

## AGENDA MEMORANDUM

**To:** Honorable Mayor and Members of Town Council

**Through:** David L. Corliss, Town Manager

**From:** Tara Vargish, PE, Director Development Services  
Brad Boland, AICP, Planning Manger, Development Services

**Title:** Resolution Approving a Request for the Demolition of the Building Located at 607 Sixth Street

---

### Executive Summary

The property owners of 607 Sixth Street, Luke and Elissa Peach, are seeking approval to partially demolish the single-family residence located on the property. The property is located at the northeast corner of Sixth Street and Cantril Street. Chapter 15 defines demolition to include partial or total ruin of a structure. Any structure within the historic downtown district built before 1945 must receive a recommendation from the Historic Preservation Board and approval from Town Council prior to issuance of a demolition permit. The residence was built in 1939 and has experienced several significant alterations over the years. The house is not historically landmarked. The Historic Preservation Board recommended approval by a vote of 4-0 at their July 1, 2026 meeting.




Figure 1: Vicinity Map

## **Background**

### *History of the Property & Existing Conditions*



*Figure 2: South Elevation (Front)*

A Colorado Cultural Resource Survey was recently completed for the property at 607 Sixth Street. The attached survey is currently in draft form and is pending final review and approval by the Colorado State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). According to the survey and Douglas County Assessor records, the residence was constructed in 1939. The building is a 1.5-story, square-plan, wood-frame residence resting on a concrete foundation. It is clad in replacement faux cedar shingle siding and features an asphalt composition side-gable roof with an interior brick chimney. Due to the sloping topography of the site, the basement level is exposed on the west elevation. The Cultural Resource Survey notes that the residence lacks a distinctive or readily identifiable architectural style and that the windows appear to be replacement vinyl units. The survey further documents a number of alterations over time, including the addition of a wraparound porch, replacement windows, boxed eaves, and re-siding of the structure. The residence is not designated as a local Historic Landmark.



*Figure 3: West Elevation (Side along Cantril Street)*

The Cultural Resource Survey documents several alterations to the residence. The wraparound porch appears to have been added circa 1984. Between approximately 2002 and 2012, the exposed rafter ends were replaced with boxed eaves and the primary elevation windows were replaced, altering both the material and design of the original windows. Between 2012 and 2015, the residence was re-sided with faux cedar shingles. Due to these alterations, the historic design, materials, and workmanship of the building are no longer clearly evident.



*Figure 4: East Elevation*

### *Proposed Demolition*

The owner has requested approval to partially demolish the existing house. The demolition includes removal of the existing gable roof, second floor, first-floor walls, and faux shingle siding. The existing basement and first-floor framing are proposed to remain. The applicant states that the proposed partial demolition would allow construction of a home that the owners can live and grow in. The applicant also states that moving the building was investigated but would be financially restrictive, and that keeping the home in its current location preserves a spacious front yard consistent with Castle Rock Style. The design of any new single-family residence on the property would require approval by the Historic Preservation Board.




Figure 5: Historic Downtown Area

## **Public Outreach and Notification**

### **Neighborhood Meetings**

An initial neighborhood meeting was held on March 18, 2026. No members of the public attended. A subsequent neighborhood meeting was held on June 29, 2026, and no members of the public attended.

### **Public Notice**

Public notice has been completed in accordance with Town requirements. Public hearing notice signs were posted on the property and written notice letters were sent to property owners within the required notification area, at least 15 days prior to the public hearings.

Town staff published notice of the Historic Preservation Board public hearing on the Town's website and provided information about the proposal on the Town's Development Activity interactive map.

## **Analysis**

Chapter 15.64.020 of the Town's Municipal Code defines Demolition as "razing, destroying, dismantling, defacing or in any other manner causing partial or total ruin of a structure." Section 15.64.090B of the Town's Municipal Code establishes the following

criteria to be used by the Historic Preservation Board and Town Council, along with a cultural resource survey, to review all demolition requests.

1. Is the property currently landmarked and/or would the property be able to achieve landmark status?

*Per the Cultural Resource Survey (Attachment A), the property is not currently locally landmarked and is recommended not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The property does meet the age criterion for local landmarking, and the survey identifies a potential historic association between the original homeowners and the Castle Rock Star. The residence also appears to retain integrity of location, which is one of the aspects of integrity considered under the Town's local landmark criteria. However, the survey also documents substantial exterior alterations, including replacement siding, replacement windows, boxed eaves, and the addition of a wraparound porch. The survey further notes that the residence lacks a distinctive or readily identifiable architectural style and does not possess sufficient character-defining features to embody a specific type, period, or method of construction.*

*Given the property's age, potential association with the Castle Rock Star, and retention of integrity of location, the Historic Preservation Board and Town Council may find that the property meets the minimum threshold for local Landmark eligibility. However, the Board and Town Council should also consider the documented exterior alterations and overall loss of historic integrity in evaluating whether local Landmark designation would meaningfully further the Town's historic preservation objectives.*

2. Is the property void of features of architectural and/or historical significance and/or integrity?

*Per the Cultural Resource Survey, the residence has undergone significant modern alterations. The survey states: "It features replacement siding and windows, an unoriginal wraparound porch, and its original exposed rafter ends have been removed." The survey further concludes that the residence "lacks integrity of design, materials, and workmanship" and "no longer conveys its historic significance."*

3. Will the effect of demolition or relocation be positive or negative on adjacent properties or the downtown district?

*The Cultural Resource Survey identifies the residence as noncontributing to a potential National Register district. Because the building does not retain distinguishable historic features or sufficient integrity, staff finds that the partial demolition would not negatively impact adjacent properties or the historic downtown district. Future new construction, if proposed, would be reviewed separately for consistency with applicable Historic Preservation Board criteria and Castle Rock design guidance.*

4. Has deterioration of the property progressed to the point where it is not economically feasible to rehabilitate the property?

*The applicant has not identified deterioration as the basis for the request. The applicant's narrative states that, as with any home of this age, portions of the house need repair or replacement, but deterioration is not the factor driving the request.*

5. For a demolition request, has moving the building been investigated? Is it a feasible option to demolition?

*The applicant's narrative states that moving the building was proposed and investigated, but would be financially restrictive. Because the residence does not retain sufficient historic integrity and is identified as noncontributing, staff does not find relocation to be a desirable or feasible alternative to demolition.*

The demolition review criteria are intended to guide the Historic Preservation Board and Town Council in evaluating the specific circumstances of each request. The criteria do not necessarily provide a single right or wrong answer for each factor, nor is an application required to satisfy all five criteria in order for the Board to find that demolition may be appropriate. Rather, the criteria provide a framework for assessing the historical, architectural, and contextual value of the property. The Board should consider all of the criteria and weigh them as it deems appropriate based on the facts of the individual property and proposed demolition. In this case, staff finds that the residence's lack of historic integrity is a particularly important consideration. Because the building has been substantially altered over time and no longer clearly conveys its original historic character, staff does not oppose the demolition request.

### **Recommendation**

The Historic Preservation Board held a public hearing on July 1, 2026, and voted 4-0 to recommend approval of the demolition request.

### **Proposed Motion**

#### **Approval**

*"I move to approve the Resolution as introduced by Title."*

### **Alternative Motions**

#### **Approval with Conditions**

*"I move to approve the Resolution as introduced by Title, with the following conditions:"*  
(list conditions)

#### **Continue item to next hearing (need more information to make decision)**

*"I move to continue this item to the meeting on xxxxx, 2026 to allow time for additional research regarding \_\_\_\_\_"*

### **Attachments**

Attachment A: Resolution

Attachment B: Cultural Resource Survey  
Attachment C: Applicant Narrative