Grading or Building Permit.

Signature
Date 12/12/14

Form: SPR/04 • Rev. 12.13.10 • g:/publications/spr/SPR04SitePlanReviewFactSheet.pdf
OFFICE OF THE STATE ENGINEER
COLORADO DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES
610 Centennial Blvd., 1313 Sherman St., Denver, Colorado 80203
(303) 866-3581

WELL PERMIT NUMBER 296617 - A
DIV. 1 WD 5 DES. BASIN MD

APPLICANT
BUTTE BLACKSMITH LLC
GARY CHAMBERS
1309 YARMOUTH AVENUE
BOULDER, CO 80304

APPROVED WELL LOCATION
BOULDER COUNTY
SW 1/4 SE 1/4 Section 22
Township 1 N Range 70 W Sixth P.M.

DISTANCES FROM SECTION LINES
Ft. from Section Line
Ft. from Section Line

UTM COORDINATES (Meters Zone: 13 NAD83)
Easting: Northing:

PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A WELL

ISSUANCE OF THIS PERMIT DOES NOT CONFER A WATER RIGHT

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1) This well shall be used in such a way as to cause no material injury to existing water rights. The issuance of this permit does not ensure that no injury will occur to another vested water right or preclude another owner of a vested water right from seeking relief in a civil court action.

2) The construction of this well shall be in compliance with the Water Well Construction Rules 2 CCR 402-2, unless approval of a variance has been granted by the State Board of Examiners of Water Well Construction and Pump Installation Contractors in accordance with Rule 18.

3) Approved pursuant to CRS 37-92-602(3)(c) for the relocation of an existing well, permit no. 296617. The old well must be plugged in accordance with Rule 16 of the Water Well Construction Rules within ninety-one (91) days of completion of the new well. The enclosed Well Abandonment Report form must be completed and submitted to affirm that the old well was plugged.

4) The use of ground water from this well is limited to drinking and sanitary facilities as described in CRS 37-92-602(1)(c), for a commercial business. Water from this well shall not be used for lawn/landscape/greenhouse irrigation, domestic animal/livestock watering, or for any other purpose outside the business building structure(s).

5) Approved as the only well providing water to this business, which is on a 1.7 acre parcel, described as that portion of the SW 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of Section 22, Township 1 North, Range 70 West of the 6th P.M., Boulder County, reference attached exhibit A.

6) The pumping rate of this well shall not exceed 15 GPM.

7) The annual amount of ground water to be appropriated shall not exceed one (1) acre-foot (325,900 gallons).

8) The return flow from the use of this well must be through an individual waste water disposal system of the non-evaporative type where the water is returned to the same stream system in which the well is located.

9) A totalizing flow meter must be installed on this well and maintained in good working order. Permanent records of all diversions must be maintained by the well owner (recorded at least annually) and submitted to the Division Engineer upon request.

10) Pursuant to Rule 6.2.3 of the Water Well Construction Rules, the well construction contractor shall submit the as-built well location on work reports required by Rule 17.3 within 60 days of completion of the well. The measured location must be accurate to 200 feet of the actual location. The location information must include a GPS location (UTM coordinates) pursuant to the Division of Water Resources’ guidelines.

NOTE: This permit will expire on the expiration date unless the well is constructed by that date. A Well Construction and Test Report (GWS-31) must be submitted to the Division of Water Resources to verify the well has been constructed. An extension of the expiration date may be available. Contact the DWR for additional information or refer to the extension request form (GWS-64) available at: http://www.water.state.co.us

APPROVED
SMJ
State Engineer

Receipt No. 3667561B DATE ISSUED 12-30-2014 EXPIRATION DATE 12-30-2016
WELL PERMIT NUMBER 296617
DIV. 1 WD 5 DES. BASIN MD

APPLICANT

BUTTE BLACKSMITH LLC
GARY CHAMBERS
1309 YARMOUTH AVENUE
BOULDER, CO 80304-

(970) 531-2655

APPROVED WELL LOCATION
BOULDER COUNTY
SW 1/4 SE 1/4 Section 22
Township 1 N Range 70 W Sixth P.M

DISTANCES FROM SECTION LINES
993 Ft. from South Section Line
1640 Ft. from East Section Line

UTM COORDINATES (Meters Zone:13,NAD83)
Easting: 481863 Northing: 4431315

REGISTRATION OF EXISTING WELL

ISSUANCE OF THIS PERMIT DOES NOT CONFER A WATER RIGHT

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1) This well shall be used in such a way as to cause no material injury to existing water rights. The issuance of this permit does not ensure that no injury will occur to another vested water right or preclude another owner of a vested water right from seeking relief in a civil court action.

2) Construction details for this existing well have not been provided to this office; therefore, it is not known if the construction of this well is in compliance with the Water Well Construction Rules, 2 CCR 402-2. The issuance of this permit does not relieve the well owner of responsibility or liability in the event contamination of the groundwater source results from the construction or use of this well, nor does the State Engineer assume any responsibility or liability should contamination occur.

3) Recorded pursuant to CRS 37-92-602(5), and the policy of the State Engineer, for historical use as indicated herein. This well produces 15 GPM, and is used for drinking and sanitary facilities as described in CRS 37-92-602(1)(c), in an individual commercial business. Water from this well shall not be used for lawn/landscape/greenhouse irrigation, domestic animal/livestock watering, or any other purpose outside the business building structure(s).

4) Approved as the only well providing water to this business, which is on a 1.7 acre parcel, described as that portion of the SW 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of Section 22, Township 1 North, Range 70 west of the 6th P.M., Boulder County, reference attached exhibit A.

5) The annual amount of ground water to be appropriated shall not exceed one (1) acre-foot (325,900 gallons).

6) The date of first beneficial use, as claimed by the applicant, is January 1, 1910.

7) The return flow from this well must be through an individual waste water disposal system of the non-evaporative type where the water is returned to the same stream system in which the well is located.

8) A totalizing flow meter must be installed on this well and maintained in good working order. Permanent records of all diversions must be maintained by the well owner (recorded at least annually) and submitted to the Division Engineer upon request.

APPROVED
SMJ

State Engineer

Receipt No. 3667561A DATE ISSUED 12-30-2014

By EXPIRATION DATE
Joe Malenoski, OWTS Manager  
Boulder County Environmental Health Division  
Boulder, CO 80302

November 25, 2014

Re: Enclosed is the proposed design of an OWS for Gary Chambers, Subarupair, 6095 Valmont Rd., located in the SE ¼ of Section 22, T1N, R70W, Boulder County Colorado.

I have reviewed the information furnished to me by the owner and I have consulted with Joe Bath, Professional Geologist, an Approved Systems Inspector.

The proposed OWS for this site would consist of a 2000 gallon, two-compartment septic tank (48 hours detention) with discharge into a pressure dosed, raised sand filter absorpption bed utilizing leaching chambers. The leaching chambers will be covered with a minimum of 10 inches of sandy loam and fenced off to prevent parking or driving over the area. Ground water is lower south of the railroad tracks than has been encountered north of the railroad tracks. All floor drains, hand washing and parts washing sinks in the building shall be discharged into a 2500 gallon, sealed vault with an additional 2500 gallon sealed vault backup. Both vaults will have audio and visual alarms installed.

Harold E. Donnelly
PE-LS 7134

Enclosures: Projected maximum number of employees on site.

Copy: Joe Bath, Professional Geologist and Certified Systems Inspector
Gary Chambers, owner
APPLICANT'S EXISTING BUSINESS IN NORTH BOULDER
PROPOSED 6' PRIVACY FENCE
6095 Valmont Rd
Butte Blacksmith LLC.
Gary Chambers

Landscape Plan

Grass

Proposed 244' x 48' shop

24' Wide driveway

6 Foot tall privacy screen

Existing house

Grass Lawn

Existing shop

Valmont Road

Grass lawn

61st Street

1" = 20'

A = Existing 24" Apple Tree
B = Existing 26" Crab Apple Tree
C = Existing 6", 6", & 10" Ash Tree Cluster
D = 3" Linden Tree
E = 8' Blue Spruce Tree
F = Mature Lilac Bush
H = Assorted Bushes
I = Existing 16" Pear Tree
J = Existing 30" Maple Tree
Wow, quite the change in use proposed at 6095 Valmont Rd. I’ve frequented D.C. Auto beginning in ’76-’79 when I owned a small Conoco station at Broadway and Kalmia St., and since then till they closed. It was never a very active enterprise. I’ve been a neighbor here since 1998 and one would not even know if they were open unless you stopped in.

This proposal is way more than any prior use and occupation. The increased traffic and night lighting will be substantially more than before. There weren’t any lights at night there. The current dark night skies will be compromised by security lights.

Incidentally, the property at 6033 Valmont Rd. was denied an addition to the house back when Valmont Rd. was widened, even though it had no effect on the road project. Set back variance was the issue. Docket VAR-01-04 Wilson Variance. Zoned Agricultural it required 110’ from center line of road.

Also, in 2004 the owner of 6003 Indian Rd. requested to build a 3700 SF house in the back yard of the 860 SF historic farm house. The applicant used other large houses and Don Rogers commercial buildings at 5973 Indian Rd. to justify his plan. Ron Stewart then commented that those commercial buildings wouldn’t even be there had he not had a permit in 1985 to keep the Industrial Zoning. The commissioners, at that time, would have preferred to have done something that would have preserved the historic nature of Valmont and they weren’t able to do that. They limited the owner to a remodel and addition to total 2000 SF. Ron Stewart and Paul Danish are still around.

My concerns are:

Property line setback. The building shown on the north side is right on the property line, where a 20’ rear setback is required. The front setback is 60’ from the center line of roadway and 0’ or 12’ side setback. Even I have a 15’ rear setback. My front set back is 35’ (or 60’ from center line of road with a 50’ ROW). My lot is 110’ deep, so that leaves me only a little more than 50% of the lot to build on north to south.

Property line with 6033 Valmont Rd. Where does their survey place that boundary? A lot of legal descriptions of properties here don’t fit the actual occupied boundaries. Ask me about my first hand experience. Bill Stengel, retired County Surveyor, is my surveyor, and brother of Jim Stengel-a prior owner as mentioned in the background letter.

Traffic. The studies don’t even mention Boulder Ready Mix with it’s busy driveway almost directly across from the auto body and repair access on N.61st. That should be a consideration. I doubt they have a problem with it though.

I’m not opposed to the project and realize that a certain level of business needs to be done to make the investment profitable. The auto repair business isn’t for everyone, but Gary seems to know how to do it right. And I welcome Gary to the neighborhood and wish him good luck. As proposed it’ll be a shocker to get used to.
Bill Mundwiller
6033 Indian Rd.
Boulder, Colorado 80301
303-449-7166
bill.mundwiller@hotmail.com

Sent from Windows Mail
To whom it may concern:

I own and live at 6029 Indian Rd. I have lived there for over 13 years. I was very happy to see the property purchased and it appeared it would be cleaned up. But, then numerous trees (offering some screening) were then cut down and rows and rows wrecked cars reappeared. The following are some of our concerns.

First, this property abuts residential property and behind it is residential property. My drive way, for instance, faces the property. Given that the property is in the middle of residential and agricultural property there is a concern about having a used car lot/junkyard and repair facility in our midst. We understand and are encouraged that there will be a residential home but that home could be built years later or not at all. The hope would be that the presence of the owner/user would keep the noise, light and traffic down to a minimum but it is my experience that customer expectations and understandably the need to make a profit win out.

Second, the constant noise from tools and large equipment is of highest concern. There appear to be no restrictions in the county for noise and once these uses are established there is no recourse for us at all. Having a repair facility and used car lot next door can only mean noise that lasts all day long and into the night. As I understand it from the county, there are no regulations to rely on to limit the noise. Same goes for light. The light for a used car lot is not in keeping with the surroundings and again once this is built we will have no regulations to rely on.

Third, the proposed building is quite large. There is no landscaping or any type of screening and in fact what little trees that were on the lot have been cut down.

We understand, after 13 years of experience, that Valmont is not high on the county's priority list. I also understand the applicant's need to make use of the land. I ask that you take some time to look into Valmont's history, consider that the use is next to residences and take into consideration that once this is built, because the county has not I am told implemented any noise or light regulations, we are without any recourse and the enjoyment of my home is destroyed.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Cindy Mitchell
Dear Ms. Hippely,

Thank you for the notice of the upcoming hearing on the above-referenced Land Use Docket. We greatly appreciate being kept informed of actions being proposed in the Valmont neighborhood. By way of introduction, we own the home at 3354 61st Street across the street and north of the subject property. The proposed project is of particular interest to us as it should be for all of our neighbors because of its negative impact on the historic and agricultural character of the Valmont community. At the same time, this proposed development project will create a significant extra burden on users (vehicles and bikes) of both 63rd Street and Valmont. As 25+ year residents of the neighborhood, and for the reasons stated below, we strongly oppose this development plan and urge the Boulder County Land Use Department to reject it in its entirety.

We have the following comments to the applicant’s proposal:

“The subject property is located within Boulder County’s General Industrial zoning district which allows for auto repair and sales uses by right. The property consists of approximately 1.7 acres and has a long history of car sales, auto recycling, auto repair, new and used auto parts sales and residential uses.”

Comment: The subject property had been a junk yard for decades with very little sales or other activity. County sales tax records would confirm that this property never had a “long history of car sales, auto recycling ….” and far from it in fact. Buildings were in disrepair, 50 gallon drums of junk formed a ten foot rusted wall between neighbors, the lot was littered with broken down cars and a crane, and a small house and trailer were rented to unaffiliated tenants. The prior owner of the property was a hoarder of parts, a tinkerer, and a hobbyist, but he never ran a viable business. With that in mind, we were excited to see the property cleared of all the junk a couple of years back in preparation for sale. Unfortunately, it has been a major disappointment since to see the new owner clear away trees and bushes and load the property again with junk cars. The property is once again an eye-sore for our neighborhood.

While the subject property may be zoned for ‘general industrial’, according to the Boulder County Land Use Department zoning map, it is surrounded by agricultural property on ALL sides of said property (including on the east side of 61st at Valmont, and continuing east on Valmont all the way to 75th --- which is interesting considering the number of industrial/non-agricultural businesses that operate on the north side of Valmont between 61st and 75th).

“(2) Will be in harmony with the character of the neighborhood and compatible with the surrounding area; The proposed use will be in harmony with the mixture of industrial and residential uses along Valmont Road. The new shop will be located behind the existing shop and its low-profile design and exterior treatments will complement the updated historical character of the existing shop. Visual
impacts from public roads will be minimized by screening the recycling business with a privacy fence and trees.”

Comment: The 5 properties to the immediate west on Valmont are residential. All the properties to the immediate north on 61st are agricultural and residential. The rail line adjoining the property is abandoned and now owned by RTD. It is slated to become a rail trail for cyclists and pedestrians. The properties across the street to the immediate east are Boulder Ready Mix and the Valmont Community Church. Ready Mix has set their operation far back from 61st and is hidden from view on Valmont – and somewhat on 61st - by numerous tall, mature trees and brush. Valmont Church sits on an idyllic setting of vast lawns and a 17 acre lake. We live immediately north of the church and, of course, our home is residential and our property is zoned agricultural. To the south of this proposed property is the Valmont Butte which is geologically significant, historic in nature, and now preserved by the city of Boulder as open space.

The applicant’s statement that this project will be in harmony with the neighborhood couldn’t be further from the truth. If this junk yard/auto recycling facility is permitted it will become the southern-most and a very ugly entry point into an otherwise beautiful river valley.

“The use is not a salvage yard with long-term storage of inoperable vehicles. It is a recycling business.”

Comment: Since Super Rupair purchased this property, it has only been a salvage yard with dozens of trashed and inoperable vehicles lined up end-to-end. It is not a salvage yard and it is definitely not a recycling business...it is a junk yard. The applicant has simply moved these junk vehicles from his other location to here. The applicant has been storing junk vehicles for many years and we are now the unfortunate recipients of these trashed vehicles in our neighborhood. They have created an eye-sore that greatly diminishes the ambiance of the neighborhood and the value of surrounding and nearby properties. It should be noted that a junk yard previously existed on Valmont Road (near Boulder Lumber) for many years before that property was purchased by the City of Boulder and became part of the Valmont Park. This is further evidence that junk yards, salvage yards, recycling plants or whatever an applicant wants to call them, DO NOT BELONG IN RESIDENTIAL OR AGRICULTURAL NEIGHBORHOODS! If the applicant is sincere about recycling these junk vehicles, they should consider a location along “Recycling Row” south of the Valmont Butte or in Denver where automobile recycling and scrap metal businesses already exist.

“(7) Will not result in undue traffic congestion or traffic hazards; As described in the attached traffic Analysis, the proposed use will not create undue traffic congestion or traffic hazards.”

Comment: Again, this statement could not be further from the truth. The corner of Valmont and 61st Street is a highly congested and dangerous intersection. In and out access on 61st or on Valmont so near to the corner would only serve to exasperate the situation and greatly increase the risks to motorists and to cyclists.

The Delch Associates traffic impact study referenced by the applicant was performed more than TWO AND ONE-HALF YEARS AGO, in March, 2013 and is no longer applicable. Since that time, development in communities north and east of Valmont and 61st, such as Gunbarrel and Erie, has already increased dramatically with even larger commercial and residential projects underway. This has greatly increased the volume of traffic that uses both 61st Street
and Valmont daily. Traffic on these roads increases even more when Foothills Parkway or roads that cross it (such as Jay Road) are under construction.

The proposed development of the property will generate an increase in traffic at an intersection that is already very congested. No right turn lane was built on 61st Street turning west on to Valmont. As such, traffic frequently backs up for up to ½ mile on 61st particularly when the lead car at the intersection is waiting to turn left (east) on to Valmont. It can be very difficult for anyone living on 61st Street or Indian Road to pull into the roadway or exit the street and return home. The Ready Mix operation and driveway across the street from the subject property is living proof that its driveway is much too close to the intersection. Their large cement trucks frequently sit for one or more light changes before they can pull onto 61st Street.

Vehicles turning into and out of the subject property – not just Super Rupair owners and employees, but also semi-truck-sized car haulers, tow trucks, delivery vehicles, customers arriving, departing, and taking test drives -- in any direction will create significantly more hazards and congestion on both 61st Street and Valmont.

In summary, we are strongly opposed to the applicant’s request for this property to be a salvage yard, “recycling”, and auto sales business. These commercial and industrial uses have absolutely no place in an agricultural and residential neighborhood. Similarly, locating this type of a business and its driveways on a corner that is already congested and dangerous is inviting more accidents and possible fatalities. WE RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT THIS PROJECT BE REJECTED IN ITS ENTIRETY BY BOULDER COUNTY. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Debi Garrity and Roy Burger
3354 61st Street
Boulder, CO 80301
Dear CoB Plannin,

There's no good reason for this guy to open up a major repair facility in an agro area. His desire to pay less in taxes to make more money shouldn't override the agricultural base of Valmont.

The concrete plant and Keeter are grandfathered in but are non-conforming. This place should not be zoned General Industry, the area should be ag or small shops, not major, flood light lit, air wrench pounding, lot paved industry.

The neighbors in the region have every right to a quiet and ag based existence. This right supersedes the right of this guy to make more profits, whether writ in law or not.

Please do the best thing for the Valmont valley and restrict the business to the existing building without permission to pave and expand a fully lit lot. If DC Auto Electric could do it quietly for 65 years then there's no reason to smash the existing neighborhood with a full scale repair shop and sales/junk yard.

Regards,
Hepburn Ingham
3614 61st St, 80301
Commissioners,

My name is Lee Ann McGinty. My father and I own and live at 3152 Indian Rd. My family has owned the property for over a hundred years. I am the fourth generation. Our farm property is directly north of the Subaru property, across the RR tracks, and runs the entire length of Indian Road from 61st to the west. The original blacksmith shop was owned and operated by my great-grandfather.

Up until the 1970’s the parcel of property, now known as the Subaru property, was a residence with a horse barn and pasture. I do not remember if the old blacksmith shop building was in use as anything other than a shed or barn when we moved to the farm in 1662. It may have still been a small auto repair shop at that time. Whatever it was, it was contained on a small sliver of land on the south side of the irrigation ditch. In the 70’s the city limits changed from 28th or 30th street to 55th street. There was a very large junk yard near where the undeveloped portion of Valmont Park is now. The city made the owner move out and the county granted him permission to relocate in our residential/agricultural community. It has been a horrible eyesore, a source of ground contamination and a breeding ground for vermin ever since. And, to add insult to injury, they painted the old blacksmith shop building Pepto Bismal Pink. This is typically what Boulder does with its undesirable industries and facilities – they move them to Valmont. This is the only parcel of land north of the Valmont Butte that is zoned general industrial. Other than one small parcel to the west of us that is zoned light industrial, all the rest of the land all the way to 95th street is zoned agricultural. All but one of the non-agricultural businesses/industries north of the butte are non-conforming and have been allowed to continue for decades for reasons unknown.

When the clean up began and the property sold a couple of years ago, we all rejoiced thinking that finally we would be rid of it, only to be very disappointed to see it being replaced by the same, only this time all the large trees and any natural screening was stripped from the property. The property is now full of junk cars once again and even more of an eyesore than before.

We are all sick to death of looking at that mess. However, Boulder, for reasons I don’t fully understand, continues to disregard the rich historical significance of Valmont. This block in particular is the old town site of Valmont itself. I hardly see where an 11,000 sq ft modern two story cinder block and galvanized steel industrial building, auto repair shop, junk yard and used car lot fit in with the “historical character” (as stated in the report) of a rural residential/agricultural neighborhood. I do applaud Mr. Chambers desire to make the existing blacksmith building facade historical in nature, even if it is a Hollywood version and bears no resemblance to the original blacksmith shop (of which I provided him photos from the early 1920’s taken by my great-grandfather).

We have other concerns, as well, including increased traffic on an already congested and accident prone stretch of road. Their entrance would be almost adjacent to the Redi-Mix...
entrance across the street with their big cement trucks and semis coming and going (with most crossing the road) and all within a half a block of a narrow and, from at least one direction, a mostly blind intersection. There is also no bike lane on the north bound lane of 61st on that block, making it dangerous for bicyclists. I think his 200 daily trip estimation is very low, with employees going in and out, delivery trucks, customers, test drives of vehicles being repaired, as well as test drives of the vehicles for sale. Just the 20 employees arriving to and leaving work generate 40 trips alone.

I also understand that the city has the railroad track bed in its sights for a bike trail between the west end of Indian Road and 61st street, bypassing the Valmont/61st intersection. That will have hundreds of bikes spilling out and crossing onto 61st at approximately the same place as the Subaru property and Redimix, causing even more traffic congestion and hazards. 61st street has a very high volume of bicycle traffic.

Additional concerns would be constant noise from pneumatic tools and large equipment; and, of very high concern to me, light pollution. Being able to walk out at night and see the stars is one of the many pleasures of living in Valmont.

I realize that this property is zoned general industrial, and Mr. and Mrs. Chambers have every right to use it as such. If there is no other alternative than to grant them permission to use it as some kind of an auto facility, so be it. However, I definitely would be opposed to a multiuse facility. I think it should be limited to a single use and that whatever was going in be screened from view from the community and the street. If a building is approved, I would ask that the board consider limiting it to a one story building along the north fence painted a neutral color that would blend in with natural environment, and to not allow a used car lot at all. I do not see how a used car lot would add to the character of, in any way enhance, nor fit into the community.

Everyone loves our little oasis in Valmont, which is evidenced by the million dollar homes going up, the renovations of historic homes and the constant inquiries I get from people asking if there are any homes for sale or rent in the area - not to mention the large volume of mail we get offering to buy our property. Once a facility of this sort goes in, there is no going back and will only encourage more of the same in future. At least what is there now is totally reversible.

Thank you and I only ask for your consideration of those of us who have a deep appreciation of Valmont’s rich history, its tranquil beauty…and who call it home.

Lee Ann and Hugh McGinty
3152 Indian Road
Valmont, Colorado
(720) 635-3562
I have lived in the Boulder area for 48 years and am very familiar with the Valmont area...the proposed use of 6095 Valmont Rd in Boulder will, in my opinion, be the most disruptive use of the land in that entire area yet! The business complex on Indian Rd is quiet with few cars in and out, Keeter trucking and Pioneer Sand & Gravel have been in existence for years and years. All of the other uses in the area are agriculture related (Creekside Tree Nursery and small farms in the area). The auto shop that was at the location prior to the proposed Subaru Shop was low key and had very little traffic in and out on a daily basis. The size of the building being proposed is out of proportion with every other building in the Valmont area NW of the 61st and Valmont intersection. I am certain that the neighbors along Valmont directly west of the site will not be happy with the added traffic and noise level inevitable in repairing cars and recycling junk vehicles! Every single item that involves recycling is not positive to all involved. Thank You, Pauline Peterson
I know I am late, but I want to make a comment regarding this docket.

I feel it would be a shame to grossly alter this beautiful, old, rural area of boulder according to this plan. There are other places around Boulder that are already bare and “modernized” where a lot like this would fit in. I don’t see any benefit for the city of Boulder or Boulder County; it’s not even a convenient or visible area for a car lot!

Rick Harrison

Boulder, CO.
I object to Super Rupair going in at 61st and Valmont. I think it will distract the area and cause more traffic congestion at 61st and Valmont. Thank you for listening to my concern on this docket.
The commercial/industrial use proposed for this corner at Valmont and 61st Street is out of character for the older, agricultural/residential usage on this stretch of 61st Street, which I drive every day to work. If plans for the four non-agricultural uses proposed are allowed to go forward, the property should be screened from public view. The industrial zoning of this property is an anomaly that should be as strongly curtailed as the law will allow.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Reshetnik
4833A White Rock Circle
Boulder, CO 80301
Dear Hannah Hippely,

I am writing in regard to Boulder County Land Use Docket SU-14-0009, Butte Blacksmith LLC.

I own the 0.8 acre property at the northwest corner of Indian Road and 61st Street, 6087 Indian Road, in Valmont. I bought the property in 1994 and lived in it until 2005. Currently, the house is under renovation for future rental.

In the late 90s, my Valmont property was rented out for a year, while I lived in the house on my property in Old-Town Superior. At the end of that year, I had a choice of which property to sell, which property to retain. One of my criteria was clarity at night, visibility of stars. After several night-time trips to compare, Valmont was the winner, at least on this criterion.

Primary among other criteria was the historic nature of Valmont. Valmont was settled in the 1860s, before Boulder, and for a time had a larger population and was a contender for county seat. My house was built in 1869, as determined by a newspaper I found inside a wall. Going along with the history of Valmont, only a mile from Boulder city limits, is its semi-rural nature. The owners of property in Valmont, past and present, have a sense of both the history of Valmont and the rurality (Wikipedia: a condition of place-based homeliness shared by people with common ancestry or heritage and who inhabit traditional, culturally defined areas or places statutorily recognized to be rural) of Valmont, and honor them.

Any objection I have regarding the proposed project is due to sharp deviations from this history and rurality. I object to construction of a two-story building, a visual pollution. I object to noise pollution. I object to light pollution. Each of these three pollutions must either be eliminated or their effects greatly mitigated. Construction of a two-story building can be reduced to construction of a one-story building. Generation of noise can be confined to building interiors. Light pollution can be eliminated by restriction of business hours to daylight hours only.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Alastair D. Robertson

303-475-6084

Sent from my iPhone
To whom it may concern,

It's interesting to me that there are so many examples of the City of Boulder attempting to preserve the beauty of Boulder in simple, arbitrary ways that regularly hinder an individual's ability to work on their house or property. Yet, there are plenty of examples where unique, relevant, local areas are "reimagined" as multi-story business/housing complexes. I could be wrong, but building a Super Rupair and used car lot in a small rural neighborhood in east Boulder seems like one of these latter kinds of decisions. Please reconsider. 
Thanks, A concerned local
PUBLIC HEARING

STAFF PLANNER: Denise Grimm

STAFF RECOMMENDATION RE:

**SPR-15-0103: Corruccini Residence**
Request: Alterations to an historic structure including an addition
Location: 785 Flagstaff Road
Zoning: Forestry (F) Zoning
Owners: Corruccini Family LLC
Agent: Stephen Sparn

PURPOSE

The role of the Historic Preservation Advisory Board (HPAB) is to serve as a referral body to review and comment on development proposals which could affect historic properties eligible for landmark designation as determined by HPAB and to provide feedback to applicants.

BACKGROUND

The house dates to 1951 and was designed by noted local architect James M. Hunter. It was built in the Usonian architectural style, a style created by Frank Lloyd Wright in the 1930s. The house was commissioned by William and Mary Spackman. Mr. Spackman was a CU professor of the classics who went on to publish five novels. The second owners of the house, Robert and Mildred Corruccini, owned it for 58 years. Mr. Corruccini was a physicist at the National Bureau of Standards for nearly 30 years.

The house appears to have had two additions. An enclosed porch was added to the south side of the house, and a larger addition was added to the north end of the front façade.

At the request of the agent, Stephen Sparn, the property was evaluated for preliminary landmark eligibility at the May 1, 2014 HPAB meeting. HPAB unanimously agreed (5-0) that the residence would be eligible for landmark status should an application be submitted.

On September 12, 2014, a subcommittee of HPAB reviewed a proposal for an Accessory Dwelling
Unit as well as alterations to the original residence. No determinations were made at this meeting and staff requested a site visit with members of HPAB.

On September 26, 2014, a subcommittee of HPAB visited the site along with Land Use staff and City of Boulder staff. Stephen Sparn and associate Adam Casias explained the proposal including the new structure and the alterations to the original residence. The site visit also exposed the interior’s condition. No determinations were made at this meeting.

On December 4, 2014, HPAB met and reviewed a landmark application for the house and the retaining wall and voted unanimously (5-0) to approve landmark status and recommend to the Board of County Commissioners approval of landmark status under Criteria 1, 4 and 5.

Criteria 15-501(A)(1) The character, interest, or value of the proposed landmark as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the county;

The owners of the house create a significant example of the development of the Modern movement in the Boulder area, as CU professors and scientists were directly related to its rise and sustainability; its owners being novelist and CU professor, William M. Spackman and physicist, Robert J. Corruccini.

Criteria 15-501(A)(4) The proposed landmark is an embodiment of the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, method of construction, or the use of indigenous materials;

The structure is significant because it is an example of the Usonian style.

Criteria 15-501(A)(5) The proposed landmark as identification of the work of an architect, landscape architect, or master builder whose work has influenced development in the county, state, or nation;

The structure is significant because it was designed by one of the “masters of local Modernism,” James M. Hunter.

HPAB then reviewed a preliminary application for a Limited Impact Special Review (LU) and a Site Plan Review (SPR) for the property. The LU was to make the historic residence an Accessory Dwelling Unit, and the SPR was for alterations to the historic residence along with a new 4,200 sq. ft. residence. The proposed alterations to the historic residence included the removal of the undated 510 sq. ft. addition on the front of the residence, the addition of 100 sq. ft. to the garage addition, the glassing in of the screened-porch addition that exists on the south, and the lifting of the roofline on the rear of the house to allow for more light and views of the mountains to the west. HPAB again voted unanimously (5-0) to send referral comments recommending in favor of the proposals.

In March 2015 a completed application for LU/SPR was submitted to the Land Use Department and staff and referral agencies reviewed the components. Concerns regarding the size, the location and the visual impact of the project were expressed and staff relayed to agent, Stephen Sparn, that the submitted proposal would not be supportable in the LU/SPR staff recommendation.

A subcommittee of HPAB met on July 16, 2015 to review a new proposal for a renovation and an addition to the existing residence. The proposal did not include landmarking or an accessory dwelling unit. The plans called for a 5,200 sq.ft. residence with only the 247 sq.ft. historic supported overhang and the east-facing stone wall wall retained. The subcommittee did not support the proposal and feedback requested preserving more of the original residence and pushing the development to the rear of the structure.
NEW PROPOSAL

The latest proposal has been renumbered SPR-15-0103: Corruccini Residence. The new plans call for a 6,327 sq.ft. residence of which 993 sq.ft. is part of the original historic design. The proposal once again removes the non-historic addition on the northeast corner but this time returns the original form of that corner. The proposed addition is narrower and extends further west than the previous version.

Much of the historic residence is proposed to be removed including portions visible upon approaching the house. Additionally, the overhang historically functioned as a porte-cochere but that use has been removed by the relocation of the main entrance. The addition steps uphill to the west of the house.

When reviewing applications for Site Plan Review, staff and referral agencies consider Site Plan Review Standards as laid out in the Land Use Code. Standard A.9 applies to historic resources and states the following:

The development shall avoid significant historic or archaeological resources as identified in the Comprehensive Plan or the Historic Sites Survey of Boulder County, or through the Site Plan Review process. Development within or affecting such resources may be approved, subject to acceptable mitigation measures and in the discretion of the Director, only if no other sites on the subject property can be reasonably developed, or only if reasonably necessary to avoid significant adverse impacts based upon other applicable Site Plan Review criteria.

While the proposal has a significant impact on the eligible historic resource, progress has been made with this latest design to address the request from the latest HPAB subcommittee as well as balancing the concern of the other referral agencies and current planning staff direction who had concerns about development to the south.

The applicant is requesting to overcome the presumptive size maximum (125% of the neighborhood median square footage) partly under the following criteria:

“Historic structure(s) that are landmarked or otherwise protected cause the residential floor area to exceed the size presumption.”

This provision was included in the Land Use Code to discourage demolition of historic resources when someone was trying to meet these size limitations. While this isn’t necessarily always a one to one trade off, because they are preserving a 993 square foot area and iconic front portion of the original structure, staff believes that we could support a similar offset with the presumptive size maximum as long as it doesn’t conflict with the other site plan review criteria and with an easement to protect the historic portion of the building in the future.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Advisory Board relay the following referral comments to the current planning staff:

The preference of HPAB was and is to more fully preserve this important historic home even if that means allowing it to become an accessory dwelling unit and allowing a second home on the site. If a buyer of the property wanted to pursue that approach with a new home that did not have the same level of conflict with other criteria, HPAB would be happy to work with the owners.
However, given the feedback from other agencies at the current time, HPAB finds that the current design balances the concerns expressed and accomplishes not demolishing the entire structure.

If the Site Plan Review is approved we would want to see an easement to protect the historic portion of the structure.
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August 24, 2015

Hannah Hippely
Boulder County Land Use Department
P.O. Box 471
Boulder, Colorado 80306

Re: Corruccini SPR Submission

Dear Hannah,

Thank you for working with me on the resubmittal of the site plan review application for the Corruccini property located at 785 Flagstaff Road. Based upon our meeting with Steven Williams, Kim Sanchez and Denise Grimm on May 28, 2015 and the HPAB meeting held on July 16, 2015, we have again revised our proposal in an effort to address the concerns of the County and City with regard to the redevelopment of the existing single family home site.

As you know, the Corruccini Family has spent the last 15 months meeting with various representatives from the County and City to help inform the proposal’s design, attempting to ensure its location was honored while also serving the community’s historic preservation values. We believe our most-recently revised proposal, which represents the Corruccini’s third design, strikes a fair balance between the relevant site plan review standards.

To help provide context for the revised proposal, below is an updated summary of our efforts concerning the original proposal and the series of redesigns based on input from County and City staff and HPAB.

I. Historic Preservation Advisory Board and Joint LU/SPR Applications

In the spring of 2014, we began working with County staff and the Historic Preservation Advisory Board concerning the design proposal, which included historic preservation of the existing residence and development of a new, aesthetically compatible residence located immediately to the south of the existing residence on a historically benched area.

We continued meeting with HPAB subcommittee members and City and County staff regarding the design proposal throughout the fall of 2014. The HPAB was generally encouraging and staff provided some recommendations in connection with design ideas, which we incorporated into our proposal. On December 4, 2014, the HPAB voted unanimously to recommend that the
Boulder Board of County Commissioners approve the proposal, with the understanding that any changes to the proposal would need to be reviewed by HPAB.

II. City and OSMP Outreach

Immediately following submission of the joint LU/SPR applications (Docket LU-15-006 and SPR-15-0027), I met with City Open Space and Mountain Parks staffers, John Damico and Kacey French, to directly address any concerns OSMP anticipated in connection with the original proposal. The meeting was instructive and informative and we were encouraged by staffers’ support of our use of non-reflective materials and muted exterior colors to blend into the natural surroundings and our ideas for minimizing glare and lighting solutions to reduce visibility at night.

We were surprised, then, by the referral from OSMP dated April 1, 2015, which focused its criticisms on extraneous issues related to water and density and advocated for an arbitrary recalculation of the presumptive size maximum for the lot. We responded directly to the numerous comments by OSMP, including providing supplementary materials to resolve concerns related to water and further altered our design proposal to address the specific concerns from OSMP that were grounded in the land use code. Moreover, we again welcomed comments and suggestions from the County in connection with the proposal.

III. Additional County Meetings and Design Concept Change

Following resolution of the primary concerns in the OSMP referral and subsequent communications with Land Use staff regarding the proposal, the County’s focus turned to the size, location and potential visual impact of the proposal.

In an effort to mitigate these concerns, we met with Steven Williams, Kim Sanchez and Denise Grimm on May 28, 2015 to discuss alternatives to the original proposal that would meet both the community’s historic preservation needs and allow the single family residence to be modernized and expanded. In that meeting, it was suggested that a viable alternative to the original proposal would be to (1) deconstruct and rebuild a major portion of the existing residence, while preserving the iconic stone wall and contemporary east room on columns, (2) abandon the proposal for a new residence and conversion of the existing house into an historic ADU and (3) not seek landmarking, while still preserving the important historic elements of the structure.

This suggestion was met with general agreement in light of the fact that the revised proposal would (1) preserve the most prolific and iconic features of the existing residence, (2) result in nearly the same density as currently exists on the property (although staff suggested the presumptive size maximum might be overcome given the effort to preserve historic resources),


and (3) not increase the residence’s visual impact from surrounding areas. The Corruccini Family was encouraged by the prospect of this reasonable compromise.

IV. Recent Engineering Investigations

Additionally, we’ve recently discovered that the existing single-family residence presents several concerns from an engineering perspective, including structural, hydrological and environmental concerns including a serious health risk due to a significant amount of asbestos-containing materials in the home. The report confirms our concerns that the existing structure is functionally obsolete. The engineer’s report is included as part of the revised site plan review application, but we felt it was important to note the concerns present significant obstacles in preserving any more than the front of the existing structure.

V. Redesign and Presentation to HPAB

A revised design was presented to HPAB staff on 7/16/15 that sought to preserve the Iconic Stone Wall and East Room of the 1951 structure while connecting a new structure to these historic features. The forms of the new structure were compatible but distinctly separate from the existing wall. The concept featured turning the suspended east room into a library that was connected to the new portion of the home by a glass connector leading to the main portion of the new home. The iconic wall was separate from the new home and was used to create a new breezeway and trellis structure between the two. The design consisted of 3,133 sq. ft. above grade, 2,067 s.f. on the lower level for a total of 5,200 s.f.

A subcommittee of HPAB met on July 16, 2015 to provide feedback on the new (second) design. In its memo provided the day before the meeting, staff stated “...the new proposal does not meet standard A.9 by proposing to only retain the East Room and Iconic Stonewall, as the other alterations and additions have an adverse effect on the historic residence.” There was concern that only 250 s.f. of the existing structure were being preserved. At the meeting both Denise Grimm and the subcommittee indicated they were in favor of keeping more of the front façade intact back to the chimney and allowing modification and expansion on the back (west) side of the house, including possible increase in the footprint north and south. Ms. Grimm also stated it could be a smoother hearing process if all parties were on the same page. Ms. Sanchez, on behalf of Land Use, stated the intent is to keep people from tearing down historic resources and then allow the residential floor area to exceed the size presumption on the new addition portion of the residence.
VI. **New (Third) Design and Second SPR Submittal for Single Family Residence, Preserving Eastern Façade Consistent with HPAB’s Recommended Action**

We have taken these comments into consideration in the redesign which is preserving the important components of the historic resource, modifying and expanding the back (west) side of the residence that is primarily below grade and on the already disturbed portion of the site, and otherwise avoiding other significant adverse impacts (e.g. visual impacts) as required by other site plan review standards.

The new design (third design) preserves 993 sq. ft. of the 1951 historic structure, to include the areas east of the chimney. We are preserving and integrating more than four times more of the original 1951 structure than the second design. One portion of the house that is being removed includes the 1962 addition that was not constructed with the design and guidance of James Hunter, the original architect. In fact, in a correspondence from Robert Corruccini, he states “the addition was designed by the contractor which displeased the architect whom said that his vision was ruined.” The second portion being removed is the unremarkable rear portion of the house which is more than 60% below grade and has significant structural, hydrostatic and building envelope deficiencies. See the attached report from our engineer attached to this SPR dated 6/15/15.

Our goal is to restore the front 993 Sq. ft. and design a tasteful addition to this historic structure. To do so, we have pushed the new square footage of the new addition back of the historic portion to separate but compliment the historic structure. The resulting structure has 2,458 sq. ft. below grade and 3,869 s.f. above grade, totaling 6,327 s.f. This distributes the square footage and massing approximately 40% below grade and 60% above grade.

**SITE PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA**

The SPR Application seeks to preserve the front façade of the historic 1951 residence and add on a renovation to the back (west) of this residence in accordance with the Site Plan Review Standards of the Code as set forth below.

**ARTICLE 4-806 - SITE PLAN REVIEW STANDARDS**

**A. All Site Plan Review applications shall be reviewed in accordance with the following standards which the Director has determined to be applicable based on the nature and extent of the proposed development. When two or more of the standards listed below conflict, the Director shall evaluate the applicability and importance of each of the conflicting standards under the facts of the specific application and make a reasonable attempt to balance the conflicting standards in reaching a site plan decision.**
1. To provide a greater measure of certainty as to the applicable neighborhood relevant for comparison, the following definition of neighborhood shall be used to review proposed Site Plan Review applications:

a. [Intentionally omitted]

b. [Intentionally omitted]

c. For applications outside of platted subdivisions with seven or more developed lots or the townsites of Allenspark, Eldora, Eldorado Springs, Raymond, and Riverside, the defined neighborhood is the area within 1,500 feet from the applicable parcel. The neighborhood shall not include any parcels inside municipal boundaries, platted subdivisions with seven or more developed lots or the townsites of Allenspark, Eldora, Eldorado Springs, Gold Hill Historic District, Raymond, and Riverside.

The applicable neighborhood relevant for comparison to the renovated residence is described under Article 4-806 (A)(1)(c) of the Code, which states that “the defined neighborhood is the area within 1,500 feet from the applicable parcel,” and further that “the neighborhood shall not include any parcels inside municipal boundaries [or] platted subdivisions with seven or more developed lots.”

2. The size of the resulting development (residential or nonresidential) must be compatible with the general character of the defined neighborhood.

a. In determining size compatibility of residential structures with the defined neighborhood, it is presumed that structures of a size within the larger of a total residential floor area of either (1) 125% of the median residential floor area for that defined neighborhood or (2) a total residential floor area of 1,500 square feet in the mapped townsites of Allenspark, Eldora, Eldorado Springs, Raymond, and Riverside, or 2,500 square feet for all other areas of the County, are compatible with that neighborhood, subject also to a determination that the resulting size complies with the other Site Plan Review standards in this section 4-806.A.

(i) [intentionally omitted]

(ii) [intentionally omitted]
b. Either the applicant or the Director may demonstrate that this presumption does not adequately address the size compatibility of the proposed development with the defined neighborhood.

(i) Factors to be considered when determining the adequacy of this presumption and whether it can be overcome include:

[(A) – (F) intentionally omitted]

(H) Historic structure(s) that are landmarked or otherwise protected cause the residential floor area to exceed the size presumption.

At the pre-application conference, Land Use staff indicated that the presumptive size maximum for the Property is 4,341 s.f. (the “Presumptive Size Maximum”). The residential floor area for the new renovated residence will total 6,327 s.f. In accordance with Article 4-806(2)(H), the Presumptive Size Maximum for a lot can be overcome when an historic structure is landmarked or otherwise protected. We would like to request that the mechanism for protection of the historical resource in this case be by a Restrictive Covenant that is placed and recorded on the title of the property. This mechanism notifies future land owners of the property of the preservation requirements through their title work on the property at the time of any sale.

In this case, the Applicant’s proposal saves the historic asset and the new renovated residence exceeds the Presumed Size Maximum by 1,986, including a 1:1 ratio for preserved historic areas and 2,458 s.f. of below ground space. Only 3,869 s.f. of the new structure will be above grade. See graphic exhibits for table of square footages.

Therefore, this SPR Application overcomes the size presumption and the proposed development is compatible with the character of the neighborhood in accordance with Article 4-806(A)(2)(b)(i)(H).

3. The location of existing or proposed buildings, structures, equipment, grading, or uses shall not impose an undue burden on public services and infrastructure.

The new portions of the residence will be located immediately west of the existing residence. The result is a compact building that is essentially hidden from public lands and will help to preserve and protect the surrounding environment.

Additionally, such clustering will allow for access to the new residence through the existing residence’s current driveway with a substantial reduction of pavement due to the location of garage. The current driveway connects directly to Flagstaff Road, which is a public road.
Moreover, the existing property currently receives water service from the City of Boulder. The new renovated residence will likewise maintain its existing water service from the City of Boulder. Upon approval, and as part of Applicant’s engineering package, Applicant will perform a percolation test, and file with Boulder County Health to repair, remove or replace the existing septic system.

Given the new residence’s proximity to access an existing water tap and the public road, the new residence will not impose an undue burden on public services and infrastructure.

4. The proposed development shall avoid natural hazards, including those on the subject property and those originating off-site with a reasonable likelihood of affecting the subject property. Natural hazards include, without limitation, expansive soils or claystone, subsiding soils, soil creep areas, or questionable soils where the safe-sustaining power of the soils is in doubt; landslides, mudslides, mudfalls, debris fans, unstable slopes, and rockfalls; flash flooding corridors, alluvial fans, floodways, floodplains, and flood-prone areas; and avalanche corridors. Natural hazards may be identified in the Comprehensive Plan Geologic Hazard and Constraint Areas Map or through the Site Plan Review process using the best available information. Best available information includes, without limitation, updated topographic or geologic data, Colorado Geologic Survey landslide or earth/debris flow data, interim floodplain mapping data, and creek planning studies. Development within or affecting such natural hazards may be approved, subject to acceptable measures that will satisfactorily mitigate all significant hazard risk posed by the proposed development to the subject property and surrounding area, only if there is no way to avoid one or more hazards, no other sites on the subject property can be reasonably developed, or if reasonably necessary to avoid significant adverse impacts based upon other applicable Site Plan Review criteria.

Applicant’s Property falls within the Major risk area (Extensive Problems; High Risk), as indicated on Boulder County’s Geologic Hazards & Constraint Areas Map adopted by the County on March 22, 1978 (the “Geologic Hazards Map”). Given that the entire Property is designated a Major hazard area, there is no way for the Applicant to avoid such hazards altogether. However, Applicant’s civil engineer will conduct a soils analysis and design the foundation and retention structures based on the results of such analysis, thereby satisfactorily mitigating the hazards posed to the Property.

Moreover, the renovated residence is located on an existing topographic bench that defines the currently disturbed site, and as such, is the only area on the Property that can be reasonably developed. The Applicant’s intent is to preserve and protect the surrounding environment, and in particular, the area of the Property located south of and below the bench. In addition to the preservation and protection of the surrounding environment, Applicant will employ measures
to satisfactorily mitigate any significant hazard risk posed by the development of the new residence and the surrounding area.

It is also important to note that this specific bench has proved to be a geologically stable location for the existing residence since its construction in 1951, particularly in light of the recent floods that swept through Boulder County in September of 2013. Accordingly, there is no reason for Applicant to believe that the bench area would prove any less stable for the new residence.

Due to Applicant’s inability to avoid the hazards altogether, coupled with the fact that no other sites on the Property can be reasonably developed, Applicant’s commitment to satisfactorily mitigate the risks posed by the development of the new residence, and the longstanding stability of the bench area, Applicant’s request for development within the hazard area should therefore be approved in accordance with Article 4-806(A)(4).

5. The site plan shall satisfactorily mitigate the risk of wildfire both to the subject property and those posed to neighboring properties in the surrounding area by the proposed development. In assessing the applicable wildfire risk and appropriate mitigation measures, the Director shall consider the referral comments of the County Wildfire Mitigation Coordinator and the applicable fire district, and may also consult accepted national standards as amended, such as the 2003 Urban-Wildland Interface Code; NFPA / 80A, 299, 1231; 2003 International Fire Code; and the 2003 International Building Code.

Applicant will work with the Boulder County Wildfire Mitigation Coordinator to develop a Wildfire Mitigation Plan (the “Plan”), which will satisfactorily mitigate the risk of wildfire posed to both the new residence and neighboring properties in the surrounding area. The Plan will provide for, among other things, adequate defensible space around the new residence, as is required to prevent the spread of fire to and from the new residence, and will allow firefighters to access the new residence safely in the case of a wildfire.

Additionally, construction of the New Residence on the topographic bench area (see Sheet 16 showing blow up of topographical bench)) is the best location on the site in terms of defensible place and lack of existing vegetation. Applicant’s efforts, in accordance with the Plan, will mitigate wildfire risks, and therefore Applicant’s request for development of the new residence on the property should be approved in accordance with Article 4-806(A)(5).

6. The proposed development shall not alter historic drainage patterns and/or flow rates or shall include acceptable mitigation measures to compensate for
anticipated drainage impacts. The best available information should be used to evaluate these impacts, including but not limited to hydrologic evaluations to determine peak flows, floodplain mapping studies, updated topographic data, Colorado Geologic Survey landslide, earth/debris flow data, and creek planning studies.

Applicant has engaged JVA as our civil engineer to assist with the development of a plan to address grading and drainage issues, in accordance with the Code, and similar to plans that have already proved successful for the existing residence. Such plan will be implemented in a manner that is sensitive to the Property’s hazard designation and does not adversely impact the Property or the neighboring properties. Applicant will work with its engineer to employ necessary mitigation measures to compensate for drainage impacts, if any. Applicant intends to limit disturbance to the topographic bench in order to mitigate drainage impacts to the remainder of the Property. Attached to this package is a letter from JVA Engineer, Charlie Hager certifying that the earthwork disturbances will be approximately 350CY, under County thresholds requiring a Limited Impact Special Review.

7. The development shall avoid significant natural ecosystems or environmental features, including but not necessarily limited to riparian corridors and wetland areas, plant communities, and wildlife habitat and migration corridors, as identified in the Comprehensive Plan or through the Site Plan Review process. Development within or affecting such areas may be approved, subject to acceptable mitigation measures and in the discretion of the Director, only if no other sites on the subject property can be reasonably developed, or only if reasonably necessary to avoid significant adverse impacts based upon other applicable Site Plan Review criteria.

According to the Critical Wildlife Habitats and Migration Corridors Map approved by the County on December 18, 2013 (the “Wildlife Map”), the Property does not fall within any protected habitats or migration corridors.

The property appears to be located within protected areas listed on the Rare Plant Areas and Significant Natural Communities Map (the “Plants Map”) and the Wetlands and Riparian Areas Map (the “Riparian Map”), both of which were approved by the County on December 18, 2013. However, as previously indicated, the New Residence will be constructed in the same general location as the existing residence on the previously established benched area. As discussed above, the benched area is the only area on the Property that can be reasonably developed (see Sheet 1, showing existing topography). This benched area not only provides sufficient space for the existing residence, but ample room for construction of the new residence, which will result in minimal impact to the protected areas outside of the shelf and the surrounding property.
Likewise, because the new renovated residence will be located on the existing bench, there will be little to no interference with the areas of the Property (south end) affected by the Plants Map and Riparian Map and the natural ecosystems and environmental features on or around the Property will remain preserved. Further, Applicant’s intent is to preserve and protect the surrounding environment, and it will undertake the measures necessary to ensure the natural ecosystems will not be compromised during construction of the new residence. For example, in order to limit disturbance of the south end of the Property, the placement of silt fencing and construction fencing are planned as part of the construction process.

Because the bench area is already suitable for construction and will result in little to no impact to the surrounding area, coupled with the fact that no other sites on the Property can be reasonably developed, Applicant’s request for development of the new residence should therefore be approved in accordance with this Article 4-806(A)(7).

8. The development shall avoid agricultural lands of local, state or national significance as identified in the Comprehensive Plan or through the Site Plan Review process. Development within or affecting such lands may be approved, subject to acceptable mitigation measures and in the discretion of the Director, only if no other sites on the subject property can be reasonably developed, or only if reasonably necessary to avoid significant adverse impacts based upon other applicable Site Plan Review criteria.

The Property does not fall within any agricultural lands of local, state or national significance as identified on the Significant Agricultural Lands Map adopted by the County on July 16, 1997 (the “Agricultural Map”). Therefore, Applicant’s request for development on the Property should be approved in accordance with this Article 4-806(A)(8).

9. The development shall avoid significant historic or archaeological resources as identified in the Comprehensive Plan or the Historic Sites Survey of Boulder County, or through the Site Plan Review process. Development within or affecting such resources may be approved, subject to acceptable mitigation measures and in the discretion of the Director, only if no other sites on the subject property can be reasonably developed, or only if reasonably necessary to avoid significant adverse impacts based upon other applicable Site Plan Review criteria.

The Archaeologically Sensitive Areas Map approved by the County on November 30, 1983 (the “Archaeological Map”), appears to show a slight overlap onto the southern side of the Property, but just outside of the area where the new residence will be located. As stated above, the new residence adequately avoids, mitigates and preserves historic resources on the Property.
Through previous designs it was determined no other sites on the Property can be reasonably developed and the currently proposed site and design solution best balances other site plan review criteria.

If this application that preserves the significant portions of the historic residence are approved, development of the project will only result in a positive impact on historic resources, ensuring the preservation of the important elements of the existing residence.

10. **The development shall not have a significant negative visual impact on the natural features or neighborhood character of surrounding area.** Development shall avoid prominent, steeply sloped, or visually exposed portions of the property. Particular consideration shall be given to protecting views from public lands and rights-of-way, although impacts on views of or from private properties shall also be considered. Development within or affecting features or areas of visual significance may be approved, subject to acceptable mitigation measures and in the discretion of the Director, only if no other sites on the subject property can be reasonably developed, or only if reasonably necessary to avoid significant adverse impacts based upon other applicable Site Plan Review criteria.

   a. [Intentionally omitted].

   b. For development anywhere in the unincorporated areas of the county, mitigation of visual impact may include changing structure location, reducing or relocating windows and glazing to minimize visibility, reducing structure height, changing structure orientation, requiring exterior color and materials that blend into the natural environment, and/or lighting requirements to reduce visibility at night.

The Applicant is mindful of the close proximity of the Property to Chautauqua Park and the adjacent Boulder Mountain Parks and has designed the new residence to avoid negative visual impact and protect views from public lands. Additionally, as explained above, the preserved historical components of the existing residence and new addition will not create any significant negative visual impact.

The renovated Residence will have no negative visual impact from public roads because the building will be located at the same location of the existing residence and will be shielded by the established bench of the property, and will not be visible from the road due to the natural topography of the area. Likewise, approximately 40% of the new residence will be constructed below grade. Moreover, by ensuring that the new residence features natural and muted colors, the new residence will blend in with the surrounding landscape, thereby avoiding any negative visual impact.
Furthermore, Applicant has worked closely with its architect and design team to ensure the addition compliments the historic residence. The building height of the new addition, as preserved and restored, will be 24’10” and the addition will stand at 29’, below the existing height limit of 30’. The result is that the structures read as one linear architectural element.

In short, the site of the new residence protects and preserves the panoramic mountain views from private residences, public roads and open space alike in accordance with Article 4-806(A)(11). Approval of the SPR Application will not, therefore, create any significant visual impact.

11. The location of the development shall be compatible with the natural topography and existing vegetation and the development shall not cause unnecessary or excessive site disturbance. Such disturbance may include but is not limited to long driveways, over-sized parking areas, or severe alteration of a site’s topography. Driveways or grading shall have a demonstrated associated principal use.

As discussed above, the addition will be located on the established bench area of the Property, which will result in minimal site disturbance. The historic renovation and addition will be compact, thereby allowing for a substantial reduction of the existing driveway and pavement.

Moreover, the choices of building materials for the new residence will complement the existing residence and be compatible with the natural topography and existing vegetation through its use of indigenous Loveland Bluff mixed with Lyons red stone (in a strip stone style), wood siding and dark bronze metal fascia. (See Sheet 7 for graphical exhibit of material choices.)

12. Runoff, erosion, and/or sedimentation from the development shall not have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding area.

Because the addition will be located on the topographic bench area, the potential for adverse impact from runoff, erosion and/or sedimentation to the surrounding area is minimal. As stated above, Applicant will work with its civil engineer to minimize any such potential effects. For example, during construction of the new residence, Applicant will ensure runoff, erosion and sedimentation are mitigated through the use of silt fences on the Property. Additionally, following construction, drainage around the new residence will respect the existing natural flow on the Property, without causing additional adverse impact to the surrounding areas.

13. The development shall avoid Natural Landmarks and Natural Areas as designated in the Goals, Policies & Maps Element of the Comprehensive Plan and shown on the Zoning District Maps of Boulder County. The protection of Natural Landmarks and Natural Areas shall also be extended to their associated buffer zones. Development within or affecting such Landmarks or Areas may be approved, subject
to acceptable mitigation measures and in the discretion of the Director, only if no other sites on the subject property can be reasonably developed, or only if reasonably necessary to avoid significant adverse impacts based upon other applicable Site Plan Review criteria.

The Property does not fall within any protected areas indicated on the Natural Landmarks and Natural Areas Map updated by the County in 2013 (the “Natural Areas Map”). Therefore, Applicant’s request for development on the Property should be approved in accordance with this Article 4-806(A)(13).

14. Where an existing principal structure is proposed to be replaced by a new principal structure, construction or subsequent enlargement of the new structure shall not cause significantly greater impact (with regard to the standards set forth in this Section 4-806) than the original structure.

The new residence will not cause a significantly greater impact than the existing residence. The new residence will occupy the same basic site, preserve the important historic elements and add tasteful square footage to the back (west) and below grade on the Property. Great efforts have been taken throughout this 15 month process to avoid significantly greater impacts.

15. The proposal shall be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, any applicable intergovernmental agreement affecting land use or development, and this Code.

Applicant is not aware of any intergovernmental agreement affecting the Property. Overall, the new residence and preservation of the important historical elements of the existing residence is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Code, and therefore approval by the County of the SPR Application is appropriate.

Lastly, Applicant believes the proposed location of the new residence is the best location on the Property taking into account all other review criteria discussed in this SPR Application.

END OF SPR STATEMENT
In conclusion, this third design concept incorporates 15 months of work, incorporating the extensive feedback of Boulder County Staff, City of Boulder Open Space comments and the guidance of HPAB. We would appreciate your approval of this Site Plan Review.

Sincerely,

SOPHER SPARN ARCHITECTS, LLC

Stephen Sparn, AIA
Principal
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- TOTAL ABOVE GRADE: 3869 SF
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NEW 5,200 SF RESIDENCE
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HISTORIC FACADE WITH ENTRANCE DRIVE - NORTH
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