



**DENVER**  
THE MILE HIGH CITY

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**MEETING ACTIVITY SUMMARY (Not intended to be verbatim minutes)**  
**Tuesday, March 2, 2010 at 1:00 p.m.**  
**MEETING LOCATION – 201 W. COLFAX, RM. 4.F.6**

**Members Present:** Chaired by Dennis Humphries, James Bershof, Barbara Gibson, Ronald Roybal, Stephen Leonard, Martin Goldstein and Carla McConnell

**Absent:** Edward Shalkey and Christopher Meza

**Staff Present:** Tyler Gibbs, Jeremy Wells, George Gause, Judy Blake, Kerry Buckey and Savannah Jameson

Chair called meeting to order at 1:10 p.m.

**I. Review and Approval of Minutes**

**Motion by: C. McConnell, I move to approve the minutes of February 16, 2010 with the modifications suggested.**

**Second by: B. Gibson**

**Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.**

**II. Applications for State Income Tax Credit**

**Motion by: B. Gibson, I move that we approve the Part I and Part II Tax Credits listed on today's agenda.**

**Second by: R. Roybal**

**Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.**

**III. Design Review**

**1. #81-09 1465 Larimer St. (Ocean Prime)**

**Staff presentation**

Greg Savage - This is an existing commercial structure and while it is a non-contributing building, it was built in 1969 as a replica of the original 1864 building. The proposal would drastically change the appearance of the building by eliminating the upper level arched vertical oriented windows and modify the ground floor by adding canopies along the majority of the frontage. According to a Tenant Design manual dated 1991, the proposed new construction will not be consistent with the 1900 vintage of Larimer Square. The existing awnings along the Larimer façade will be removed. Aluminum storefront material is prohibited in the design manual. Signage is typically located on a building sign band. The lighting of exterior signage should be achieved with an indirect light source. Internally illuminated signage should not be allowed.

The proposed modifications will destroy the functional and decorative features of the original windows.

Staff recommendation is to deny the new windows and doors on the basis of:

Modifications will destroy the functional and decorative features of the original windows. The original double hung dark colored windows will be replaced with a bi-folding white powder coated folding door system and storefront. (guideline 8)

The modifications will also destroy the position, type, number and groupings of windows on significant facades. The pattern of arched double hung windows at the second floor will be replaced with large folding windows along both the Larimer St. and 15<sup>th</sup> St. facades. A new continuous steel channel header will be inserted above the second story windows to match the first floor. (guideline 9)

Original window proportions will not be maintained. The vertical orientation will be replaced with a more square proportion of openings. In addition, the original masonry proportions will be modified to provide heavier vertical columns between the new windows. (guideline 10a)

The new door type will also change the functional and decorative features of the original entry door. The original double swinging doors with sidelights will be replaced with a revolving door. The existing glass canopy suspended from the corner of the building will be removed and replaced with a column supported canopy and signage. (guideline 7a)

Staff recommendation is to deny the entry canopy on the basis of:

The new location of the revolving entry door and canopy over the entry will change the location of the original entry. The new entry will be relocated from the Larimer St. façade to the corner of the building. (guideline 5)

A new canopy will also be built along the Larimer St. façade. It will be designed to hold lights, fans and heaters. The existing steel channel at the building façade will be painted white to match the new canopies. All canopies will be roofed with a canvas covering. (guideline 28)

Staff recommendation is to deny the signage on the basis of:

New signage along Larimer St. and at corner will be mounted on new canopies. See comments above relating to canopies. The new signage on 15<sup>th</sup> St. will be wall mounted and back-lit, but the logo is similar to typical public parking signage and could be confusing.

### **Applicants Presentation**

Mark Knauer, Knauer Inc. Architects – We have done other restaurant's in your city. something we need to determine here, based on Greg Savage's review, is that it was based on a contributing structure, and this was built in the 1960's. Our restaurant setting is a bit more contemporary than a historic district. We have activated the second floor. We need to have as much fenestration as possible to do this. Rather than saying destroy we prefer to use the word alter. The corner entrance could re-activate the corner.

When reviewing this, I think it is more important to look at and address the contemporary design of historic districts for new construction that you have outlined in the past. I guess the real issue here is the fenestration.

B. Gibson - It looks like you are going to be putting some of this columns lineage back in with brick that was apparently taken out in the 1990 change?

M. Knauer – Yes, we are using the same brick. That includes the steel headers, the aluminum storefront system, which we are looking at replacing which is now painted black, and we are looking at replacing it with a powder coated system that will require less maintenance.

D. Humphries – Would you address the canopy concept?

M. Knauer – Our customers comfort is the key to our success. We have proposed an awning structure as minimal as possible. We looked at three different types. Since there is a railing system requirement around the outdoor seating, we would use the vertical posts to support the structure itself. The posts became the most practical way to do this. There is not another structure like this on the street, and it is a neutral design that is neither old nor new but compatible, and a contemporary element that compliments the district and the use.

D. Humphries – This is more of a structure than we normally like to see in an outdoor area.

K. Buckey – They would have to get approval for outside heat from Public Works and also zoning encumbrance.

### **Board discussion**

- Moving the entry to the corner should be allowed and would create more activation and sidewalk use.
- Adding brick would help.
- Concern of the second floor windows and the horizontal relationship, there could be other approaches.
- What is being done to the façade relates to the district. The fact that it is a non-contributing building allows the applicant possible replacement.
- We would want to see how the proposed changes relate to the whole face block.

### ***Motion #1***

**(windows and doors)**

**Motion by: J. Bershof, Project #81-09, 1465 Larimer St., I move that we request a re-study of the exterior elevations and that we are in agreement that the general idea of the location of openings is acceptable and re-distribution of the masonry is acceptable but that the overall proportions of the openings be re-studied and specifically the openings on the upper level be more in conformance with the district and that in the restudy we ask that it include a face block analysis to help us see how these issues would be resolved. We are generally in favor of the proposed revolving door on the corner but would like to see more details on materials and how it looks.**

**Second by: B. Gibson**

**Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.**

**Board discussion**

- Great concern expressed about the significance and whether it will be enclosed at some point.
- It seems like a bold and overpowering move.
- There is no need to shout to be successful, as Ocean Prime speaks for itself. There is more interested in a more sensitive approach to the canopy and the seating that is more consistent with rest of that district.
- There is a more subtle way to develop this.
- The use of white draws too much attention.

***Motion #2***

**(canopy)**

**Motion by: C. McConnell, Project #81-09, 1465 Larimer St., I move that we deny based on plans as presented and suggest a re-study that would look at the canopy treatment and entry treatment in the context of the overall district and with their eye towards making it more in conformity with the character of the district as a whole.**

**Second by: S. Leonard**

**Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.**

**Board discussion**

- Concern expressed for what is appropriate for the district and that a valet sign is not needed.
- A permit would be needed for valet and concern that this is not the right thing at this point.

***Motion #3***

**(signs)**

**Motion by: M. Goldstein, Project #81-09, 1465 Larimer St., I move that we deny the current signage proposal as submitted and request a re-study and that it be more in context with the district.**

**Second by: B. Gibson**

**Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.**

**2. #104-10 2933 Welton St.**

**Staff presentation**

George Gause - The primary building is a contributing structure to the Welton Street Commercial Corridor Historic District. The applicant is proposing to construct a two-story secondary structure behind the existing primary structure. The structure is appropriately located at the rear of the lot and utilizes the existing rear alley. Sanborn maps show that a two-story secondary structure was located at the rear of this lot, but was demolished between the 1950's and 1970's. Staff has a concern with the design of the east façade. In particular the design reads more like a primary structure and not a secondary structure. Staff has worked with the architect and one revision simplifying the design has been made. Removal of the nested gable and the balcony would simplify the form to appear secondary to the primary structure. Simplification of the window design should also occur.

Staff recommendation is for conditional approval of construction based on the fact that the structure is appropriately located and makes use of existing alley. Over all design should be simple and subordinate to main structure. Design may imply an earlier period of construction.

### **Applicants presentation**

Russell Veazey, Architect, Veasey Design – We are here today to discuss the project and hear your comments and suggestions. We feel strongly about the second floor deck and would like to keep that.

### **Board discussion**

- Questions about the horizontal rather than vertical railing with the answer that they were looking to create some type of contemporary look for the railing.
- The question was asked about the clipped gable, with the reply that it fall under the bulk plane and that it lends itself to the idea that this is a secondary structure rather than as the primary structure.
- The comment was also made that this is a nice addition to the neighborhood.

**Motion by: C. McConnell, Project #104-10, 2933 Welton St., I move that we approve this project as presented for mass and form; we request that the east elevation gable be simplified to straight gable and the railing be re-studied for compatibility, and that final approval for materials or details needed be returned to staff.**

**Second by: J. Bershof**

**Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.**

### **3. #80-10 3620 N. Franklin St.**

#### **Wyatt Park School (Hyde Park School – DLM #172)**

#### **Staff Presentation**

George Gause - Hyde Park School is Denver Landmark # 172. The school was built in 1887. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing windows with a vinyl (PVC) window product. The existing windows are not original to the structure, the existing frames however do appear to be original. The existing windows sashes do not fit the openings correctly and are causing water infiltration into the structure.

Vinyl as a material is not recommended by the area guidelines or by the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation. A wood sash should be found that replicates the character of windows originally found on the structure.

Staff recommendation is for conditional approval of window replacement with the condition that replacement window sash is to match the original windows in style and material. Window frames should be repaired. The basis is that existing windows are not original to the structure and replacement windows should be wood to match the original windows.

**Applicants presentation**

Jim Haessler, Operations Manager, Wyatt-Edison School – The proposal was written the way that it was for a number of reasons. Primarily having to do with as a school there are serious financial considerations, the building is not environmental sound, and we have had a number of safety incidents with the sashes falling in. The windows are approximately 43”x31” double pane wood windows they are an exceptionally heavy feature. They are mounted 46” off floor to sill and are not operating optimally at all. So our concern is that a replication of the current window structure would not stand the course of time. We would be in a 7-10 year range of time before we would be back to this board asking for a similar renovation project.

There was a 1998 renovation, and 7 years later we had a sash fall in and injure an individual. The building was vacant for 20 years prior to that.

Linee Perroncel, Principal, Wyatt-Edison School – On the second floor there are already vinyl windows there. We want to use this long term until a viable wood product is found.

**Board discussion**

S. Leonard - If the State Historical Society helped pay for these windows they may have a say in this.

B. Gibson – How long would these last?

L. Perroncel – They are guaranteed for life and that is transferrable.

Several board members stated that they were not convinced that the proposed windows were going to be acceptable.

It was determined that this project should probably be continued and some research done to look up the renovation of 12 years ago as well as what the State Historical funds original agreement stated.

**Motion by: C. McConnell, Project #80-10, 3620 N. Franklin St., I move that we continue the design review so that the applicant has the opportunity to obtain further information from the State Historical Society on the basis of the original grant if there was one from Historic Denver and to contact contractors who may be able to provide some solutions for renovation of the existing windows, and possible location of the original construction documents for the 1998 renovation.**

**Second by: J. Bershof**

**Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.**

**VI. Discussion items**

**1. Letter from Karl Lueders , 551 Humboldt St., Driving Park Historic District, Secretary**

The letter that you have in front of you is old news now and I was using it as a conduit. I spoke with George over the last few weeks with hope to get some clarity for what we do as a neighborhood board.

D. Humphries – I was very involved as president in the Golden Triangle for many years and it was an advisory board. It is an RNO.

K. Lueders – I am not an expert but our board members would rather provide an opinion.

B. Gibson – Somehow you can get that opinion to us for our review at the start of a project.

**2. Dana Crawford Award (Edward White)**

Jeremy Wells – There was an email that Colorado Preservation Inc. that was very informal stating that on May 18, Edward White would be honored with the Dana Crawford Award. Jim and I thought about whether the commission would want to do anything at the presentation for Edward White.

S. Leonard – We passed a resolution when Ed retired and that could be the basis for anything, as it was a pretty clear resolution. Bart Barger has a copy.

B. Gibson – Ed White was one of the original people on the Landmark Commission.

D. Humphries – We could draft a letter.

Meeting adjourned,  
Submitted by:

Judith Blake