November 12, 2019

AMENDED AGENDA

5:30 P.M. LAFAYETTE URBAN RENEWAL MEETING
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
1290 S. Public Road

I. 5:30 PM - OPENING OF REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING
   A. Roll Call

II. MINUTES
   A. Minutes from the October 8, 2019 Meeting

III. PUBLIC INPUT
   B. Items from the Public

IV. AGENDA ITEMS
   C. Addendums to the 2019 Surveys of the 700 Block
   D. Final Draft RFP for 700 Block
   E. 2020 Budget
   F. Storage Units at Carr Avenue and Baseline Road
   G. New Bookstore/Cafe
   H. HPB Update

V. NEW BUSINESS/STAFF AND COMMISSIONER REPORTS

VI. ADJOURN TO EXECUTIVE SESSION
   According to C.R.S. 24-6-402(4)(e), for determining positions relative to matters that may be
   subject to negotiations; developing strategy for negotiations; and instructing negotiators
   pertaining to properties on Public Road and Baseline Road.
Opening of the Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Call to Order
Chair Muller opened the October 8, 2019 meeting of the Lafayette Urban Renewal Authority (LURA) at 5:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at 1290 South Public Road, Lafayette, Colorado. Those present were Muller, and Commissioners Arrington, Gross, and Bonner.

Also present was Executive Director Caruso.

Minutes from the September 10, 2019 Meeting
The Authority reviewed the minutes from the September 10, 2019 meeting. Arrington motioned to approve the minutes. Gross seconded. All voted in favor.

Public Input
Vicky Uhland, 303 W. Simpson St., discussed the 700 Block RFP and Circle Motel redevelopment application. She really likes the way the RFP is coming together and gave kudos to staff, the designer, and LURA for working on this. She appreciates the surveys that LURA has conducted on the property as well. She discussed the surveys that have been conducted on the properties and their inclusion in the RFP. She offered to proofread the RFP for LURA.

Ms. Uhland discussed the Circle Motel redevelopment. She likes the commercial building close to Baseline and that 2-story building along Cornelius Street is appropriate. She had concerns with 3-story buildings. Her biggest concern is the density. She inquired about what the City is getting for density bonus. She had concerns about whether the live/work units would be used for mixed uses.

Tej Mangat, 709 S. Public Road, discussed the RFP that LURA is entertaining for the 700 Block. He stated his history with the City and property. He stated his business has never been late on sales tax payments, and his business generates thousands in tax revenues for the City. He stated he and the neighbor would like to obtain the property and work with LURA and the City on redeveloping the property, prior to LURA publishing the RFP.

Mark Tracy, Barbara Huntting, and Diedre Appelhans came to let LURA know they purchased the assets from the former Book Cellar in Louisville, and they will be rebranding the business and opening in Lafayette. They stated they have worked with LURA on securing a location and helping the financing of the build-out. At this time, they are keeping the location under wraps, but will announce it soon. They are looking to be open in the middle of January.

RFP for 700 Block
Caruso gave a background on the 700 Block and history of the RFP evolution. Caruso looked for feedback on the RFP drafted to date. He stated it would be hoped for LURA to adopt at their November meeting. Caruso stated we will try and shorten the document and make it more readable.

Muller discussed the surveys conducted of citizens on what they would like to see with any potential redevelopment, and discussed the HPB surveys. Muller stated he thinks staff captured LURA’s intent by improving the RFP.
Arrington mentioned the dates the RFP responses will be due. Gross stated he thinks the RFP is capturing everything LURA was looking for. Bonner concurred.

**Site Plan/Architectural Review for 200 W. Baseline Road**
Caruso presented the Site Plan/Architectural Review for 200 W. Baseline Road. Caruso stated that the conditions presented are those that Planning staff has drafted to date. Due to last minute discussions, the conditions changed slightly from the conditions in the packet.

Erik Hartronft, Hartronft and Associates, 950 Spruce Street, Louisville, stated he will present the application. Owner Matt Godshaw gave a brief overview of his experience and view on the redevelopment of the former Circle Motel. He stated his intent with the development is to contribute to Lafayette in a positive way. Hartronft discussed the neighborhood meeting and concerns, and gave an overview of the project. Hartronft discussed the architectural intent, design, and elements. He stated he concurs with the conditions as amended.

Caruso discussed with LURA the process of review. The Authority discussed the conditions. Hartronft discussed the access to public transit, urban location, and benefits to the community for this development along with the transition to the neighborhood. Hartronft discussed the live/work units and signage.

Arrington moved to approve the Site Plan/Architectural Review for 200 W. Baseline Road with the 29 conditions. Gross seconded the motion. Motioned passed unanimously.

Caruso asked LURA if they would like to make a motion to offer a grant to move any existing structures, should the owner want to donate them, to the public. The Authority showed interest in doing so, but needs more information.

**2018 Budget Recap**
Caruso gave a brief overview of the 2018 budget final numbers. Caruso stated the ending net position of LURA increased to $2,991,256 with cash position decreasing to $1,029,969 (due to outstanding loans).

**2020 Budget**
Caruso stated he would like feedback for the 2020 budget. The 2020 budget, as proposed, shows estimated revenues of $1,289,000 with estimated expenses of $714,000. Caruso stated the projected 2020 beginning fund balance is $1,935,482 with the estimated ending balance being $2,510,498. Caruso stated he will present to Council per the Urban Renewal Plan requirement, and bring back to LURA at their November meeting.

**Storage Units at Carr Avenue and Baseline Road**
Muller discussed the storage units at Carr Avenue and Baseline Road being for sale. He stated that there is an opportunity for LURA to do something creative, diverse, and eclectic such as a park at the property. Muller discussed the built environment, existing destination points in the area, and potential new development in the area. He discussed how the space could be programmed, installation of murals, etc.
Caruso discussed the asking price, the 2020 budget and numbers, and potential funding options. The Authority discussed it and decided to bring it to the next meeting when more members of the Authority are present. Caruso mentioned that the property could be under contract by then. The Authority acknowledged and understood.

**New Business/Staff and Commission Reports**
Arrington discussed Legacy Lafayette and gave a status update. No other comments were received.

**Adjourn**
Muller adjourned the meeting at 7:48 p.m.

LAFAYETTE URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY, COLORADO

ATTEST: Kevin Muller, Chair

Roger Caruso, Executive Director/Secretary

The minutes herein are a summary of the business conducted at this meeting, not a verbatim transcription. Only the actions taken and text appearing within quotation marks are verbatim.
STAFF MEMORANDUM

To: LURA
From: Roger Caruso, LURA Executive Director
Date: November 7, 2019
RE: Addendum to 2011 and 2019 Surveys for 701, 705, 707, and 711 S. Public Rd.

Attached, please find an addendum to the 2011 and 2019 Surveys. The addendum was submitted to staff by Kimberly Dugan of Wood Identification and Consultation Services. Ms. Dugan is also the Vice Chair for the Lafayette Historic Preservation Board. The addendum is a result of the HPB/LURA workshop on September 14, at which, Historic Preservation Board members expressed concerns with information (or lack thereof) within the 2019 Surveys LURA commissioned (and the 2011 surveys as well). The Historic Preservation Board asked LURA if LURA would be willing to update the 2019 surveys with corrections/additional information.

Staff connected the historic preservationist LURA hired, Natalie Feinberg Lopez of Built Environment Evolution, with Ms. Dugan, to discuss the corrections/additions. Ms. Feinberg Lopez agreed to update the surveys if supplied factual information, and to update the surveys with more history on previous owner/occupants.

Staff has subsequently discussed with Ms. Feinberg Lopez and she was unwilling to make some of the proposed changes because she does not agree with the findings presented. As stated by her, in her professional opinion, some of the changes are not factually accurate. In addition, Ms. Feinberg Lopez disagrees with the additional criteria for designation of 705 S. Public Road as a local landmark.

Given that Ms. Feinberg Lopez will update the surveys with some, but not all of the information requested, staff recommended Ms. Dugan provide an one (1) addendum that was all-inclusive. As such, please see attached addendum.

Attachments: 2019 Cultural Resource Survey Addendum
Report:

2019 Cultural Resource Survey Addendum:
701 S. Public Road (5BL11247), 705, S. Public Road (5BL11248), and 707 S. Public Road (5BL11249), Lafayette, Boulder County, Colorado

Submitted to:
The City of Lafayette
1290 S. Public Road
Lafayette, CO 80026

Submitted by:
Kimberly Dugan
Wood Identification and Consultation Services
P.O. Box 550
Lafayette, Colorado 80026

November 6, 2019
2019 Cultural Resource Survey Addendum: 701 S. Public Road (5BL11247), 705, S. Public Road (5BL11248), and 707 S. Public Road (5BL11249), Lafayette, Boulder County, Colorado

BACKGROUND

Kimberly Dugan of Wood Identification and Consultation Services (WICS) was asked by the Lafayette Historic Preservation Board (HPB) and the Lafayette Urban Renewal Authority (LURA) to compile additional historical background information and construction material data for three properties that were recently the subject of cultural resource surveys commissioned by LURA. The purpose of this addendum is to address inaccuracies from the recent 2019 survey as well as a previous survey undertaken in 2011\(^1\) and to provide additional historical information on each of the three properties of concern.

Kimberly Dugan also currently serves as Vice-Chair of the HPB. Under Section 47.3(c)(7) of the Lafayette Municipal Code, the powers and duties of the HPB include “Conduct[ing] surveys of historic areas for the purpose of defining those of historic significance, and prioritizing the importance of identified historic areas.” HPB board members Doug Conarroe and Amanda Downes contributed historical research and information for this report. Mr. Conroe and Ms. Dugan completed limited field investigations of 701 S. Public in September 2019. In compiling this data and completing this report, Ms. Dugan is acting in her capacity as a historic preservation professional; This report represents solely her professional conclusions and does not reflect the opinion(s) or conclusions of the HPB as a whole.

SCOPE OF WORK

Three properties identified by LURA as the subjects of a cultural resource survey undertaken in the summer of 2019 are included in this addendum. The three properties are 701 S. Public Road, 705 S. Public Road, and 707 S. Public Road. This addendum provides additional information on the ownership history of each of the three properties, as well as additional information on the potential eligibility of each of the properties for landmarking at the local level. Updated OAHP forms that include these expanded sections will be submitted separately from this addendum.

FINDINGS

Format

The body of this addendum reflects changes and/or updates to specific sections of the Colorado OAHP (Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation) 1403 Cultural Resource Inventory Form. The identified survey source (i.e., the 2011, 2019, or 2019 Addendum) is identified at the beginning of each section. The text is also color-coded to add additional clarity regarding the source; the 2011 survey information is provided in purple text, the 2019 survey information is provided in green text, and this addendum’s additional information is in black text. Additional historical resources are identified in the appropriate section of the 1403 OAHP form; footnotes and hyperlinks have also been added with reference information where applicable. This addendum only includes the sections of the 1403 OAHP form where additional information or corrections have been provided. The properties of concern are included in numerical address order.

701 S. Public

Figures 1a, 1b, and 1c. Images of 701 S. Public from the Boulder County Assessor Record (1a, top left, ca. 1950), the 2011 survey (1b, top right), and courtesy of Mr. Doug Conroe (1c, bottom left, September 2019).

21. 2011 Survey - General Architectural Description:
The vacant one-story, front-gabled house is set deep on the lot near the rear alley. The size of the house is 28’ x 22’. It has parged concrete or concrete stuccoed walls and an asphalt composition roof. The roof is asphalt composition. The eaves are overhanging and enclosed with exposed rafters. There is a partial brick chimney in the center of the house. There is a centrally located wood-panel front door. Also, on the façade are two windows with plywood board covering. There are three windows on the north elevation and one window on the west
elevation; all with plywood covering. All windows have wood frames. There are doors on the west and south elevations covered with plywood. There is an open porch (10’ x 6’) on the façade with concrete foundation and gabled roof with wood posts. The foundation is concrete and there is a concrete path leading to South Public Road.

21. 2019 Survey - General Architectural Description:
The front-gabled house is located towards the rear of the lot, close to the alleyway that forms the West boundary of the property. The size of the house is 616sf. The property has not had a tenant or resident for number of years, and the condition of the house and property reflects the lack of maintenance. The house appears to be concrete block, with a concrete stucco on exterior walls. The gable has composite shingles on the exterior, possibly asbestos shingles. The roof is asphalt composite shingles. The eaves are overhanging. The centrally located brick chimney is damaged and missing the majority above the roof surface. The East elevation is the facade, and has a centrally located wood-panel front door, flanked by double hung windows, which are currently covered by plywood. The North elevation has three windows, equally spaced, all covered with plywood. The West elevation has one small window, with a door on the south side of the elevation, all covered with plywood. The South elevation has a door, covered by plywood, and a make-shift ramp where there might have been stairs at one time. The is a porch located on the East elevation, at the front entrance to the house, which appears to be original to the date of construction. The porch is 10’ x 6’ with on a concrete pad and a gabled roof that matches the pitch of the gabled roof of the main house. The wood posts at the corners are not original to the date of construction. The foundation of the house appears to be board-formed concrete. A concrete path leads to South Public Road.

21. 2019 Addendum - General Architectural Description:
The subject structure is generally described accurately in both the 2011 and 2019 surveys. However, a close visual inspection shows the exterior walls are constructed of structural hollow clay tile blocks (Figure 2), not concrete or CMU (concrete masonry units) with wood framing on the gable ends and roof construction.

Figure 2. Exposed terra cotta hollow clay tile visible on the west elevation of the building. Photo courtesy of Doug Conarroe.
25. **2011 Survey - Date of Construction:** Estimate: 1920  Actual:  
Source of Construction: Boulder County Tax Assessor & Real Estate Appraisal Card Records

25. **2019 Survey - Date of Construction** Estimate: 1908  Actual:  
Source of information: Boulder County Assessors Form at Carnegie Library, source on form labeled “B.C.R.”

25. **2019 Addendum - Date of Construction** Estimate: 1908 Actual:  
Source of information: Boulder County Assessors Form at Carnegie Library, source on form labeled “B.C.R.,” Lafayette Leader, 1908 article, and property information from the Boulder County Clerk and Recorder.

29. **2011 Survey - Construction History:** According to the Boulder County Tax Assessor Card, the house was built in 1920; however, the 1948 Boulder County Real Estate Appraisal Card lists 1907 as the build date. It is unclear whether the original house was razed to build the larger house, which is suggested by the deep set on the lot. The appraisal card states the house was constructed of yellow tile, but is now covered with a parged concrete in stucco style. The 1937 Sanborn Map shows a rectangular dwelling with a long, irregular shaped addition on the west side that extended around the south elevation. However, the house assessment from 1948 shows the same footprint as is visible today. The circa 1948-50 photo on the appraisal card shows an irregular west/south addition. At some unknown date, at least after 1948, the addition was removed.

29. **2019 Survey - Construction History:**  
The 1998 survey states a recording of a 1907 construction date, but the Boulder County Assessors Card lists it as 1908. The photo from this card shows an irregular west/south addition that appears to be a stud-frame construction. It was demolished at an unknown date. The 1998 survey states “the house was constructed of yellow tile” beneath the concrete stucco, thus making the structure eligible for land marking criteria, however no evidence of yellow tile was found during the site inspection in 2019. Research of the construction history did not reveal the source of “yellow tile”, in fact to the contrary, the Boulder County Assessor Card list the construction as concrete block with true dimension timbers for joists. Research regarding any local or national materials of historical value called “yellow tile” or “yellow brick” were not found. It is suggested that perhaps the intent was to say the house had hollow tile or hollow brick. This is a recognizable material, but is common, and would not typically warrant eligibility.

29. **2019 Addendum - Construction History:**  
The 2011 survey text includes inaccurate information based on the Boulder County Assessor’s Card. The handwritten note identifying the exterior wall construction type is decipherable as “hollow tile,” not “yellow tile” over stucco (Figure 3). The foundation walls are listed on the card as “cement.” The text of the 2019 survey references a “1998 survey”. As there were no surveys completed in 1998 of this area of Lafayette, the text should be corrected to refer to the 2011 survey as the source of the information.
Additionally, there is no reference on the Assessor’s Card to “concrete block foundation with true dimension joists.” This text should be removed from the 2019 survey form unless a direct source of the information can be provided. The City of Lafayette has digital versions of Boulder County Assessor’s Cards available at https://www.cityoflafayette.com/1331/Assessor-Records.

Additionally Information - the 1937 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map identifies this as a single story wood frame dwelling with a footprint appearing to match the configuration of the building as visible in the 1950 Assessor’s Card. A visual inspection of the building in September 2019 confirmed the exterior walls are constructed of structural hollow clay tile with cementitious stucco; the foundation is concrete. The interior walls are wood frame construction with plaster and lath. The roof framing is rough-sawn dimension lumber.

![Figure 3](image.png)

**Figure 3.** A detail of the Boulder County Assessor’s Card, identifying the exterior wall construction as “hollow tile”.

### 35. 2011 Survey - Historical Background:

The house may have been built between 1907 and 1920, but the earliest record of ownership was Mary D. Clyncke in 1948 and then Charles and Blanche Grant in 1950. The Grants, however, did not occupy the house, but lived at 507 East Chester Street. The earliest listing in the Lafayette City Directories, state the occupants of 701 South Public Road as Henry and Theresa Manzanares in 1955. Henry “Dick” Manzanares was born in Walsenberg, CO but has lived in Lafayette since 1922, working on a farm and a coal mine for 25 years before becoming a plumber(pipefitter. In 1959, Mrs. Rita Martinez, who worked at Barber Brother’s Poultry, also lived with them. Henry started working at Rockwell International in 1966 and then retired in 1976. By at least 1967, the Manzanareses had moved out of the house, presumable when Dick started work at
Rockwell International and the house stood vacant. From at least 1972, William J. (a teacher) and Helen Martinez occupied the house. The house is currently vacant.

35. 2019 Survey - Historical Background:
Records show the house was built in 1908. The earliest record of ownership was Mary D. Clyncke, who owned the house in 1948 (from 1998 survey). Charles and Blanche Grant are shown to be the owners from the 1950 County Assessor records. The Grants resided at 507 East Chester Street. In 1955 the Boulder County Directory shows the occupants at 701 South Public Road as Henry and Theresa Manzanares. From the 1998 Survey: “Henry “Dick” Manzanares was born in Walsenberg, CO but has lived in Lafayette since 1922, working on a farm and a coal mine for 25 years before becoming a plumber/pipefitter. In 1959, Mrs. Rita Martinez, who worked at Barber Brother’s Poultry, also lived with them. Henry started working at Rockwell International in 1966 and then retired in 1976. By at least 1967, the Manzanareses had moved out of the house, presumable when Dick started work at Rockwell International and the house stood vacant. From at least 1972, William J. (a teacher) and Helen Martinez occupied the house.” The house has been vacant for a number of years.

35. 2019 Addendum - Historical Background:
The 2019 survey text in this section makes reference to a 1998 survey; this should be corrected to reference the 2011 survey or the correct source of information.

Additional Historical background - Emma Sage was deeded the land south of Emma Street by Mary Miller ca.1900. (Emma Street was named by Mary Miller in 1889.) The Industrial City No. 2 Addition plat that includes the parcel that became 701 S. Public, is situated on land acquired from Emma Sage by Charles Spaulding in 1903. Nellie Davis Patton owned the land following Charles Spaulding, until 1907. In 1907, John Barnd and his law partner, James Miller, platted the expansive Industrial City No. 2 Addition west of South Public Road and south of West Emma Street. Charles and Christina Stonefelt purchased the land from Nellie Davis Patton in 1907 and owned the property until 1910. Charles and Christina Stonefelt may have built the residence that stands today. A Lafayette Leader article published in 1908 states that Stonefelt’s house, “south of the railroad tracks on the Main road,” was damaged by fire. The roof was destroyed and most of the family’s personal effects were lost. It would thus seem likely that the house was rebuilt with structural hollow clay clay (a fire-resistant material) following this 1908 fire.

Elizabeth and Peter Smith then purchased the property in 1910 and owned it until 1916. The Bankers International Life Insurance Co. owned the lot from 1916 to 1920. Louis Prince and his daughter, Lillie R. Prince (Sherratt) owned the property from 1920 to 1924. George B. Smith and his wife, Ellen Smith owned the property from 1924 to 1929. Engelbert Gosch owned the house from 1929 to 1943. Boulder County ownership records show Mary Clynke owned the house at 701 S. Public Road starting in 1943. In October of 1948, Mary Clyncke sold the property to the Charles J. and Blanche B. Grant, who appear to have owned the property into the 1960s. The Lafayette Directory shows that Henry and Theresa Manzanares lived in the property from 1955 through
1966, according to the 2011 survey author. Henry “Dick” Manzanares was born in Walsenburg and came to Lafayette in 1938 to work in the mines before becoming a plumber (Figure 4). In March of 1967, Gene Levy purchased the property through auction from the City of Lafayette (the property had apparently been seized and sold at auction to collect on delinquent property taxes).

36. 2011 Survey - Sources of Information:

36. 2019 Survey - Sources of Information:

36. 2019 Addendum - Sources of Information:
The 2019 survey identifies a 1998 survey as a source; it is likely this is in reference to the 2011 survey and should be corrected.

Figure 4. Historical information on Henry Manzanares, from Latinos of Boulder County, 1900-1980, Volume 1: History and Contributions, by Marjorie K. McIntosh, https://bocolatinohistory.colorado.edu/sites/default/files/McIntosh-Latinos-Volume1.pdf.

42. 2011 Survey - Statement of Significance: The building was evaluated for architecture for its reportedly yellow tile construction. However, no data is available to substantiate it is constructed of yellow tile. Because the use of tile for houses is limited, removal of the exterior materials to reveal the tile construction should prompt a reevaluation. Construction and historical research for 701 South Public Road provided no evidence that there are any historical associations with persons or events that would make it eligible for the National Register under Criteria A and B. The house
42. 2019 Survey - Statement of Significance:
The 1998 survey states the house at 701 Public Road is constructed of yellow tile as an aspect of significance, however there was no evidence of yellow tile, nor evidence that yellow tile is a material of historic significance. It would not change the status of the local landmark criteria. While there is excellent documentation of the residents at site, the specific history does not show associations with persons or events that would make it eligible for the National Register or local landmarking. The house does not represent a specific style inherent to the US, the West, or to Lafayette. No architects or builders were identified as associated with the construction of the property.

36. 2019 Addendum - Statement of Significance:
Both the 2011 and 2019 surveys focus on “yellow tile” as a construction material type. This text should be changed to reflect the actual construction material and focus on the historical significance of hollow clay tile construction in residential buildings ca. 1908. Unfortunately, while much has been published on decorative glazed tile and some has been written on structural clay tile in commercial applications, there is a lack of published information on the use of structural hollow clay tile block for residential construction in Colorado and in Boulder County. Based on existing historical resource surveys of Lafayette, hollow clay tile does appear to be a rare construction material for both residential and commercial buildings. Known hollow tile structures include one outbuilding in Old Town and one commercial building now housing Community restaurant. A garage made of hollow tile at 300 E. Geneseo, built ca. 1940, was torn down in 2018.

In the absence of more conclusive information on the significance of hollow clay tile as as construction material for residential construction in Lafayette, a determination of eligibility for local landmark status cannot be made at this time. While the building retains its original design features, materials, and/or character (Lafayette Municipal Code (LMC) Section 47-17(a)(1).a.2), and is in its original location (LMC 47-17(a)(1).a. 3), The historical connections to notable persons in Lafayette history identified under section 35 are not significant enough to warrant eligibility, and while there are associations with the hispanic mining community, they also are not significant enough to warrant local landmark eligibility under criterion 47-17(a)(2)b.2; i.e., the building does not exemplify the cultural, political, economic, or social heritage of the community. The building does not meet NRHP criteria for eligibility, nor does it meet criteria for listing on the Colorado State Register for Historic Properties based on the lack of architectural style and it’s lack of strong associations with notable persons.

43. 2011 Survey - Assessment of Historic Physical Integrity Related to Significance:
The building does retain its physical integrity as a circa-1920 house relative to the aspects of integrity as defined by the National Park Service and the Colorado Historical
Society for setting, location, feeling and/or association. It has poor integrity for design, materials, and workmanship. Assuming the addition on the south and west elevation was added after the house was built and then removed, there have been no major changes to the original house building. Alterations include applications of wood sheets over the windows to protect the glass from vandalism and parged concrete on the exterior walls. Due to vacancy and issues of condition, there is significant loss of integrity of feeling and association.

43. 2019 Survey - Assessment of Historic Physical Integrity Related to Significance:
The building retains some of its physical integrity as an early example of a Lafayette residence. It has poor integrity for design, materials, and workmanship. At one time there was a south and west addition that has been removed, but the main house shows no evidence of changes to the original structure. Exterior finishes have changed, as the original stucco is gone, and has been replaced with a cementitious coating of poor craftsmanship. The original stucco appears to have been in the gable of the house, which now has a composite shingle applied. Porch columns appear to not be original. Plywood sheets have been placed over the windows to secure the house and protect it from vandalism. The majority of Public Road has been redeveloped, and thus the setting and context for the house has changed, causing a significant loss of integrity due to the changes along Public Road.

43. 2019 Addendum - Assessment of Historic Physical Integrity Related to Significance:
The 2011 survey indicates a ca. 1920 construction date, but the 2019 Addendum research through historical records from the Boulder County Clerk and Recorder indicate the house was built ca. 1908. The building retains its original construction material, form, and massing. Original windows are present behind protective plywood sheets, and very little of the building, other than the demolition of the south and west addition, has been changed over time. The unglazed clay tiles would have always had some type of protective coating, as they were not designed to be exposed, and the west elevation displays the original stucco. This original stucco still exists under the gray concrete stucco, which is a very thin layer (approximately 3/16-inch) over the original material. The 1950 Assessor’s Card also documents the exterior wall covering as “cement,” and thus, the concrete stucco may be over 50 years of age.

While the majority of Public Road has been redeveloped over time, the 700 block of South Public was primarily residential when it was first platted in 1907 and remained so through the mid 1960s. Three of the original buildings remain on the block, and all of them retain their residential scale, despite conversion of two properties (705 S. Public and 707 S. Public) to commercial uses. The changes made over time as South Public transitioned into more of a business corridor can be viewed through the lens of the historical context identified in the 2011 survey of 20th Century Growth, as commercial development shifted from Simpson Street in the Old Town to Public Road beginning in the 1930s and spanning into the 1950s and 1960s. In this regard, while Lots 1 through 4 remain relatively unaltered in terms of the massing and scale of the original residential
structures from the turn of the 20th century, they also reflect the development of South Public as it became more of a commercial corridor during the mid-20th century.
705 S. Public

**Figures 5a, 5b and 5c.** Images of 705 S. Public from the Boulder County Assessor Record (5a, top left, ca. 1950), the 2011 survey (5b, top right), and google street view image (5c, bottom left, June 2019).

### 35. 2011 Survey - Historical Background:
The earliest record for 705 South Public Road is the Boulder County Real Estate Appraisal Card which lists Estanislas and Katherine Montemayor as owners in 1948. However, the Lafayette City Directories state their residence at the time was at 801 South Public Rd. The 1959 city directory lists Stanley and Katie Montemayor as the occupants. From at least 1967 through 1978, apart from 1972, the house stood vacant. In 1972, Philip Manzanares, a construction worker, and his wife, Stella, lived in the house. The current property houses the offices of Rocky Mountain Legal.

### 35. 2019 Survey - Historical Background:
From the 1998 Survey and confirmed by additional research - The earliest record for 705 South Public Road is the Boulder County Real Estate Appraisal Card which lists Estanislas and Katherine Montemayor as owners in 1948. Lafayette City Directories state their residence at the time was at 801 South Public Rd. The 1959 city directory lists Stanley and Katie Montemayor as the occupants. From at least 1967 through 1978, apart from 1972, the house stood vacant. In 1972, Philip Manzanares, a construction worker, and his wife, Stella, lived in the house. The current property houses the offices of Rocky Mountain Legal.
35. 2019 Addendum - Historical Background:
The history and background of 705 S. Public is somewhat intertwined with 701 S. Public (Lot 1). 705 S. Public is 2 lots, legally described as lots 2 and 3 of Block 3, Industrial City No. 2 Addition. Emma Sage was deeded the land south of Emma Street by Mary Miller ca.1900. In 1907, John Barnd and his law partner, James Miller, platted the expansive Industrial City No. 2 Addition west of South Public Road and south of West Emma Street. The earliest records show that James Miller sold lots 2 and 3 to Charles Spaulding ca. 1910. Charles Spaulding quickly sold the two lots to George Murie, also ca. 1910. George likely moved the house from one of the local mines to the property ca. 1910-1912, as he took out a mortgage in 1912, but was forced to sell the property ca. 1916 to the Lafayette Bank and Trust Company. George B. Smith then purchased the property that became 705 S. Public from the Bank of Louisville in June 14, 1922. Ellen Smith purchased Lots 1, 2, and 3 (both 701 S. Public and 705 S. Public) from George B. Smith on October 29, 1929 (she sold Lot 1 to Engelbert Pete Gosch soon after). Estanislao (also recorded as Estanislas) and Katherine Montemayor purchased 705 S. Public (lots 2 and 3) on April 22, 1940 from Ellen Smith, and owned it until Katherine’s death in 1959 (Figure 6). Sons Nemicio Montemayor and Joe Montemayor received some interest in the property in 1961. The current owners are Gerald and Janet Morrell.

42. 2011 Survey - Statement of Significance: This house is eligible under NRHP Criterion C as a good example of a Hipped-Roof Box building type constructed at the turn of the twentieth century in Lafayette. The type of building exhibits distinctive characteristics identified as the hipped-roof, wood-frame construction, and single story on a square footprint. Historical research for this resource provided no evidence that there are any historical associations with persons or events that would make it eligible for the National Register under Criteria A or B.

42. 2019 Survey - Statement of Significance: This house is good example of a Hipped-Roof Box building type constructed at the turn of the twentieth century in Lafayette, but is not eligible under NRHP Criterion C. While the type of building exhibits characteristics identified as the hipped-roof, wood-frame construction, and single story on a square footprint, this is a very common construction type in Lafayette, and does not qualify for landmark designation simply due to the
architectural style. It is a building type associated with the mining cabins and history of Lafayette. Historical research provided no evidence that the property is associations with historically significant persons or events that would make it eligible for the National Register under Criteria A or B. While there is no record that the house was moved to this site, it does represent a period earlier than the construction date, and there is a substantial history of mining cabins being moved between the various mining camps in the area.

The property has been evaluated according to the above Lafayette Landmark Criteria, and even though it meets two of the criteria, it does not meet any of the Local Lafayette Landmark Criteria.

42. 2019 Addendum - Statement of Significance: The 2011 survey identified this building as eligible for designation under NRHP Criterion C as a good example of a Hipped-Roof Box building type constructed at the turn of the twentieth century in Lafayette. There have been no noticeable physical changes to the building since the 2011 survey. However, the 2011 survey determination of eligibility for the NRHP is not supportable; the loss of original design features (the original siding and trim, and the loss of the original central chimney) make it ineligible for NRHP designation under Criterion C. Historical research for this resource provided no evidence that there are any historical associations with persons or events that would make it eligible for the NHRP under Criteria A or B.

A building may be eligible for the State of Colorado Register if it demonstrates apparent distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. While the building is readily identifiable as a mining cabin (Figure 7), the loss of the original siding, trim, windows, and chimney negatively impacts its eligibility as a potential State Landmark.

---

Figure 7. Hipped roof dwellings from the Simpson Camp, are the only physical reminders of the coal mining activity that shaped Lafayette. Photo courtesy Lafayette Historical Society.

Per the Lafayette Landmark Criteria, the building does retain its original design character (Lafayette Municipal Code (LMC) Section 47-17(a)(1)a.2), and, while it is not

in its “original” location (likely the Simpson Mining Camp), it is in the same location since
the land was developed as a residential lot ca. 1910 and also reflects Lafayette’s long
history of relocating residential buildings (LMC 47-17(a)(1)a.3), thus meeting the local
criteria for physical integrity.

The 2019 survey text includes the following, “[t]he property has been evaluated
according to the above Lafayette Landmark Criteria, and even though it meets two of
the criteria, it does not meet any of the Local Lafayette Landmark Criteria.” This
statement is confusing, as the criteria for local landmarking in Lafayette includes two
components: 1) The building must exhibit physical integrity, which it does through
retention of its original design character (it is readily identifiable as a mining cabin even
with the loss of original architectural features), and it has been in the same location
since ca. 1910, and 2) the building must meet at least one architectural, social/historic,
geographic/environmental, or informational criterion as identified in the Lafayette
Municipal Code.

The mining cabin located at 705 S. Public both exhibits physical integrity and meets
criteria 47-17(a)(2)a.5, (a)(2)a.6, and (a)(2)b. 2 of the Lafayette Municipal Code as a
style particularly associated with Lafayette or one (1) of its neighborhoods that
represents the built environment of a group of people in an era of history. The building
also exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, and social heritage of the community
as coal mining was the driving force behind Lafayette’s founding and growth, and the
coal mining era (1889 - 1946) is the city’s primary period of historic significance.

43. 2011 Survey - Assessment of Historic Physical Integrity Related to
Significance:
The building retains its physical integrity as a hipped-roof box property type relative to
the seven aspects of integrity as defined by the National Park Service and the Colorado
Historical Society--location, design, workmanship, setting, materials, feeling or
association. Major modifications, include the additions on the west elevation and the
replacement of the windows on the façade are in keeping with the size and form of the
house.

43. 2019 Survey - Assessment of Historic Physical Integrity Related to
Significance:
The building retains some of its physical integrity. Modifications to the structure,
including the replacement of original siding with modern materials, the addition of new
shutters, and possibly the additions on the West elevation, have compromised the total
historical integrity of the house. The house was built when this area of Public Road was
residential. The setting of Public Road has changed from residential to commercial, a
substantial change that has devalued the integrity of the once-residential house. The
house can recover its missing elements of integrity by removing the non- original
materials, restoring the original materials, and by moving the house to a residential
setting. There are two additional buildings on the lot, both are non-contributing
structures. The garage is historic, as it is 63yrs old. It retains the original materials, and
is in fair to poor condition. The second out building is a modern tuff shed, not historic, but in good working condition.

43. 2019 Addendum - Assessment of Historic Physical Integrity Related to Significance:
The building retains its physical integrity as a hipped-roof box building type constructed as a miner’s cabin near the turn of the 20th century. Modifications, including the additions on the west elevation and the replacement windows on the east elevation are in keeping with the size and form of the house. At least one addition can be seen in the 1937 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map and in the ca. 1950 Assessor’s Card photograph, making one addition on the west elevation at least 50 years old.

This building is eligible for Lafayette landmark status. The building exhibits distinctive characteristics identified as the hipped-roof, wood-frame construction with a single story on a square footprint. It is readily identifiable as a mining cabin even with the loss of the original architectural materials. The building also exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, and social heritage of the community as coal mining was the driving force behind Lafayette’s founding and growth, and the coal mining era (1889 - 1946) is the city’s primary period of historic significance.

The 700 block of South Public was primarily residential when it was first platted in 1907 and remained so through the mid 1960s. Three of the original buildings remain on the block, and all of them retain their residential scale, despite conversion of two properties (705 S. Public and 707 S. Public) to commercial uses. The changes made over time as South Public transitioned into more of a business corridor can be viewed through the lens of the historical context identified in the 2011 survey of 20th Century Growth, as commercial development shifted from Simpson Street in the Old Town to Public Road beginning in the 1930s and spanning into the 1950s and 1960s. In this regard, while Lots 1 through 4 remain relatively unaltered in terms of the massing and scale of the original residential structures from the turn of the 20th century, they also reflect the development of South Public Road as it became more of a commercial corridor during the mid-20th century. As such, the shift from residential to commercial use does not diminish its historical integrity.

48. Lafayette Landmark Eligibility Field Assessment: Eligible
705 S. Public

Figures 8a, 8b and 8c. Images of 707 S. Public from the Boulder County Assessor Record (7a, top left, ca. 1950), the 2011 survey (7b, top right), and google street view image (7c, bottom left, June 2019).

35. 2011 Survey - Historical Background:
Research on the property at 707 South Public Rd provided limited information. The only details available were from the Real Estate Appraisal Card which lists the owners of the property in 1948 as Eli and Julie Souply and the city directories. The Souplys are listed in the City Directories as the occupants in 1959 through 1967. In 1972, Annie Manzanares occupied the house and then in 1976, Rita Way Cement Incorporated (with W.K. Bussard as President) was operated from the property. By 1978, the house was vacant. However, the current property is now home to a business called Two Pears Incorporated.

35. 2019 Survey - Historical Background:
Research on the property at 707 South Public Rd provided limited information. Lafayette City directories list the owners of the property in 1948 as Eli and Julie Souply, and they are listed through 1967. The 1998 survey shows that in 1972, Annie Manzanares occupied the house and then in 1976, Rita Way Cement Incorporated (with W.K. Bussard as President) was operated from the property, and by 1978, the house was vacant. The Boulder Daily Camera show that a psychic operated from the property as recently as 2012, with various business at the location for short periods, including a tattoo parlor. Currently the property is used as a salon.
35. 2019 Addendum - Historical Background:
707 S. Public is described as Lot 4, Block 3, of Industrial City Addition 2. Emma Sage was deeded the land south of Emma Street by Mary Miller ca.1900. In 1907, John Barnd and his law partner, James Miller, platted the expansive Industrial City No. 2 Addition west of South Public Road and south of West Emma Street. The earliest records show that James Miller sold Lot 4 to Charles Spaulding ca. 1907. Spaulding granted a lien on the property to the Ernest Grill Lumber Company in 1908, which may have been when the original structure was built. By 1912, Charles Spaulding had sold the property to L. E. Bowles. Mr. Bowles may have run into financial trouble in the years following his purchase of Lot 4, as the next record of ownership transfer show that Chas Hake and Josephine M. Hake purchased Lots 4, 5, and 6 of Industrial City Addition 2 from the Boulder County Treasury in July of 1920.

In February of 1924, Josephine Hake sold Lot 4 to Lena Smith. In November of 1925, Lena Smith sold the property to George W. Burks. In May of 1927, George Burks sold the property to Albert Williams. In June of 1930, Albert Williams sold the property to Victoria Assala. Victoria owned the property through the 1930s, and sold the property to Nemicio Montemayor (the son of Estanislaao and Katherine Montemayor, who owned the property next door at 705 S. Public), in September of 1941. The Boulder County Real Estate Appraisal Card on file lists the owners of the property in 1948 as Eli and Julie Souply. The Souplys are listed in the City Directories as the occupants of 707 S. Public in 1959 through 1967. In 1972, Annie Manzanares occupied the house. In 1973, Eli J. Souply Jr. sold the property to John Waldman.

The mid-1970s saw a shift in the use of the property from residential to commercial/retail. In 1976, Rita Way Cement Incorporated (with W.K. Bussard as President) was operated from the property. By 1978, the property stood vacant. It seems likely that Waldman sold this lot in the same manner and similar time frame as lots 2 and 3, with all of the lots eventually ending up under the ownership of Gerald Morrell and Janet Morrell ca. 1999. The Boulder Daily Camera show that a psychic operated from the property as recently as 2012, with various business at the location for short periods, including a tattoo parlor. Currently the property is used as a salon.

43. 2011 Survey - Assessment of Historic Physical Integrity Related to Significance: The building does not retain its physical integrity as a Front-Gable Linear relative to the seven aspects of integrity as defined by the National Park Service and the Colorado Historical Society—poor integrity of design, workmanship, materials, feeling or association. Major modifications have been made, such as the faux stone and wood-shingles on the façade.

43. 2019 Survey - Assessment of Historic Physical Integrity Related to Significance: Significant changes to the house, possibly in the 1970s, have changed the character of the house significantly, with a loss of integrity that makes the structure ineligible for landmarking. Alterations that have compromised the integrity of the structure include the
faux stone veneer and wood-shingles on the façade, the porch roof and columns, the shingles in the gable, the siding, the non-original windows, and the trim.

43. 2019 Addendum - Assessment of Historic Physical Integrity Related to Significance:
As stated in the 2011 and 2019 surveys, the building does not retain its physical integrity as a Front-Gable Linear relative to the seven aspects of integrity as defined by the National Park Service and the Colorado Historical Society—poor integrity of design, workmanship, materials, feeling or association. Major modifications to the east elevation have been made, such as the faux stone and wood-shingles, which likely occurred ca. 1975. These alterations are nearing 50 years of age and may be viewed as relevant in the future under the historical context of 20th Century Growth, as commercial development shifted from Simpson Street in the Old Town to Public Road beginning in the 1930s and spanning into the 1970s. Unlike many of the other blocks along South Public Road, this portion of the 700 Block of South Public Road was originally developed as a residential block, with changes being made over time as South Public transitioned into more of a business corridor. In this regard, Lots 1 through 4 remain relatively unaltered in terms of the massing and scale of the original residential structures from the turn of the 20th Century while simultaneously representing the shift in use from residential to commercial. As such, this property represents multiple historic contexts relative to the development of Lafayette.
STAFF REPORT

To: Lafayette Urban Renewal Authority  
From: Roger Caruso, LURA Executive Director  
Date: November 7, 2019  
RE: RFP for 701, 705, 707, 709, 711, and a portion of 801 S. Public Road

**Recommendation:** Approval of the RFP for 701, 705, 707, 709, 711, and a portion of 801 S. Public Road.

At LURA’s August 13, 2019 meeting, direction was given to staff to write a Request for Proposal ("RFP") for LURA’s review. LURA gave staff direction on what their vision is for the 700 Block which helped staff draft the initial RFP.

At LURA’s September 10, 2019 meeting, staff presented a draft RFP. This RFP was drafted using feedback from LURA from their previous meeting, and using other jurisdictions/urban renewal authority’s published RFP’s as templates. Commissioners gave feedback that the RFP itself felt a bit cumbersome or overwhelming, the structure of the RFP could be reorganized to read better, and the design could be improved.

At LURA’s October 8, 2019 meeting, staff presented an updated draft RFP as designed by Davis Creative Inc. The Authority gave direction to staff that the RFP was taking shape and they were pleased. The Authority directed staff to continue on the same path, and present a final draft RFP to the Authority at their November meeting. Staff has reorganized the RFP, and continued to work with Davis Creative Inc. to improve the aesthetics of the RFP.

At this time, staff is looking for final comments regarding the RFP, and to discuss a date the RFP submittals will be due by. Staff recommends the submittal date be set for Monday, February 10, 2020 at 5:00 p.m. This would give staff time to prepare for a review of the Request for Qualifications by the Authority for their Tuesday, February 11, 2020 meeting.

Staff also recommends the Authority set a date that would give an opportunity for interested respondents to discuss the project directly with the Authority. Staff recommends this be set for December 4, 2019 at 5:30 p.m. This would give respondents enough time to understand what the Authority is envisioning, and to be able to put plans together by the proposed RFP deadline of February 11, 2020.

**Attachments:**
Final Draft RFP for 701, 705, 707, 709, 711, and a portion of 801 S. Public Road
S. 700 BLOCK OF PUBLIC ROAD
Retail, Office, and Residential Opportunity

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
September, 2019
INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

The Lafayette Urban Renewal (the “Authority”) is excited to seek qualified developers who possess the ability, desire, and financial resources to develop an approximate 1.03-acre site within the Lafayette Old Town Revitalization Area (the “Area”). To the maximum extent possible, your response to the Request for Proposals (the “Proposal”) should evidence ‘creative, diverse, & eclectic’ as its theme.

On September 20, 2011 ‘Downtown: The Vision’ (see attached as an exhibit) was adopted to guide future development within the area. The response to the proposal will be highly graded on weaving the proposed development with Lafayette’s ‘Downtown: The Vision’ guide.

A successful response to the RFP will be one that the public can understand and connect with emotionally. Although the plan is advisory and serves as a guide for public decisions related to development in the district, be sure to treat it as a living document that has served and will continue to serve as a source of inspiration to our community.

MAKE SURE YOU MIX
market reality, community desires, AND economic feasibility.
One of the identified issues in the **VISION PLAN** is the length of Public Road and lack of community along the street. The responder should focus on how their proposal **improves the community along the street**.

The cultural arts community is active and vibrant in Lafayette. Keep asking yourself: **“How does my proposal capitalize on the strength of Lafayette’s cultural arts.”** Once you feel comfortable that your proposal meets that intent – **push yourself harder**.

The Vision Plan states “**Diverse, kid-friendly, value-oriented shops and restaurants were often mentioned and are desired by many residents**”. Although it may be too early to commit to specific businesses, tell us what the type of business you will be fighting for.
Play to the street, play to the street, play to the street!

Unique plant pots, seasonal hanging basics, new public seating opportunities, colorful banners and graphics, bike racks, public art --- your proposal should have a WOW x 10 factor.
And don’t get us started on our love for artistic murals!
PART 2

Lafayette Urban Renewal Authority – Request for Proposals

OBJECTIVES, INTENT, AND SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS
OBJECTIVES, INTENT, AND SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

S. 700 BLOCK

The Authority has secured fee simple title to 701 S. Public Road and an additional 20 feet of the northern portion of 801 S. Public Road; and holds a two-year option contract to acquire fee title to 705, 707, 709, and 711 S. Public Road. The area is approximately 350 feet long (along Public Road) x 128.75 feet wide (along Spaulding Street) and is approximately 1.03 acres in total size.

The property at 701 S. Public Road was acquired by the Authority for $238,000. The option contract for the properties at 705, 707, 709, and 711 S. Public Road provides for acquisition at $1,200,000. The additional 20 feet of 801 S. Public Road was acquired by the Authority for $45,383.82 plus future ancillary costs to move fencing, irrigation, and restore the area. Total costs for property acquisition are $1,483,383.82 plus future ancillary costs.

OBJECTIVES OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

The primary objective of the Proposal is to identify those development teams that appear to have the ability, experience, financing, development credentials, and redevelopment concept necessary to develop the project site in a manner that meets the overall objectives of the Urban Renewal Plan. From the Proposals submitted, one development team may be selected to enter into negotiations, which, if successful, may result in a redevelopment agreement. The development team will be required, as a part of the negotiation process, to develop more detailed physical and financial plans.

INTENT OF THE SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

The intent of the submittal process is to ensure a fair review of all development teams.
SUBMITTAL

The Proposal may be submitted at any time before the deadline of 5:00 PM (MST) on [DATE]. Responses submitted after that time will not be considered by the Authority. The Proposals will be opened at a public session after [DATE]. Please follow the directions below, as failure will also disqualify your Proposal.

The Proposal will consist of three documents: 1) an identifying Request for Qualifications (“RFQ), 2) a non-identifying RFQ, and 3) the Plan. Please submit ten (10) copies of the Proposal.

RFQ SUBMITTAL

Please note that there are two RFQs to be submitted. The identifying RFQ shall refer to all persons and companies by real name and shall be submitted in a sealed envelope within the sealed manila envelope which contains the Plan. The non-identifying RFQ shall not refer to persons or companies by name, but instead should refer to people as Person A, Person B, Person C, etc.; and companies should be referred to as Company 1, Company 2, Company 3, etc. The non-identifying RFQ shall be submitted in a sealed envelope and stabled to the outside of the manila envelope.

The RFQ information shall include the following:

A) The name, company title, and responsibilities/qualifications of each member of the development team;
B) The member(s) of the team who will be making decisions and with whom the Authority shall principally negotiate. It is desirable to have a single contact point;
C) Number of years of experience that member(s) of the team have in development, construction, or in a residential or commercial leasing capacity;
D) The name, company title, and responsibilities/qualifications of consultants who will be involved in the project (civil engineer, architect, structural engineer, etc.);
E) Description of the legal relationship between members of the development team and the legal entity with whom the Authority will negotiate;
F) A description of the development team’s experience and success with similar types of projects, especially those that have been completed within an Urban Renewal Area or a downtown area;
G) A description of the financial capability and capital resources of the development team. This may be evidenced by any sources of information the development team may choose to supply, and may include financial statements. If a new entity is contemplated, include the above financial information for each owner of the new entity, and a statement of the manner on which the new entity will be capitalized.
H) Submittal of a liquid net worth of the principals of the development team or corporation or LLC of at least $1,000,000;
I) Letter from a President or Vice President of a Colorado-based bank speaking to the Developer’s credit line, past performance on construction or lending loans, and banking history.
PLAN SUBMITTAL

The following preliminary information is necessary for the Authority to understand the Proposal. Development teams selected to negotiate further with the Authority will be required to develop more detailed information.

J) Concept Plan with Narrative – The Developer shall describe, in narrative and schematic plan forms, the basic concept of the proposed project. The narrative should describe the theme of the project, including a description of how the Project Plan conforms to the objectives of the RFP, the Urban Renewal Plan, and “Downtown: The Vision.” The concept plan to be submitted should include the following;

K) Land uses and proposed potential zoning;
L) Generalized building footprints;
M) Architectural treatment of the buildings;
N) Location of parking;
O) Pro Forma Statement – Responses shall include a conceptual pro forma statement that provides an outline, to the extent possible, of the anticipated economics and proposed financial approach to the project under consideration, including any needed public investment;

P) A preliminary schedule of performance, which includes time periods for design, equity and debt financing, property acquisition, construction, lease-up/sale, and any other critical milestones.

DISQUALIFICATION DUE TO LACK OF INFORMATION

Although it is understood that the nature and size of the project being proposed will affect the complexity of the submittal, the documentation should be at a level of detail which provides an opportunity for an accurate evaluation of the Proposal.

Proposals are to be submitted to:
Susan Koster
City Clerk
1290 S. Public Road
Lafayette, CO 80026
Telephone: (303)661-1227

Inquiries are to be directed to:
Roger Caruso
LURA Executive Director
1290 S. Public Road
Lafayette, CO 80026
Telephone: (303)661-1262
UPDATES

Updates including meeting times and dates, or answers to questions proposed will be available at https://www.cityoflafayette.com/S700Block

SELECTION PROCESS

In general, the Authority intends to follow the selection procedure outlined below. The Authority may change the process in its sole and absolute discretion.

Response Submission – The Authority will accept responses at any time up to and including the submittal deadline of 5:00 PM (MST) on [DATE].

Q) Preliminary Review – Upon receipt of the responses, the Authority will schedule the review of the Proposals. The Authority will first open and review only the non-identifying RFQs to determine the qualifications of the development team;

R) Post RFQ review, the Authority will outline the process.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING RESPONSES

The Authority has established the following criteria upon which it will evaluate the responses submitted. It will select the development team and responses that best meet these criteria. The Authority’s determination of satisfactory compliance with the selection criteria will be at their sole and absolute discretion, and any decision will be final and conclusive.

S) Project Concept
   i) The manner in which the response conforms to the Authority’s Objectives and Vision Plan;
   ii) The extent to which the response responds to the Urban Renewal Plan and the redevelopment objectives of such plan;
   iii) Conformance with all applicable building and zoning ordinances (as may be amended) and all other applicable ordinances of the City;

T) Background and Experience of Development Team
   i) The proposed development team of individuals or firms who will be responsible for the project;
   ii) The success of the development team’s past projects, especially those that are in areas similar to Old Town Lafayette;
   iii) The overall architectural and design quality of prior projects of the development team;
   iv) The development team’s experience in working with public entities;
   v) The development team’s history of the timeliness of completion of prior projects;
   vi) The development team’s history of completing projects as originally proposed;
   vii) Status of any litigation regarding the development team’s past projects;
U) **Financial Capability of Developer**
   
   i) The development team’s ability to provide sufficient equity for the proposed project;
   
   ii) The development team’s ability to secure any necessary debt financing;
   
   iii) Evidence of the development team’s ability to fund the project until its completion, closing of permanent financing, and project stabilization.

**POST SUBMISSION CHANGES/TRANSFERS**

After submission of a response, the Developer may make substantial change in the project. After submission of a response, the Developer may make substantial changes in the project concept or the development team, or transfer or assign the response or any interest therein to another Developer, only with the written consent of the Authority. The Authority reserves the right to withhold consent or to impose conditions on such consent at its sole and absolute discretion. As a condition to any consent, the original Developer of the project and the transferee may be required to demonstrate or certify to the Authority that except for reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses incurred in connection with the submission of the response, no compensation, remuneration, transfer fee, or similar payment has been made in connection with such transfer or assignment.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

The Authority will treat responses to this RFP as public record subject to the Colorado Public Records Act. Accordingly, information submitted to the Authority is subject to disclosure to the public. Confidential and financial information submitted by the Developer that is exempt from disclosure to the public will be retained on a confidential basis by the Authority.

All information that a Developer wishes to remain exempt from disclosure should be submitted separately, bound and clearly marked: “Confidential Commercial and Financial Information – Exempt from Public Disclosure in Accordance with the Colorado Public Records Act.” The Authority will make reasonable efforts to consult with a Developer prior to disclosure of information so marked, if in the Authority’s view said information is not entitled to exemption from disclosure.

**REDEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS**

After negotiation, the Authority intends to enter in a Redevelopment Agreement with the Developer selected for the project. The Redevelopment Agreement may include, without limitation, provisions respecting the following: description of the project and Authority’s rights regarding design approval and access; project construction and schedules of performance; the Authority’s and the Developer’s financing; continuing financial disclosure relating to the project; mitigation of traffic and potential interruptions to adjacent properties; signage; commitment to public art; insurance; indemnification of the Authority; anti-discrimination and affirmative action; default and termination; restriction on use; restriction on assignment and transfer; and other customary and appropriate provisions.
The Developers chosen will have exclusive negotiation rights after notification of selection, for a period of up to 90 days, in order to execute a Redevelopment Agreement. During the negotiation period, either the Authority or Developer may, upon written notice, withdraw from negotiations if either party determines that a satisfactory agreement is not likely to be reached. The Executive Director may extend the 90-day period by two (2) additional 90-day periods if progress is being made toward a Redevelopment Agreement.

**REJECTION OF PROPOSAL**

Any and all responses may be rejected at any time at the sole and absolute discretion of the Authority, and the Authority’s decision will be conclusive and final. Automatic rejection will occur if the Authority has not selected a Proposal within one year of the submission date. In addition, the response may be rejected for any of the following reasons:

- **V)** The response was submitted past the deadline of 5:00 PM (MST) on [DATE];
- **W)** The response was incomplete or did not include adequate information to review the request;
- **W)** The Developer was otherwise non-responsive to additional requests for information;
- **X)** The Authority believes the Developer does not have the experience, background, commitment, or financing to perform the project;
- **Y)** The Authority determines that the rejection of the Proposal is in the best interest of the Authority.
DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS
AND VISION

S. 700 BLOCK OF PUBLIC ROAD CHARACTERISTICS

1. **Acreage** – Approximately 1.03 acres;

2. **Owner** – Combination of fee simple ownership by the Authority and an options contract.

3. **Zoning** – B-1/LURA – Community Service Business District. The intent of the B-1/LURA zoning – Community Service Business District is to provide areas for retail stores and convenience services. The character of these uses requires convenient vehicular access from a Major Street. The Plan allows mixed-use residential/commercial if approved through a Special Use Review.

   Additionally, per Resolution 2012-20, 8.1.1. (see attached as an exhibit):

   “When the underlying zoning is non-residential, no greater than 75% of the floor area within the complex shall be residential uses. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the City Council may, after review and recommendation of the Planning Commission, allow up to 95% of the floor area within a mixed use building complex to be used for residential uses upon finding that the proposed PUD is unique and/or necessary for the economic development of the city, that the market is unlikely to support 25% or more of the floor area being non-residential, and that one or more of the following criteria has been met:

   A) That 50% of the nonresidential floor area of the proposed mixed use building complex shall be legally restricted by the owner to uses that will generate sales tax revenues for the city;

   B) That the proposed mixed use building complex is a redevelopment project that will result in the abandonment of a legal nonconforming use;

   C) That 50% of the residential floor area within the proposed mixed use building complex shall be legally restricted by the owner to be affordable;

   D) The proposed mixed use building complex is a redevelopment of a property which has caused significant problems for adjacent neighborhood(s), such as, but not limited to, graffiti, vagrancy, noise, or other similar deleterious impacts to the quiet enjoyment of neighboring properties; or

   E) That the proposed mixed use building complex provides some parking spaces available for the Urban Renewal Authority.
4. **Parking** – Parking requirements can be found in Lafayette’s Municipal Code, Section 26-20-2.

5. **Preferred Use of the Site** – Mix of restaurant, retail, office, and/or residential uses, which complement existing Old Town businesses;

At the Authority’s August 13, 2019 meeting, members gave direction on what they would like to see in a future project. That direction included:

- Funky
- Mixed-Use
- Historical Context
- Business Incubator
- Flex-Space
- Rights-Sized
- Fits the Character of Public Road
- Unique
- Good Commercial Signage
- Public Spaces
- Live/Work
- Attainable (residential and commercial)
- Bold
- Potential of Incorporating Existing Tenants
- Artistic

Most importantly is Old Town’s tagline: creative, diverse, and eclectic!

6. **Dimensional Standards** -

   **Height Limits** – B-1/LURA allows a 35-foot height maximum;

   **Building Setback** –
   - **East Elevation:** Preferred to be built up to sidewalk unless incorporating outdoor patios or public spaces;
   - **North Elevation:** Preferred to be built up to sidewalk unless incorporating outdoor patios or public spaces;
   - **South (side) and West (rear) Elevations:** 5-foot side yard unless approved through a PUD modification. 10-foot rear yard unless approved through a PUD modification.

   **Density** –
   - **Residential Density:** 10 dwelling units per acre unless approved through a PUD modification. 50% maximum lot coverage unless approved through a PUD modification.
   - **Commercial Density:** 50% maximum lot coverage unless approved through a PUD modification.

7. **Architectural Standards** – Please refer to the Old Town Design Guidelines and Standards (see attached);

8. **Historical Considerations** –
A) **2011 Public Road Survey** - In 2011, a survey was conducted on 701, 705, 707, and 711 (combined with 709) Public Road. The survey stated the landmarking eligibility for 701 S. Public Road was unknown and more information was needed. It stated 705 S. Public Road was eligible for national landmark status due to the hipped roof. It stated 707 and 711 (combined with 709) did not meet national or local landmarking criteria.

B) **2019 Surveys** – In 2019, surveys were recommissioned on 701, 705, 707, 709, and 711 S. Public Road. The survey stated that upon further investigation, 701 S. Public Road is not eligible for landmarking status. The survey stated for 705, the hipped roof was not solely a reason for landmarking, and changed that recommendation from eligible to not eligible. 707, 709, and 711 remained not eligible for landmarking.

The Authority values Lafayette’s rich history and legacy. The City and Authority have previously invested in a number of buildings in the Old Town district to retain their original character. As such, the Authority would be looking for a proposal to address these structures either through:

A) **Potentially saving some or all in their existing place;**

B) **Potentially saving some or all but relocating them on the property for better function and use;**

or

C) **At a minimum, offering 705 S. Public Road to the general public to move to another property within Lafayette. LURA would participate in a generous grant to a party who could reuse 705 S. Public Road.**
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1. Project Area Map

2. 2018 Lafayette Community Profile

3. 2018 Lafayette Demographic Information

4. Downtown: The Vision Plan

5. Design Guidelines and Standards

6. B-1/LURA Use Chart

7. Resolution 2012-20

8. 2011 Public Road Surveys for 701, 705, 707, and 711 (combined with 709) S. Public Road

9. 2019 Updated Surveys for 701, 705, 707, 709, and 711 S. Public Road
Attachment 2

Lafayette Urban Renewal Authority – Request for Proposals
Attached, please find staff’s proposed 2020 Budget. The 2018 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) was recently submitted to the State. This report is conducted by an independent third-party auditor, and essentially closes the books on the year being reviewed. The 2018 CAFR shows LURA having a fund balance of $2,991,256 with an ending cash balance of $1,029,969.

The 2019 adopted budget for LURA shows revenues of $1,276,225 and expenses of $2,332,000 for a net reduction in fund balance of $1,055,775. Knowing the 2018 ending cash balance, if LURA were to spend $2,332,000 in 2019, LURA would have a negative ending cash balance of -$25,805. To date, LURA has spent approximately $439,741. If all months were equal, LURA should have spent approximately $1,554,666 through August. In other words, LURA’s 2019 expenses have been far less than anticipated.

Currently, LURA is working on three projects: 1) former Miller’s Grille; 2) gas stations on Baseline Road; and 3) the 700 Block of S. Public Road. Staff anticipates an Economic Development Agreement being on LURA’s November agenda for the former Miller’s Grille. Staff anticipates a very large gap in the financing of the project, but less than the outstanding loan of $1,130,816. If this is the case, LURA’s ending fund balance will be reduced (assume a write-down of the loan), but LURA’s ending cash balance will increase (i.e. it is anticipated the developer will pay back part of the loan, with the remaining ‘forgiven’ to fill the gap for the remodel of the building).

It is not anticipated there will be resolution on any incentive for the gas stations or the 700 Block of S. Public Road in 2019. Therefore, if LURA had an ending cash balance of nearly $1,029,969 in 2018, and with any additional monies from 2019 (either through revenues being higher than anticipated or expenses lower than anticipated), it could be anticipated that LURA may have an ending 2019 cash balance of approximately $1,500,000 or so.

Staff would not present a budget to LURA which would have them spending more than their anticipated cash balance. Therefore, the 2020 budget will be realistic on revenues, but expenses will be pared down substantially versus 2018 or 2019. With the anticipated ending LURA cash balance in 2019, LURA could more than likely not incentivize the gas stations and the 700 Block of Public Road at the same time in 2020. LURA will either need to seek a loan from the City under the City/LURA IGA approved in 2018, or the incentive to either of the above could be structured over multiple years to address cash flow.
Currently, LURA’s revenues vs. expenditures (minus any incentives given) is approximately $1,000,000/year. With five (5) years left in LURA’s tif collections, LURA would then have approximately $6,500,000 to incentivize the gas stations on Baseline Road, 700 Block of Public Road, or other property owners.

Each budget is based off the previous budgets in terms of ending fund balance. Since we now know LURA’s 2018 ending fund balance, staff has amended the 2019 Budget to reflect $2,991,256 as 2019’s beginning fund balance. Staff left the budgeted revenues and expenses as they were as adopted by Resolution 2018-07, which shows the ending fund balance should be $1,935,482. This ending fund balance does not exclude any loans LURA has made to property owners. Subtracting that, the 2019 ending cash fund balance should be about -$25,805. Therefore, the 2020 budget revenues must be greater than the expenses by at least $25,805 (this is separate from the fact staff needs to ensure the actual 2019 revenues must be more than anticipated, and expenses less than anticipated, by at least $25,805).

Staff has anticipated the 2020 property taxes and sales taxes at 5% more than 2018 actuals. In theory, the increase should be done twice to get to the 2020 anticipated revenues. Additionally, the City received notice from the County that City-wide, property values (and therefore taxes) increased 12% over the 2017-2019 reassessment cycle. Staff believes a lot of the 12% is related to residential property value increases. Since LURA is more commercial, staff recommends parring the 12% City-wide increase down for LURA’s budget.

Staff is proposing $714,000 in expenses. The expenses are compromised of maintenance of public/private parking lots and the Starkey building, the administrative fee (10% of gross income) paid to the City to administer LURA, along with $250,000 for downtown development, $50,000 for an additional private/public parking lot, and $100,000 for streetscape. Therefore, the revenues of $1,289,016 vs. expenses of $714,000 have LURA in a positive ending 2020 cash balance of $575,016.

As required by the Urban Renewal Plan, staff presented the proposed budget to Council at their October 15, 2019 meeting. Council did not have any concerns or comments. Staff is bringing the budget back to LURA for final changes/adoptions.

**Fiscal Impact:** The 2020 LURA estimated revenues are $1,289,016 and the estimated expenses are $3,179,000. The projected 2020 beginning fund balance is $1,935,482, with an ending fund balance of $45,498. For this to be achievable, LURA will have to convert some of its non-cash fund balance ($1,480,241 in assets held for resale and accounts receivable) back to cash.

**Attachments:** Resolution No. 2019-03
WHEREAS, the Lafayette Urban Renewal Authority (the “Authority”) was created by Ordinance No. 99-38, Series 1999; and

WHEREAS, in June 2012, the Lafayette City Council passed Resolution 2012-30 approving the appointment of seven commissioners to act as the Board of Directors for the Authority; and

WHEREAS, the Authority operates to eliminate blight and prevent the spread of blight within the urban renewal areas of the City of Lafayette in accordance with the Urban Renewal Law or Colorado; and

WHEREAS, the Authority is to consider at least once a year a proposed budget and make appropriations for each budget year; and

WHEREAS, the Treasurer, as Budget Officer designated by the Authority, has prepared and submitted a recommended budget for the 2020 Budget Year and a public hearing thereon has taken place on November 12, 2019.

Section 1. That the 2020 Budget for the Authority incorporated herein as Exhibit A is hereby adopted and approved in essentially the form and content accompanying this Resolution.

Section 2. That the Treasurer is directed to file the approved budget with the Division of Local Government in conformance with the state budget law.

Section 3. That the Executive Director shall attest and affix the seal of the Authority to this resolution.

RESOLVED AND PASSED THIS 12th DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2019 by the Lafayette Urban Renewal Authority as follows:

LAFAYETTE URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY

_________________________________
Kevin Muller, Chair

ATTEST:           APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_______________________  _______________________
Roger Caruso     David S. Williamson, City Attorney
Executive Director
## Lafayette Urban Renewal Authority

### Proposed 2020 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>13-103-7050</td>
<td>$653,799</td>
<td>$686,505</td>
<td>$598,450</td>
<td>$700,236</td>
<td>$628,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>13-103-7180</td>
<td>328,383</td>
<td>561,755</td>
<td>624,422</td>
<td>572,990</td>
<td>655,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc Revenues</td>
<td>13-103-8090</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>13-103-8850</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>17,042</td>
<td>19,620</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from General Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>983,582</td>
<td>1,755,302</td>
<td>1,257,492</td>
<td>1,276,226</td>
<td>1,289,016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books &amp; Periodicals</td>
<td>13-103-7050</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Supplies</td>
<td>13-103-7180</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,747</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Repairs and Maintenance (Festival Plaza, Starkey Building, Parking Lots)</td>
<td>13-103-7550</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>38,253</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>13-103-8090</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Treasurer's Fees</td>
<td>13-103-8140</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>13-103-8150</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIO Marketing (w/ Professional Services)</td>
<td>13-103-8150</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities Expense</td>
<td>13-103-8210</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Fee</td>
<td>13-103-8240</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>38,253</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; Publishing</td>
<td>13-103-8520</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships &amp; Meetings</td>
<td>13-103-8540</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc Services</td>
<td>13-103-8890</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Development</td>
<td>13-103-8940</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
<td>347,532</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Market (w Downtown Development)</td>
<td>13-103-8940</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Public/Private Parking Lots (w Downtown Development)</td>
<td>13-103-8940</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>272,243</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>13-103-8945</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Porch Design and Improvements (w Streetscape)</td>
<td>13-103-8945</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Purchases (Art)</td>
<td>13-103-8850</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Night Out</td>
<td>13-103-8963</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to General Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,993,000</td>
<td>3,187,000</td>
<td>813,925</td>
<td>2,332,000</td>
<td>714,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excess Revenues/(Expenditures)</td>
<td>-1,009,418</td>
<td>-1,431,698</td>
<td>443,566</td>
<td>-1,055,774</td>
<td>575,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>2,048,196</td>
<td>2,547,690</td>
<td>2,547,690</td>
<td>2,991,256</td>
<td>1,935,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>1,038,778</td>
<td>1,115,992</td>
<td>2,991,256</td>
<td>1,935,482</td>
<td>2,510,498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Ending Fund Balance of 2018, 2019, and 2020 is reduced by outstanding loans on various properties within LURA
STAFF MEMORANDUM

To: LURA
From: Roger Caruso, LURA Executive Director
Date: November 7, 2019
RE: New Bookstore/Cafe

Attached, please find a press release regarding a new bookstore and café coming to Old Town! Earlier this year, staff heard about the impending closure of the Book Cellar in Lafayette. Multiple LURA commissioners asked staff to look into the possibility of courting them to Lafayette.

Staff discussed with the landlord and potential tenant and the idea was already in the works. LURA was involved in helping negotiate the final lease terms, and granting a small incentive for the build-out of the space.

Attachments: Press Release
News Release
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Lafayette Urban Renewal Authority announces bookstore move to Old Town
The new bookstore will be located at 129 N. Harrison Ave.

LAFAYETTE, Colo November 11, 2019 – When Louisville-based Book Cellar announced it was closing in April, after almost two decades in business, friends Deirdre Appelhans and Barbra Huntting didn’t quite know how the details of their concept were going to evolve, but instinctively knew this was an opportunity they couldn’t pass up.

The duo, in addition to extensive retail and independent business backgrounds, have a life-long love of books and were looking for a new opportunity when they learned of the Book Cellar’s closing. "It all happened so fast," said Deirdre. “By chance we learned about the Book Cellar going out of business and within 2 weeks we owned the inventory! Lafayette was our first thought for a new home.”

“The idea of moving to Lafayette was an easy decision - we love the sense of community here," added Barbra. The growth and development over the past few years have created a really exciting environment. We never really had any doubts that Lafayette was the right location for the bookstore. The community has already been so welcoming, with genuine excitement from both residents and business owners. We’re thankful for the accommodating support of our new landlord and LURA (Lafayette Urban Renewal Authority). We know we will be a success with such a supportive community!”

Renovation construction is in full swing for the bookstore (whose new name will be revealed soon), located at 129 N. Harrison Ave., across the street from the WOW! Children’s Museum in the old Lafayette Lumber building. The bookstore will feature a café and outdoor patio and will procure an extensive offering of new, used, and rare books, unique toys and accoutrements for all ages, greeting cards, postcards, and journals.

“We think the business concept and the independently-owned nature of the bookstore complements the charm and personality of Old Town, and are thrilled to welcome them to Lafayette,” said Kevin Muller, LURA Chair. “While LURA is working on some larger redevelopment projects in the corridor, we’re also focused on these types of smaller endeavors which harmonize with the overall vision for Old Town.”
The owners anticipate a February 2020 opening and encourage residents to follow their Facebook page or newsletter to stay informed of progress.

Contact Information
Deirdre Appelhans / Barbra Huntting

Kevin Muller, Lafayette Urban Renewal Authority (LURA) Chair
303-241-9989 cell

Roger Caruso, Assistant City Administrator/Economic Development Director/LURA Executive Director
geroc@cityoflafayette.com 303-661-1262

# # #