



DENVER
THE MILE HIGH CITY

LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING ACTIVITY SUMMARY (Not intended to be verbatim minutes)
Tuesday, March 16, 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, Edward Shalkey, Christopher Meza, Stephen Leonard and Carla McConnell

Absent: Martin Goldstein

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

None for review this date

II. Applications for State Income Tax Credit

None for review this date

III. Design Review

1. #81-10 1465 Larimer St. (Ocean Prime)

Staff presentation

Greg Savage - Modify the exterior of an existing building for a new restaurant use. Alterations to include: 1) new windows, 2) entry canopy and outdoor seating awnings and 3) signage to the existing building.

This project was brought before the commission on March 2, 2010.

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 re-submittal addresses the concerns of the commission except for the horizontal orientation of the new windows at the second floor. The addition of awnings rather than a heavy framework for the dining canopy improves the Larimer Street façade.

Staff recommendation is to deny the new windows and doors, based on:

The new door location and style was approved. The window modifications were approved with the condition that a full block face was presented showing the relationship of this building with the existing buildings on both sides of the block. The concern was that the windows were becoming a more horizontal orientation rather than the typical vertical orientation.

The proposed modifications are much more of a horizontal orientation than any other windows shown in the block face studies included with this submittal.

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 15th St. facades. (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)

Staff recommendation is to approve the entry and dining canopies on the basis of:

The proposed canopy as originally shown was denied based upon the amount and size of the supporting framework being added.

The dining canopy along Larimer has been eliminated and will be replaced with retractable awning supported by the building. The entry canopy has been shortened and some of the columns eliminated. (guideline 28)

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

The signage in the original proposal was denied based upon the amount and location of the signage.

The re-submittal eliminates the signage for the valet and has the main building signage located closer to the building face on the shortened entry.

Applicants presentation

Mark Knauer, Knauer Inc. Architects – First I will address the verticality of the windows. As we explained the reasoning for the openings to the second floor is to engage the street with seating on the second floor, to have an indoor/outdoor feeling. For the Larimer Street elevation we attempted to create vertically by bringing the brick all the way down to the street.

For the heaviness of the revolving door, the actual radius housing is shown as solid, and we proposed it to be glass.

We got rid of the canopies and columns. The columns at the entrance currently exist. Also the signage was reduced in size and we got rid of the valet.

Board discussion

- The question was asked about reducing the rectangle opening over the door and the applicant stated that it was being reduced.
- Verification was established that with a lot of brick on the façade matching brick was going to be used.
- Verification was also established that there was a vertical part in the center when the windows open.
- Comment was made that what they accomplished is an interesting façade. The block study is pretty revealing. This is a different approach than the rest of the block, and if there was at least one vertical in the middle of the openings to give some strength it might introduce some rhythm that get back some of the character of the rest of the block.

Motion by: R. Roybal, Project #81-10, 1465 Larimer St., I move that we recommend that the applicant provide a re-study for the upper windows to get more vertical orientation conducive to the upper block to be approved by staff; also recommend approval the suggested approach to the canopy and awning that drops off over the outdoor dining area and also recommend approval of the signage because it has been reduced and moved back closer to rear façade of the building.

Second by: C. McConnell

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

2. #81-09 2745 Umatilla St.

Staff presentation

George Gause - The existing structure on the site was declared non-contributing to the West 28th Avenue Historic District by the LPC in January 2007. Demolition was approved in April 2009. The structure was demolished last month in anticipation of the new infill construction that was also approved April 2009. Due to unforeseen issues with an easement along the side of the property the approved infill design had to be revised. There have been minor changes to the overall design prompted by having to pull the structure away from the easement. Most of the changes work very well, articulating a more vertical style that is found on historic Stoneman's Row. Staff is concerned with the glass curtain wall on the south façade. It is a large expanse (approximately 38' x 29') and has a commercial look. A break along this façade would be compatible with development in the area.

We also in receipt of a letter dated March 14, 2010 from Highland United Neighbors.

Staff recommendation is for conditional approval of plan revision based on:

Break is needed on south façade curtain wall expanse.

Guideline C-5B: The solid-to-void relationship of openings in related adjacent design should be reflected in the proportions of new windows and entrances of either additions or new construction.

Applicants presentation

David Berten, Real Architecture LTD. – We discovered a large sanitary sewer running through the property and Waste Water didn't know it was there, and they now have a 24' easement on our 50' lot. That issue required us to "skinny" up the house. The front has not changed at all. We have narrowed or simplified the large area protruding out. The front is trying to address the historic neighborhood. The south side can not be seen.

The applicant brought additional plans for Plan B was not previously submitted to staff.

Board discussion

- An opposing comment of opposition was made that the glass is too commercial looking and not liking that element.
- The massing was liked but not the skin.
- Comment made that some richness is lost with the change of the very simple commercial store front compared to the earlier version.

- Several board members liked the scale of the dividers, the mullions, and the horizontal on the original design versus what is taking place now. It does look like a commercial curtain wall.
- Several comments were made that the design is not quite there yet.

Motion by: E. Shalkey, Project #81-09, 2745 Umatilla St., I move that we accept the alternative Plan B presented here today, with the exception of a little more study of the glass curtain wall to reduce the scale and exposure, and those details can be worked out with staff.

Second by: R. Roybal

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

3. #133-10 2301 Blake St.

Staff presentation

Greg Savage - This building was built in 1916 and is a contributing building in the Ballpark Historic District. The business is re-locating from 2401 Blake St. I believe that other projecting signs have been approved in the area after going to the BOA.

The proposal is to install new awnings, a new overhead door to replace glass block infill, re-furbish the existing windows and new projecting sign.

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

The horizontal awning design is not compatible with the arched features of the original windows. (guideline 3)

Staff recommendation is to approve the new overhead door on the basis of:

The glass block infill does not appear to be original and the new overhead door would be compatible with the existing loading dock. The original opening will not be disturbed. (guideline 11)

Staff recommendation is to approve the window re-furbishment on the basis of:

The proposed re-furbishment will consist of removing non-historic materials and replacing glazing. The proportions, materials and operation of the existing windows will be maintained. (guideline 8)

Staff recommendation is to deny the projecting sign on the basis of:

The projecting signs are not allowed in the I-2 zone district. The applicant will need to go to the Board of Adjustment for a variance. The sign design does match other wall signage that will be located on the building, but the mounting location does cover the existing stone keystone of the arch. (guideline 16).

Applicants presentation

Kevin Koernig, Studio K2 Architecture – We looked at doing the arched awning but it didn't come out that well. In my opinion in looking through my research, we thought that the arched awnings were a little clunky and a little heavy on the building and what we are trying to do is just a very simple triangular awning which better expresses the arched openings. We want to bring daylight back into the space, open up those windows and really liven up the area.

The uncharted ground that I am not entirely sure of how to deal with is the blade sign. You can't really identify what that space is without some sort of projecting sign. We do feel that the sign is appropriate and the BOA is quite willing to work with on any kind of decisions that we come through with here today.

Roger Wilson, Ace Sign Consultants – The rationale behind this is that there are eleven openings in the front of that façade. We wanted to address the one that actually gets you into the building. We would like to bring you to that opening. This sign would identify the entrance.

Board discussion

Comments:

One does not care for the awnings but is not sure of a solution.

If the awning is kept within the window opening it might be better to show the arch.

Motion by: J. Bershof, Project #133-10, 2301 Blake St., I move that we approve the insertion of the overhead door, the refurbishment of the windows, the addition of the canopies, that they match into the openings that do not have pins, and that the rectangular opening nest in at the top, and that the signage proposal of the wall and blade signs are acceptable.

Second by: R. Roybal

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

4. #159-10 144 W. Colfax

Staff presentation

Steve Oliver – This project is for proposed day lighting by the installation of one (1) Sundolier device on the roof. New mechanical equipment should be screened from view or placed such that it is out of public view. To achieve that with this application requires such a large screen that the form of the roof is compromised.

Staff recommendation is to deny.

Applicants presentation

Mike Moore, Tres Birds Workshop - The bad remodels on this building are gone. We need to replace the windows and can not address this because of the time and cost. It requires a two foot (2') diameter hole in the roof and our device does not use any electricity. It follows the sun, and lights 3,000 sf. This would replace 70/100 watt light bulbs.

Board discussion

Comments as follows:

- This has far less impact than an array of PV panels, but I would be concerned and look at it as a temporary improvement.
- It is intriguing.
- It should have conditional approval limited to the roof replacement and skylights are replaced.

Motion by: B. Gibson, Project #159-10, 144 W. Colfax Ave., I move that we approve the project as presented with the condition that the installation lasts no more than ten (10) years and if roof is replaced, whichever is less.

Second by: R. Roybal

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

5. #119-10 A 2 E. 14th St.

Staff presentation

Savannah Jameson – The Civic Center was designed using principals from the “City Beautiful” movement and served to organize and connect Denver’s civic buildings in a formal manner. Civic Center serves as a frame for the State Capitol and the City and County Building. The design concept and a majority of the buildings were developed from 1904-1932.

The State Historical Society & Museum was built in 1977.

Recommendation is conditional approval of demolition.

The condition is that the WPA mural on front façade is preserved.

#119-10 B

S. Jameson - The Civic Center was designed using principals from the “City Beautiful” movement and served to organize and connect Denver’s civic buildings in a formal manner. Civic Center serves as a frame for the State Capitol and the City and County Building. The design concept and a majority of the buildings were developed from 1904-1932.

The State Judicial Building was built in 1977.

Recommendation is conditional approval of demolition.

The condition is that the Angelo di Benedetto mural is preserved.

Applicants presentation

Bill Moser, TrammelCrow Company, Project Manager – This is not really a mural, but rather a fabric banner on a frame that is attached to the building. We have spoken to the demolition company about this banner, and we think it can be removed and saved.

The Di Benedetto mural is actually 72 mounted panels. We are hoping after we get the first panel down, that the other panels will be easier and plan to save them. We do not know how they are mounted at this time.

#119-10 Schematic design

G. Savage – This project application is for a new Courthouse, office building and underground parking as a replacement structure to replace the existing Colorado Judicial Heritage Center and History Museum

The existing Colorado Judicial Heritage Center and History Museum were built in 1977. The buildings are non-contributing structures.

The new facility will be sited to open the views from the state capitol as well as Civic Center Park and extend the open space at the park. The courts building will be setback from 14th Ave. for security but will provide a large landscaped civic plaza. This will help to strengthen 14th Ave. as a grand avenue as noted in the Civic Center District plan. The office building located on the south end of the site will be a more typical office building and will reinforce the street presence along 13th Ave.

The heights of the new facilities step down towards Civic Center Park and meet the requirements of both the Civic Center Height limitations and the View Plane from the Capitol.

Staff recommendation is for approval of the replacement structure mass and scale only.
Additional submittal will be required for the final materials and details.

Applicants presentation

John Cossett, State Administrative Office – the rotunda is open in the 3rd and 4th floor inside. Materials on the exterior are primarily glass. All of the windows are fixed. There will be an interactive learning center for high school students and also

Board discussion

Brief discussion regarding the lawn area and steps, which are at grade and that they are trying to increase activity there.

Motion #1

Motion by: C. McConnell, Project #119-10 A, 2 E. 14th St., regarding the State Historical Society & Museum, I move that we give conditional approval of demolition with no requirement that the mural be preserved.

Second by: C. Meza

Vote: One opposed, seven in favor, motion carries.

Motion #2

Motion by: C. McConnell, Project #119-10 B, 2 E. 14th St., regarding the State Judicial building, I move that we give conditional approval of demolition with the requirement that the di Benedetto mural be preserved.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

Motion #3

Motion by: J. Bershof, Project #119-10, 2 E. 14th St., I move that we approve the schematic design as presented for mass and scale only and as recommended by staff.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

VI. Discussion items

Sustainability

Elaine Gallagher Adams, Rocky Mountain Institute – Recently I was invited to New York to participate in a National Preservation Conference with representation and focus on sustainability.

This was a hybrid think tank. All of the big, real preservationist names were there, including some of the leaders of National Trust.

We talked for three days about how to get our preservation more noticed and why is historic preservation being criticized so often in the sustainability realm. What came out of the three days was an agreement that we definitely need to speak together. We need to be taking advantage of the same things, so we talked about sustainability and the use of tax credits.

The big question was how can we maintain the viability of a building and make historic features more energy efficient.

We have set up information on line that you can look at by going to:
www.PreservationNation.org/green

Meeting adjourned,
Submitted by:

Judith Blake