Historic Preservation Commission
Agenda
February 9, 2015
Council Chambers, 2nd floor of City Hall
City Hall, 749 Main Street
7:00 – 9:00 PM

I. Call to Order
II. Roll Call
III. Approval of Agenda
IV. Approval of Minutes – January 12 (Page 2 to 12)
V. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda
VI. Probable Cause Determination – 1401 Cannon (page 13 to 25)
VII. Update from Staff –
   • Location of Public Notices (Page 26 to 27)
   • Preservation Master Plan (Page 28 to 29)
   • HPF Loan Program (Page 30)
   • Meeting Dates/Locations Clarification (Page 31)
VIII. Committee Reports – None
IX. Update on Demolition – 1001 Lincoln, 564 Grant, 841 Garfield (Page 32 to 34)
X. Update on Alteration Certificate Requests: 740 Front (Page 35)
XI. Items from Commission Members –
XII. Discussion Items for Next Meeting –
XIII. Adjourn
Historic Preservation Commission

Meeting Minutes

January 12, 2015
City Hall
749 Main Street
7:00 PM

Call to Order – Chairperson Watson called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.

Roll Call:

Commission Members Present:
Lynda Haley, Dana Echohawk, Kirk Watson, Peter Stewart, Deborah Fahey, Mike Koertje and Jessica Fasick

Commission Members Absent:
none

City Representatives:
Lauren Trice, Planner I

Approval of Agenda

Watson asked to approve the agenda as is.

Motion was approved by voice vote.

Approval of Minutes

Watson asked for approval December meeting minutes.

Haley moved to approve.

Fasick seconded.

Motion approved by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda –

Jean Morgan stated she believes there is an issue with posting hearing signs in Downtown, and brought up the posting for the Empire Sign demolition as the example.
She was concerned a discussion item has not been placed on this past couple HPC agendas. She stated she thought the regular posting signs for regular properties is fine, but Downtown posting should be handled different due to the parked cars and Main Street Patios.

Watson asked staff about any potential solutions.

Trice stated the main issue is Downtown and this item will be on the next agenda.

Watson stated initially it was to be discussed during the Preservation Master Plan, but we have decided to put it on the next agenda.

Morgan stated she would like to see a policy created on this.

Fahey stated item 17 on our agenda speaks of posting locations.

Trice stated that is for posting the public meeting agenda.

Stewart stated it was a mistake to not include it on the agenda and hopes we can see it on the next meeting agenda.

John Leary spoke regarding landmarking signs. He believes there should be additional landmarking signs that give a brief history of the house. He stated if others get another plaque make sure to ask for the discount.

**Welcome New Commission Members**

Stewart and Koertje are new, and old, commission members.

**Public Hearing – Landmark Request – 1101 Grant**

Trice presented the information in staff’s report. She presented the social history of the structure. She then stated the purpose of the application is to request a landmark for the structure. She stated the structure should be considered for eligibility for local landmarking based on its architectural integrity. She recommends the house be named for the Atkins Family, who owned the house for over 60 years.

Watson asked if the applicant

Koertje asked if the landmarking was just for the house.

Trice said it was for the whole house.

Stewart asked if the shed was a contributing structure.

Trice stated it does appear to have significance but it is unclear of the exact age. It does appear to be over 50 years.

Kathy Valentine, applicant, stated they want to landmark because the house has been around for over 100 years and the mining history of the previous owners. She is
wishing to have the house retained if they ever sell. She believes the house has an interesting past, including the addition done in 1930.

Watson thanked her for her contribution. He then asked if they were going to do anything with their garage.

Valentine stated they might consider placing a 3 car garage in the area that we have. She stated they would keep the existing garage as a shed.

Stewart asked about the reasonable condition of the house and if there is any work that needs to be done.

Valentine stated the house is in awesome condition but the back entry stairway and enclosed porch might need some assistance, such as insulation. She also stated the front porch might need some assistance as well.

Leary stated he was in support of this request and believes this house should become an example of how a house can be adequately added onto and still be livable.

Leslie Julian, neighbor, states she is in support of the landmarking and is glad it isn’t being scraped.

Commission Discussion and Motion

Fahey stated she believes this is a wonderful house and is very appreciative of the action. She agrees with Leary about the additions.

Koertje agrees with Fahey.

Echohawk stated she was happy the entire property is being considered.

Stewart stated this application meets the criteria of architectural and social integrity. He emphasized the siting of this house on the property is also unique and adds to Old Town diversity.

Stewart made a motion to approve this application based on its compliance with the criteria.

Fahey seconded the motion.

Koertje added a friendly amendment to state the landmark includes the other structures on the property. He then asked if the name, Atkins House, was acceptable.

Valentine asked if it makes a difference as to what the house is named.

Stewart stated usually it is associated with the most significant person who owned the property.
Valentine stated she agrees with the name Atkins House because of their involvement in the community.

Watson stated the resolution does not appear to be as specific as stating the landmark is for the entire property. He asked if Koertje wanted to make any changes to the language.

Koertje stated he would.

Watson asked if Stewart would be open to a friendly amendment to include more specific language.

Stewart stated he will wait until he hears the language. He states in general a landmark usually includes everything within in the property lines.

Watson stated he is only concerned because the resolution states “structure” and not “structures”. He recommended changing “on” to “and”.

Koertje agreed and stated we should remove the word “commercial”.

Stewart accepted the amendments.

Motion was approved 7 to 0.

**Public Hearing – Demo Request – 1001 Lincoln**

Trice presented the information provided in staff’s report. She presented the historical background, including some photos. She believes the structure has architectural and social integrity and believes the house has probable cause for a potential landmark. The application was submitted on November 18, 2014 and staff recommends a 30 day stay be placed on this application from the time of this meeting.

Stewart asked why staff chose a 30 day stay.

Trice stated it just gives enough time for staff and the board to speak with the applicant.

Mike Meyers, owner, spoke on behalf of his application. He has chosen Tom Ramsey as his contractor.

Tom Ramsey spoke on behalf of the project. He spoke towards the rubble foundation of the structure and stated the house is in very rough shape. He stated the floors are in rough shape and stated the engineers report gives fair evidence of the poor condition. He presented some of the work he has done in Old Town and in other parts of town showing the detailing he does.

Koertje asked Ramsey what the cost to remediate the foundation.
Ramsey stated it would be between $75,000 to $100,000. He gave details on some of the work involved. He stated there would be other costs to improve the house that might cost up to $250,000 to address.

Stewart stated he appreciated the additional information because he didn’t think the engineers report was not that detailed. He stated there is a certain point where remediation isn’t feasible and believes that is subjective.

Ramsey stated he does do renovations on old houses as well. He stated he lives in Old Town and takes pride in what he does.

Trice stated there is a letter from the adjacent property owner included in the packet.

Stewart stated he appreciates Ramsey’s presentation showing how he cares about Old Town. He stated our criteria is not based on proposed projects, we are to look at the existing situation to determine eligibility. He stated we can look at reasonable balance between expenses to renovate which might preclude landmarking. He states he believes the builder’s numbers are credible.

Koertje agrees with Stewart in regards to the criteria being the focus of this discussion. He states the structure is over 50 years old and has retained its architectural character. He added the social structure is strong with the nod to mining heritage. He stated he appreciates the builder’s numbers but doesn’t believe those are accurate numbers as they were determined tonight.

Watson stated he believed the builder’s numbers were a little high because there was no intent of including the existing structure within your plans. He believes the structure is significant and contributing and is skeptical the structure cannot be integrated, from what he can see from the street.

Stewart stated he appreciated Watson and Koertje’s comments and said the commission usually gets 3 bids from qualified contractors to determine the actually cost of renovation.

Fahey stated she would also like to see some option of preserving the front façade to make it look, from the street, more like the original structure. She recommended a stay of longer than 30 days.

Echohawk believes there isn’t enough evidence or photos to show it is not worthy to be restored.

Haley stated she believes there is definitely architectural integrity. She added the social history shows a family ownership of over 50 years. She recommended there should be research as to how this structure could be included into a future structure.

Trice reminded everyone the decision is whether to release the permit or place a stay on the permit. She stated you can place up to 180 days on the stay.
Stewart stated the best approach would be to lift the structure and place steel underneath, but the cost for that is unknown.

Koertje made a motion to place a stay on the demolition of this structure due to its eligibility. He stated the loss would be detrimental to the neighborhood. He stated there is evidence of neglect and potential high costs of repair, but not enough detailed evidence. He placed a stay of up to 90 days and recommended we review this at our next meeting to explore options.

Fahey seconded the motion and added she would like to see details in the cost to repair the structure and the cost to demo and rebuild.

Watson stated he did not believe that would be an “apples to apples” comparison and might not be fair.

Fahey stated it will cost a certain amount of money to repair the existing foundation and add a new.

Stewart stated that would be phase two of the process, after design assistance has been provided.

Motion was approved 7 to 0.

Meyers asked for a summary of the decision.

Trice stated there has been a 90 day stay placed on the decision and more information needs to be provided for design options.

Stewart stated it is 90 days from the application date.

Trice agreed and stated the application was submitted in November.

**PUBLIC HEARING – Alteration Certificate/Grant Application – 733 Pine**

Watson asked if this item has been continued.

Trice stated it has been continued due to lack of information.

**Update of the Preservation Master Plan**

Trice introduced the consultant, Mary Terese, who will give an update of the process.

Mary Terese presented a recap of the public meeting.

Watson asked if this was going to be online for others to review.

Trice stated it will be on the Preservation Master Plan of the website.
Mary Terese stated the meeting was widely attended and there was a balanced attitude, more so than in any other community, which means there was not a polarity of interests. She stated it was a surprise to see a post WWII ranch listed as one of the top 3 structures in town.

Echohawk asked what the agricultural complex example was.

Mary Terese stated that is the red barn south of Community Park.

Stewart stated the report is great raw data.

Mary Terese then spoke to the upcoming schedule and what are the next steps. She discussed what worked, what didn’t work and what might need to be changed.

Stewart asked about a study session with Council.

Trice stated that will be in April.

Mary Terese presented the list of ongoing issues that will be addressed in the Preservation Master Plan.

Stewart stated this is a great list because it will allow us to discuss the elements that need to be addressed.

Mary Terese stated this is a 20 year plan so it won’t have to be done too often, unless you want to do amendments on your own.

Fahey stated the list does look substantial and inclusive but she doesn’t see a lot of things coming from the public. She believes the list appears to be more from staff, consultant and the commission. She hopes we can see more items from the public before we get to City Council.

Trice stated the March 2nd public meeting will pose the question to the public so we can hear from them.

Watson stated we should create categories to thin down the list. For example, there are process and code issues we can do sooner rather than wait for the Preservation Master Plan to be adopted.

Discussion ensued where the commission recommended minor modifications to the wording of the report. A statement was made the report needs to emphasize the HPF and the benefits that fund brings to the community. Other statements were made to the intent of the master plan.

Mary Terese asked about timing of this report.

Trice stated the next time to discuss this will be February 3rd with City Council.

Some of the commission were upset they didn’t have more time to review this purpose and vision document to discuss and redline.
Fahey stated she feels we are presenting something to council that we have not finalized.

Trice stated we can look at changing the City Council date. She added we can also consider another publicly noticed subcommittee meeting.

Watson stated that might not be a bad idea.

Mary Terese stated we can always present a draft document to City Council and ask for edits at the Council meeting.

Stewart stated he might not completely understand the process, especially if we present an unfinished document to City Council.

Trice stated this should be considered a working document until it is adopted. She stated we can still have a subcommittee meeting for anyone who wanted to attend to add comments.

The commission agreed to this approach.

**Direction – Subcommittees for Preservation Master Plan**

Trice stated we have not established subcommittees for a few elements of the master plan. She asked who would like to volunteer for Goal and Policy.

Fahey and Fasick volunteered.

Trice asked for volunteers for the implementation process.

Koertje volunteered.

Watson asked if Fasick should consider volunteering for implementation based on her background.

Fasick agreed.

Stewart volunteered for Goals and Policies in Fasick’s absence.

**Direction – Subcommittee for Wayfinding Task Force**

Trice asked for volunteers to work on the Open Space wayfinding project in regards to interpretive signs.

Haley and Fahey volunteered.

**Committee Reports – none**

**Update on Demolition Requests - none**
Update on Alteration Certificate Requests – 740 Front

Trice stated a subcommittee reviewed siding material changes to the new addition and released the request.

Stewart asked for more detail.

Trice stated the siding had the same profile as the historic structure and was wood, but has been changed in style and material, to a cementitious product.

Discussion/Comments on Planning Department Referrals – none

Items from Staff – Posting Locations, Meeting Dates, Open Government Pamphlet, and Election of Officers

Trice stated we need a vote for the locations.

Fahey stated the Rec Center location is changing a little so non-paying patrons can see the notices. She asked if we are moving our locations as well.

Trice stated yes.

Motion approved by voice vote.

Trice presented the meeting dates and open government pamphlet.

The commission acknowledged the items.

Trice then asked for a discussion on election of officers.

Stewart stated he believes the chair position should be rotated to give others opportunities.

Watson stated he would like another year because it takes a while to get the process down.

Fasick stated Haley did a great job when she stepped in as chair.

Stewart asked Haley if she is still interested in vice chair position.

Haley stated she would if no one else wanted it. She then stated she would put her name in the hat for chairperson as well.

Watson asked if they could share chair positions.

Trice stated she would check but doesn’t see why not, other than having a standard point person.

Fahey stated it sounds like a co-chair situation.
Koertje stated the HPC needs to have a chair and vice chair, not co-chairs.

Fasick nominated Watson as chairperson.

Stewart nominated Haley as vice-chairperson.

Nominations approved by voice vote.

**Updates from Staff – Reroof Ordinance, Agency Issues for Demolition, Historic Structure Assessment Funding, Demolition and Development Timeline**

Stewart stated the issue with the reroof is it would be best if we had a policy so that we don’t delete roof review from the ordinance so we can release certain types of roof reviews without having to go through a formal subcommittee.

Watson stated he could see the main issue being if the structure was landmarked. Otherwise staff should be able to review and release administratively.

Trice stated the ordinance is grey enough to cover all aspects of the roof. Staff recommends placing this in the Preservation Master Plan.

The commission agreed with the process.

Fahey asked about the demolition and development permit timeline.

Trice believes the agency issue of the demolition has been addressed by the timeline deals with PUD’s and process which should be discussed during the Preservation Master Plan.

Watson stated some of the agencies issue was listed in the building code.

Trice stated the historic structure assessment funding is more of a programming issue that must be addressed.

Watson stated he would like to extend the demolition expiration, especially in the commercial area, to keep a structure alive during the process.

Stewart stated the reason for the expiration is we wanted to stop speculative permits. He added during the PUD process there isn’t a need for a subcommittee since the application comes to the commission.

Watson stated the extension of the demolition time period can be done on a case by case basis. He believes keeping the building alive, during the PUD process, is the underlying theme.

Stewart stated it is worth reviewing.
**Items from Commission Members –**

Fahey stated the new website has a place to link to the list of Louisville structures which have been designated as landmarks. She wondered if there is a way to put a link to the walking brochure.

Trice stated she has just been given the authority to make our own changes so yes, we can. She also tweeted the walking tour brochure.

Stewart stated he doesn’t agree with the fact that a member of the public was shut down 3 times and does not believe we should do that.

Watson asked what the issue is.

Stewart stated the issue is a topic was asked to be discussed 3 months ago and has yet to be discussed.

Haley stated she agreed with Stewart and we should keep this in mind for the future.

Fahey asked why it took so long to get a demolition permit to hearing tonight when it was submitted in November.

Trice gave the background.

Fahey stated the process does not give enough time for us to review the item.

**Discussion Items for Next Meeting – February 9, 2015**

Koertje recommended to discuss the loan program, which is an item that was last discussed a year ago.

Echohawk asked for more detail on the item Koertje was recommending.

Koertje gave a brief history of the loan program and how we need a finance consultant to assist with this program.

**Adjourn**

Stewart made a motion and Fahey seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 9:20.
ITEM: Landmark eligibility probable cause determination for 1401 Cannon Unit A

APPLICANT: Else Roth
1401 Cannon Street, Unit A
Louisville, CO 80027

OWNER: Same

PROJECT INFORMATION:

ADDRESS: 1401 Cannon Street
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: "Unit A 1401 Cannon Condominiums"; formerly Lot 6, Block 8, Caledonia Place
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: circa 1900

REQUEST: A request to find probable cause for a landmark designation to allow for funding for a historic structure assessment for 1401 Cannon Street.
Under Resolution No. 2, Series 2014, a property may be eligible for reimbursement for a historic structure assessment (HSA) from the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) if the Historic Preservation Commission finds “probable cause to believe the building may be eligible for landmarking under the criteria in section 15.36.050 of the Louisville Municipal Code.” Further, “a finding of probable cause under this Section is solely for the purposes of action on the pre-landmarking building assessment grant request, and such finding shall not be binding upon the HPC, City Council or other party to a landmarking hearing.”
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:
*Information from Historian Bridget Bacon*

This house in the Louisville neighborhood of Little Italy was the home of the Rizzi/DiGiacomo family for nearly 100 years. Frank Rizzi, who grew up in the house, was mayor of Louisville for many of the years when it transitioned from being a coal mining town to a modern city.

*Frank Rizzi*

Frank Rizzi, who grew up at 1401 Cannon and served in World War I with the 44th Army Infantry. His terms as mayor were from 1956 to 1960 and 1962 until 1970. He was also a councilman for 18 years. According to his 1991 obituary, it was during his civic tenure that the residents of Louisville got paved streets, sewers, and a new City Hall building. For his occupation, he started working as a coal miner at age 16 and later worked for Fischer Construction.
ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY:

The house at 1401 Cannon was constructed circa 1900 and the structure has maintained its overall form since 1948. The roof shape and openings appear to be the same as the 1948 photo. A chimney has been removed on the south elevation, the house has been resided in asbestos shingles, and the windows and door have been replaced. The gable-roofed home has several additions. The shed addition to the north and a gable addition to the south appear in the 1948 Assessor’s photos. Since 1948, a long gable addition has been added to the rear, along with an enclosed breezeway which leads to a modular ranch home. The modular ranch home is Unit B built in the 1980s.

Overall, the vernacular style of 1401 Cannon Unit A does not have a strong architectural integrity.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE AND CRITERIA FOR FINDING PROBABLE CAUSE FOR LISTING AS LOCAL LANDMARK:

To receive grant funding, the HPC must find probable cause that the property meets the landmark criteria. Landmarks must be at least 50 years old and meet one or more of the criteria for architectural, social or geographic/environmental significance as described in Louisville Municipal Code (LMC) Section 15.36.050(A). The City Council
may exempt a landmark from the age standard if it is found to be exceptionally important in other significance criteria:

1. **Historic landmarks shall meet one or more of the following criteria:**
   a. **Architectural.**
      (1) Exemplifies specific elements of an architectural style or period.
      (2) Example of the work of an architect or builder who is recognized for expertise nationally, statewide, regionally, or locally.
      (3) Demonstrates superior craftsmanship or high artistic value.
      (4) Represents an innovation in construction, materials or design.
      (5) Style particularly associated with the Louisville area.
      (6) Represents a built environment of a group of people in an era of history that is culturally significant to Louisville.
      (7) Pattern or grouping of elements representing at least one of the above criteria.
      (8) Significant historic remodel.
   b. **Social.**
      (1) Site of historic event that had an effect upon society.
      (2) Exemplifies cultural, political, economic or social heritage of the community.
      (3) Association with a notable person or the work of a notable person.
   c. **Geographic/environmental.**
      (1) Enhances sense of identity of the community.
      (2) An established and familiar natural setting or visual feature that is culturally significant to the history of Louisville.

2. **Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites shall meet one or more of the following:**
   a. **Architectural.**
      (1) Exhibits distinctive characteristics of a type, period or manner of construction.
      (2) A unique example of structure.
   b. **Social.**
      (1) Potential to make an important contribution to the knowledge of the area's history or prehistory.
      (2) Association with an important event in the area's history.
      (3) Association with a notable person(s) or the work of a notable person(s).
      (4) A typical example/association with a particular ethnic group.
      (5) A unique example of an event in Louisville's history.
   c. **Geographic/environmental.**
      (1) Geographically or regionally important.

3. **All properties will be evaluated for physical integrity and shall meet one or more of the following criteria:**
   a. Shows character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the community, region, state, or nation.
   b. Retains original design features, materials and/or character.
c. Remains in its original location, has the same historic context after having been moved, or was moved more than 50 years ago.

d. Has been accurately reconstructed or restored based on historic documentation.

Staff has found probable cause to believe this application complies with the above criterion by the following:

Social Significance - Association with a notable person or the work of a notable person.
This was the home of Frank Rizzi, Louisville mayor during the transition from coal mining town to modern city.

Social Significance - Exemplifies cultural, political, economic or social heritage of the community.
The structure is a part of the historic Little Italy and was lived in by the Rizzi/DiGiacomo family for nearly 100 years.

RECOMMENDATION:
The structure has strong social significance due to its association with Frank Rizzi, the Rizzi/DiGiacomo family, and Little Italy.

Staff recommends finding there is probable cause to believe the building may be eligible for landmarking under the criteria in section 15.36.050 of the LMC, making the property eligible for up to $900 for the cost of a historic structure assessment. HPC may, by motion, approve or deny the finding of probable cause.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION AND INFORMATION:
Attached for your review are the following documents:

- 1401 Cannon Unit A History
1401 Cannon Unit A History

Legal Description: “Unit A 1401 Cannon Condominiums”; formerly Lot 6, Block 8, Caledonia Place

Year of Construction: circa 1900 (see discussion below)

Summary: This house in the Louisville neighborhood of Little Italy was the home of the Rizzi/DiGiacomo family for nearly 100 years. Frank Rizzi, who grew up in the house, was mayor of Louisville for many of the years when it transitioned from being a coal mining town to a modern city.

Development of Caledonia Place

The subdivision in which 1401 Cannon is located is Caledonia Place. It was platted and recorded with Boulder County in 1890 by James Cannon, Jr., Howard Morris, and Henry Brooks. It was the fourth addition to original Louisville, which had been platted in 1878.

This particular section of Caledonia Place, located northeast of the core downtown, is still known as Little Italy. It covers Griffith Street from the railroad tracks to Highway 42, as well as Harper Street and the cross streets of Front and Cannon and the west side of Highway 42. The separation of the neighborhood from the rest of the town due in part to the railroad tracks led to the formation of an especially tightknit, close neighborhood and cultural practices that endured for decades, such as winemaking by many residents using grapes that were delivered directly into the neighborhood by truck. This area was attractive to coal miners and their families for its proximity to coal mines to the east and northeast of downtown Louisville.

It was members of the Italian DiGiacomo/James family who at one time owned many or most of the lots at some point and who played a large role in the development of the neighborhood (James being the American version of the name DiGiacomo). This led to many of the families in Little Italy being of Italian heritage, with many of them actually being related to one another.
The concentration of Italians in the neighborhood in the early to mid-1900s was even higher than that in Louisville generally.

Louisville’s Little Italy neighborhood can be seen in this excerpt of the 1909 Drumm’s Wall Map of Louisville. The house at 1401 Cannon is shown as the black square at the northwest corner of Griffith and Cannon.

This excerpt of a 1962 aerial photo of Louisville is a view looking northeast that shows the Little Italy neighborhood. 1401 Cannon is indicated by a blue arrow.
Early Ownership

The developers of the Caledonia Place subdivision sold a large piece of the property to the United Coal Company in the early 1890s. The United Coal Company was the company of Caledonia Place founder James Cannon, Jr. By a deed recorded in 1893, the United Coal Company sold at least all of Blocks 7 and 8, located in Little Italy, to Peter James (Pietro DiGiacomo). Peter James then conveyed ownership of all of Block 8 of Caledonia Place, located in Little Italy, to his wife, Mary James, by a deed recorded in 1898.

Rizzi/DiGiacomo Family Ownership, c. 1900-1997; Date of Construction

By a deed recorded in 1901, Tom Rizzi purchased Lot 6 of Block 8 (1401 Cannon) from Mary James. Members of the Rizzi (in Louisville, pronounced “Ree’-Zye”) family would end up owning 1401 Cannon until 1997.

Boulder County gives 1980 as the date of construction of this house on its website and 1900 as the date on the 1948 Assessor Card. However, the County has frequently been found to be in error with respect to the dates of construction of historic Louisville buildings, or the dates have been found to be very rough estimates, so it is helpful to look at all of the available and relevant information (particularly in cases like this where the County has given two different dates).

Tom and Jennie Rizzi and their first two children are shown to have been living in Little Italy by the time of the 1900 federal census, based on the names of known residents of Little Italy being listed with them. They could have been living in Little Italy even earlier than 1900, as they had moved to Louisville in 1897. The census records indicate that they were renting, but they could have been living in a house on the site with the intention of purchasing it. The deed conveying ownership was recorded in 1901. The 1904 directory lists Tom Rizzi as being a resident of Caledonia Place. The 1909 Drumm’s Wall Map, above, shows the house in its correct location. For these reasons, “circa 1900” is believed to be the most accurate date of construction for this house that can be identified. This is also close to the estimated date of 1900 given by the County. The date of 1980 given on the County website might have been the date of a remodel or an error. There is no evidence that the original house was torn down and another built.

Thomas Rizzi was born in Italy in 1877 and arrived in the United States in about 1890. He married Giovanna “Jennie” DiGiacomo in Wyoming. Jennie DiGiacomo had been born in 1881 in Kansas (sometimes stated to be Arkansas) to Italian-born parents. Although this could not be established with certainty, it is believed that she was a relative of Peter and Mary James, who owned most or all of the lots in Little Italy at one point.

Tom and Jennie’s first child, Frank, was born in Hanna, Wyoming in January 1897. The family reportedly moved to Louisville later in 1897. Their other three children were born in Colorado:
Joe in 1898, John in 1902, and Louise in 1909. During the 1914 strike violence, gunfire from the Hecla Mine aimed towards downtown Louisville threatened residents of Little Italy in particular. This led to evacuations of women and children. According to information at the Louisville Historical Museum, the Rizzi children traveled to the Wellington area to live with their mother’s parents until the danger passed.

Tom Rizzi worked as a coal miner in Louisville. By the time of the 1920 census, Tom and all three of his sons were working as coal miners, and all four of the children were still living at home. By the time of the 1930 census, Tom was still working as a miner, but all three sons had left home, leaving only Louise living with Tom and Jennie. In 1940, only Tom and Jennie were living in the house (although Jennie’s brother also lived on the property, as discussed below).

Louise Rizzi married Louisville resident William Brown in about 1930 and they had two daughters. William died in 1948. Louise and her two daughters then moved in with her parents at 1401 Cannon. In 1951, Tom Rizzi conveyed ownership of 1401 Cannon to his daughter, Louise Rizzi Brown.

Jennie and Tom Rizzi died within four months of one another in late 1954 and early 1955.

Records show that relatives of both Tom and Jennie Rizzi also lived in Little Italy, in houses all around them. In addition to the surnames of Rizzi and DiGiacomo/James, other relatives with such surnames as Carpanzano (Carpenter) and Rappa also lived in the neighborhood. The familial relationships among many of the neighbors in this area no doubt contributed to the tightknit aspect of Little Italy.

The following photo from c. 1928-29 shows the back of the Rizzi house at 1401 Cannon on the right. The family shown is the Bosko family, who lived next door at 1409 Cannon. The Bosko house is on the left.
The following images are from the 1948 Boulder County Assessor card for 1401 Cannon.
Frank Rizzi, who grew up at 1401 Cannon and served in World War I with the 44th Army Infantry, became a leader in Louisville at a time when the town was transitioning from being a coal mining town to a modern city. His terms as mayor were from 1956 to 1960 and 1962 until 1970. He was also a councilman for 18 years. According to his 1991 obituary, it was during his civic tenure that the residents of Louisville got paved streets, sewers, and a new City Hall building. He was also instrumental in obtaining more water rights for Louisville. In recorded oral history interviews from 1977 and 1990, he stated that his parents always had a garden and that he remembered playing on an informal Little Italy baseball team with eight boys from the neighborhood; they had to find a ninth player from town to make a full team.

For his occupation, he started working as a coal miner at age 16 and later worked for Fischer Construction. He married Annie Jasko in 1923 and they lived one block from his parents, at 1401 Courtesy Rd. (Highway 42), in a house that he built.

The following photo shows Frank Rizzi in the 1970s. He died in 1991 at the age of 94. In 1995, the Historical Commission selected him to be the recipient of the 1996 Louisville Pioneer Award.

Joe Rizzi married Christina DiGiacomo and they lived on Grant Ave. in Louisville. Their daughter, Rita Ferrera, was born in 1924 and was available to be interviewed for this report. She remembers many family gatherings at her grandparents’ house at 1401 Cannon when she was growing up, particularly on Sunday nights and holidays. She stated that on Christmas Eve following Midnight Mass, her grandfather, Tom Rizzi, would cook sausage for all of the relatives to enjoy at the house at 1401 Cannon. She recalls that Little Italy was almost all Italian when she was a child and remembers a big garden and an outhouse in the back yard. A “shanty,” or summer kitchen, was also in the back yard for cooking and eating in the summertime to keep
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the house from getting too hot. According to Rita, her grandmother’s brother, Joseph James, slept in the shanty and took his meals in the house. The family called him “Big Joe” to differentiate him from her father, who was called “Little Joe.” (The 1940 census records confirm this arrangement of Joe James living by the Rizzis.) Rita also recalls her grandmother’s wonderful cooking and the presence of a pantry off the kitchen on the north side of the house at 1401 Cannon.

John Rizzi married Angeline DiGiacomo and lived at 1003 Harper in Little Italy, not far from 1401 Cannon.

Louise Rizzi Brown continued to live at 1401 Cannon after the deaths of her parents, and lived there until her death in 1996. Her daughters then sold the house in 1997.

Many descendants of Tom Rizzi and Jennie DiGiacomo Rizzi still live in the Louisville area, with some still living in Little Italy itself.

**Later Owners, 1997-present**

Louise Rizzi Brown’s daughters, Dorothy Thompson and Delores Steinbaugh, sold 1401 Cannon in 1997 to James P. & Sarah E. Beaton.

Rita Ferrera, granddaughter of Tom and Jennie Rizzi, stated that she believes that the addition onto the back of the original house at 1401 Cannon, which is now a separate property called Unit B, was not put on until after the Rizzi family’s ownership ended in 1997.

In 1998, the Beatons sold the property to Jade Cauldron LLC. County records show that in 2006, Jade Cauldron LLC officially platted separate condominiums on the property. The original house that faces Cannon is now Unit A. A later addition to the west, which is parallel to Griffith Street, is Unit B. The 2003 Cole Directory for Longmont, Boulder & Vicinity shows that Jim and Leticia Dienst were residents of Unit A and that William and Deb Palmer were residents of Unit B in 2003. This suggests that the separate dwelling areas were established at least a few years before they were officially platted as separate condominiums.

Alex Diamond purchased 1401 Cannon, Unit A in 2006. The current owner, Else M. Roth, purchased the property from him in 2013. According to online County property records, she is the current owner of Unit A, while Andre Shea Armijo is the current owner of Unit B.

The preceding research is based on a review of relevant and available online County property records, census records, oral history interviews, Louisville directories, and Louisville Historical Museum maps, files, and obituary records.
TO: HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

SUBJECT: PUBLIC NOTICE PROCEDURES

DATE: FEBRUARY 9, 2015

FROM: TROY RUSS, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND BUILDING SAFETY

SUMMARY:
The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) requested an agenda item be added for public discussion regarding staff’s administrative application of public notice requirements for various Historic Preservation requests.

BACKGROUND:
Louisville municipal Code
Public notice requirements vary based on the land development request in terms of posting (place and duration), mailing (distance from affected property), and publication in the local newspaper. Based on community feedback, City Council adopted Ordinance 1647, Series 2013 amending Titles 16 and 17 of the Louisville Municipal Code (LMC) to update, clarify, and make more consistent public notice requirements for all quasi-judicial proceedings.

Unfortunately, Chapter 15.36, Historic Preservation, was not amended with Ordinance 1647. Public notice requirements for historic preservation requests are interwoven throughout Chapter 15.36 in the LMC:

1) Historic Designation (Landmark) with Owner’s Consent: Section 15.36.060B (Commission Hearing) and Section 15.36.060C (Council Hearing);
2) Landmark Alteration Certificate Review: Section 15.36.110D
3) Demolition Request: Section – 15.36.200G

In each of these three cases, the LMC dictates requirements of the public notices in terms posting (place and duration), mailing (distance from affected property), and publication in the local newspaper.

None of the LMC’s requirements dictate the placement, color, or size of the public notice. It is staff’s opinion there are too many variables in the actual placement of the notice to be codified in the LMC. The final placement requirements of the public notice postings are based on administrative application of the code.

Concerns were raised regarding the placement of the public notice for the demolition request of the Empire Sign. Staff immediately adjusted the postings placement and implemented the following administrative guidelines:
1. The posting shall be visible from the sidewalk and street.
2. Staff shall work with the applicant to seek the most appropriate location balancing visibility requirements with economic hardship concerns.
3. Staff shall have the discretion to place the public notice on the property, on a structure’s wall, or in a structure’s window;
4. Staff shall have the discretion to vary the size of the public notice between 24"x36" and 36"x48";
5. Staff shall have the discretion to vary the orientation of the public notice between landscape and portrait orientation.
6. If practical, staff should have the public noticed placed above the height of parked cars.

DISCUSSION:
Staff is interested in hearing the HPC’s and the community's comments regarding the staff’s administrative application of the public notice posting requirements.

RECOMMENDATION:
None.

ATTACHMENTS:
None.
MEMORANDUM

To: Historic Preservation Commission Members

From: Department of Planning and Building Safety

Subject: Preservation Master Plan Discussion – HPC Training, Tools, and Processes

Date: February 9, 2015

Purpose:
To seek input from all HPC members in order to assist the Program Description/ Assessment and Goal/ Policy Setting subcommittees in their tasks for the Preservation Master Plan.

Background:
As per local ordinance, the HPC is responsible for:
- protection and preservation of the city's historic and cultural heritage,
- enhancement of property values, and the stabilization of historic neighborhoods;
- increase of economic and financial benefits through the city's attractions to tourists and visitors; and
- provision of educational opportunities to increase public appreciation of Louisville’s unique heritage

The HPC also has certain powers and duties related to the City of Louisville’s CLG status (some repetition of above). These include:
- review of landmark and historic district nominations and making recommendations to City Council regarding designation;
- review of alterations, demolitions, moving of landmarks/ buildings in historic districts;
- advise/ assist owners of historic properties on physical and financial aspects of preservation (renovation, rehabilitation, and reuse, nomination to NR/ SR)
- develop/ assist with public education (walking tours, brochures, plaques, lectures, conferences);
- conduct surveys of historic areas to determine historic significance and prioritize nomination and designation;
- advise City Council on matters related to preserving the historic character of the City; and
- pursue financial assistance for preservation-related programs
**Questions:**

Given the above duties, your experience on the HPC, and your opinions regarding the types of issues likely to face the Louisville HPC between 2015 and 2035…

1) What type of **training** does (and will) the HPC need? Please be specific about topics, formats, and frequency.

2) What types of **tools** are needed to assist the HPC in fulfilling their duties? Please be specific about topics, formats, and prioritization/ timing.

3) What changes or improvements to current **HPC** (and general historic preservation) **processes** might make the Commission more effective in fulfilling its duties? Consider specific challenges and brainstorm solutions.
MEMORANDUM

To: Historic Preservation Commission Members

From: Department of Planning and Building Safety

Subject: Historic Preservation Fund Loan Program

Date: February 3, 2015

On January 26, 2015, Planning Staff met with the City’s Economic Development and Finance Departments to discuss the implementation of the Historic Preservation Fund Loan Program. The HPF Loan Program was approved by City Council in Resolution No. 4, Series 2014. Staff is finalizing the Request for Proposal for the administration of the loans and working out the details of the operation of the program.
MEMORANDUM

To: Historic Preservation Commission Members

From: Department of Planning and Building Safety

Subject: 2015 Meeting Dates

Date: February 2, 2015

HPC Meetings:

Regular meetings are held at 7:00 p.m. on the 3rd Monday of every month in Council Chambers (2nd floor of City Hall, 749 Main Street).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note:

1) January 12th, February 9th, and April 27th are special meeting dates.
2) The date of the joint Historic Preservation Commission and City Council study session is April 14th. This meeting is held in the 1st floor conference room of the Library, 951 Spruce Street.

Other Upcoming Events:

- March 11: Preservation Master Plan Open House, 6:30pm at City Hall
- May 20: “The Homes of Our Families: Connecting with the Homes of Ancestors and Leaving a Record for Future Generations”, 7pm at Library Meeting Room
MEMORANDUM

To: Historic Preservation Commission Members

From: Department of Planning and Building Safety

Subject: Demolition Update – 1001 Lincoln

Date: February 3, 2015

On January 9, 2015 the Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the request for a full demolition of the structure at 1001 Lincoln. The Historic Preservation Commission put a 90-day stay on the property from the date of application. On January 23, 2015, Kirk Watson, appointed by the full HPC, met with the property owner to review the condition of the property and offer design assistance.

The property owner has chosen to wait out the stay which expires on February 16, 2015.
MEMORANDUM

To: Historic Preservation Commission Members
From: Department of Planning and Building Safety
Subject: Demolition Update – 564 Grant
Date: February 3, 2015

On January 14, 2015 Planning Staff and two subcommittee members of the HPC reviewed a permit request to replace the siding and windows at 564 Grant Avenue.

On February 2, 2015 Planning Staff and two subcommittee members of the HPC reviewed a permit request to replace the roof at 564 Grant Avenue.

After deliberation, the HPC subcommittee decided to release the permit because the demolition of the structure does not have a strong social or architectural significance. Also, the siding and roof materials are not historic.
MEMORANDUM

To: Historic Preservation Commission Members

From: Department of Planning and Building Safety

Subject: Demolition Update – 841 Garfield

Date: February 3, 2015

On February 2, 2015 Planning Staff and two subcommittee members of the HPC reviewed a permit request to demolish the rear addition on the residential at 841 Garfield.

After deliberation, the HPC subcommittee decided to release the permit because the demolition of the rear addition would have a minimal impact on the overall architectural integrity.
MEMORANDUM

To: Historic Preservation Commission Members
From: Department of Planning and Building Safety
Subject: Alteration Certificate Update – 740 Front (Di Francia Saloon)
Date: February 3, 2015

On January 13, 2015 Planning Staff and two subcommittee members of the HPC reviewed a permit request to add a sign over the front door of 740 Front. The PUD showed the sign along the Front Street side of the building but not over the front door.

After deliberation, the HPC subcommittee decided to release the permit because the changes will have a minimal impact on the exterior of the historic structure. Also, the sign location is the same as the previous Old Louisville Inn sign.

Sign Design for 740 Front