



DENVER
THE MILE HIGH CITY

Community Planning and Development
Planning Services
Plan Implementation
Landmark Preservation

201 W Colfax Ave, Dept 205
Denver, CO 80202
p: 720-865-2985
f: 720-865-3056
www.denvergov.org/planning

LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING ACTIVITY SUMMARY (Not intended to be verbatim minutes)
Wednesday, July 29, 2009 at 1:00 p.m.
MEETING LOCATION – 201 W. COLFAX, RM. 4.F.6

Members Present: Chaired by Dennis Humphries, James Bershof, Barbara Gibson, Edward Shalkey, and Christopher Meza

Absent: Stephen Leonard, Carla McConnell, and Ronald Roybal

Staff Present: George Gause, Jeremy Wells, Kerry Buckey and Savannah Jameson

Chair called meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

I. Review and Approval of Minutes

Motion by: E. Shalkey, I move we approve the minutes of May 5, 2009.

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

II. Designations

1. 747 Downing St.

Staff Presentation – S. Jameson

This is the staff report to the Landmark Preservation Commission (LPC) for the preliminary review of the **Governor Carr Residence** at 747 Downing in the Capitol Hill Neighborhood. The Designation Committee of the LPC reviewed the application on July 7, 2009 and voted 3-0 to refer the application to the LPC with recommendation for approval.

The application was prepared and submitted by Randy C. W. Swan, The Cygnet Group.

The application demonstrates that the property meets the criteria required for designation in the categories of history and architecture. It meets criterion 1C regarding history and Criteria 2A and 2D regarding architecture.

Historical Importance:

- *1C, have direct and substantial association with a person or group of persons who had influence on society;*
747 Downing Street was the personal residence and home office of Ralph Lawrence Carr who served as Colorado's Governor from 1939-1943. Governor Carr was the only US Governor who opposed the Japanese American internment camps.

Architectural Importance:

- *2A, Embody distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or type*
Governor Carr's house is an exceptional example of the Denver vernacular classical revival also known as the Denver Square. The house is a foursquare with a balanced façade. 747 Downing has a hipped roof with dormers. These are all key elements of the Denver Square.
- *2D, Portray the environment of a group of people or physical development of an area in an era of history characterized by a distinctive architectural style*
Governor Carr's residence, a contributing building to the 7th Avenue Historic District, is an example of the development of this area during the 1900s-1930s that portrays the transition from the earlier "Victorian" and Revival Styles to the Foursquare and Craftsman styles popular during this time.

Staff Recommendation:

The staff recommendation is to schedule a public hearing at the Landmark Preservation Commission meeting on August 18, 2009 noting the application meets the criteria for designation.

Motion by: J. Bershof, I move that we forward this designation application for 747 Downing St. to the September 1, 2009 LPC meeting for the Public Hearing.

Second by: E. Shalkey

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

II. Applications for State Income Tax Credit

Motion by: B. Gibson,

Second by: E. Shalkey

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

III. Design Review

1. #74-09 2837 Champa St.

Staff Presentation - J. Wells

This is a design review application in the Curtis Park "F" district. The applicant proceeded to replace windows without seeking a permit or obtaining Landmark review.

The applicant has been asked to remedy the situation and they said that they were not aware that this structure was in a historic district. After I explained the guidelines and the Landmark review, the process actually went through very smoothly. Openings 1 and 2 were bricked in and much of this year and without a permit or Landmark review, openings 3 and 4 on the back of the house on the later addition had windows that were removed and new windows were put in. The configurations of those windows were that the muntins and the rails and stiles were different than the originals. That happened sometime in April. By Ordinance, section 39, chapter 30, section 9.2 states that "in situations where an owner proceeds to make modifications to a building that is in a Landmark district they have to restore what was changed". So what needs to happen is that the owner needs to put back the windows where the openings were bricked in and also address the windows in the back.

The change that the applicant is proposing is to remove the bricks from the bricked in openings and place in double hung wood windows, single pane, which is condition 1 & 2. On windows 3 & 4 keep the same windows but insert muntins that match the profile of the original windows that were removed.

LPC staff feels that the homeowner has adequately addressed the requirements of section 30-9 (2) of the Landmark ordinance to return the house to its state previous to the unlawful alterations. Staff recommendation is for approval of this application.

Applicants Presentation

Guoping Li, 2837 Champa St., owner – I took over this property in March. I didn't know anything that was going on till I asked Jeremy if it is historical. Later I realized that I was wrong and I apologize for that, because I had no idea and I did my best to complete the work.

Board discussion

Board member thought that the house looked great and thought that Mr. Li has done a great job.

Motion by: B. Gibson, Project #74-09, 2837 Champa St., I move that this project be approved as presented, based on recommendations by staff.

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

2. #94-09 1133 E. 3rd Ave. *continued for 5th review

Staff Presentation - George Gause

This was former Mayor Sharpley's house, built in 1907.

Staff has received two concepts which propose raising the entire roof of the structure between 18" to 30". We had a number of concerns with the proposals. Not only would removal and reconstruction of the entire roof constitute a form of demolition, but the decorative brackets found at the eave line would have to be altered to make the proposal work. We discussed our concerns with the architect and suggested investigating just raising the roof of the area of congestion on the interior plan. Staff feels that raising the entire roof is excessive and will have a negative visual impact on the historic structure.

This dormer is located at the front façade corner of the structure. It is designed to increase the headroom of the living space on the second floor level of the structure. The dormer will be highly visible and the size will dwarf that of the original dormers. Staff believes that it will have a negative visual effect on the original structure.

This dormer is confined to the rear of the property opposite to the intersection of 3rd & Downing. It is in keeping with the goals of the guidelines for accommodating living area in an attic level.

My recommendation is for denial of raising the roof based on Guidelines 20 and 34. Also, I recommend denial of construction of the southeast façade dormer, based on Guidelines 35b and 36a.

Both will have a negative visual impact to the character of the original structure and the proposed work is not subordinate to the main building.

Applicants Presentation

Ted Schultz, Architect, CTA Architects Engineers – We did bring along copies of the evolution of the design. We had proposed that the 2nd story have an alteration to the head height and interior modification by building up the wall to accommodate this. We have really diminished the second story by trying to work with the comments that somehow balance the notion that we can make useable space out of it.

Board discussion

Discussion determined that the board members were generally okay with the dormer on the north and the west side conceptually. The dormer over the southeast corner helps reference the entry and has its own scale and style of construction but could be acceptable given some more design. A comment was made that the dormers seem to pop up and that this is a fairly significant change and there are also concerns about the step up of the roof line as it takes away from the sweep of the roof. The front dormer is not as substantial and was said to not look like original construction.

Motion by: J. Bershof, for Project #94-09, 1133 E. 3rd Avenue, I move that we conceptually approve the dormer construction presented for the alley façade and that the roof not be raised, but that the southeast façade dormer is conceptually acceptable; that it needs to per the Guidelines be subservient to the main roof subordinate to the main rooflines of the house and that the design be brought back to the commission for possible approval, based on the Guidelines cited in the staff report.

Second by: E. Shalkey

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

3. Project #197-09 495 High St.

Staff Presentation - George Gause

The existing Bungalow style structure was constructed prior to 1929 and is a contributing structure to the Driving Park Historic District.

The owner is proposing removing the existing roof of the structure and adding a second floor addition.

The existing dormer is an original feature of this structure. The addition will have a negative visual impact to the character of the original structure. The proposed work is not subordinate to the main building. Staff recommendation is for denial of the second floor addition.

Recommendation: DENIAL OF SECOND FLOOR ADDITION (guideline 4, 5a/b, 20, 32, 34)

**Basis: Existing dormer is an original feature of the structure
The addition will have a negative visual impact to the character of the original structure
The proposed work is not subordinate to the main building**

**Staff Suggestion: Maintain front dormer and front slope of the existing roof
Explore an addition with lower height-utilizing dormers
Explore developing a first floor rear addition**

Applicants Presentation

Stewart Lawrence, owner – We do want to maintain the footprint of the home. We wanted to take into account the views and maintain historic integrity. We are not changing the pitch of the roof, so the porch stays at the same pitch. When you carry the roof up the dormer then becomes under scale to the structure.

Board discussion

Discussion focused around the size of the dormer and perhaps finding something between the original and the proposed, so that a smaller one on the east elevation might work.

Motion by: E. Shalkey, for project #197-09, 495 High St., I move that we deny this application as is on the basis of the Guidelines cited in the staff report, and ask that the dormers be re-studied and be brought back to the full commission.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous objection, motion fails.

Motion by: J. Bershof, for project #197-09, 495 High St., I move that we approve the project as presented with the exception of the front dormer that needs to be re-studied for its massing and that the re-study come back to the commission.

Second by: E. Shalkey

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

4. Project #132-09 663 Fillmore St.

Staff Presentation – George Gause for Greg Savage

This is a house that was built in 1926 and is considered contributing. The existing flagstone wall around the porch is being partially removed or replaced and they want to add an ornamental iron railing at the front patio. A two-story addition to be built at the rear corner of the house with a second story addition above the existing office on south side which changes the street elevation is not recommended by the guidelines. Also, adding a one-story addition for a mudroom at the rear of the house.

The recommendation is for approval of the renovation work to the non-contributing patio, approval of a two-story addition at the rear corner of the house and addition of a one-story mudroom to this house and a denial of a second story addition above the office without modifications.

Applicants Presentation

Meghan and Fred Deibel. property owner

Scott Parker, Nest Architectural Design – We have tried to subordinate the addition of the master bedroom to the rest of the house. We lowered the eave so we have a lower plate to the small top of the building.

Board discussion

- Regarding the work on the front patio, the two-story addition at the rear and the one-story mudroom addition, there does not seem to be any issues.
- The staff recommended denial of the second story addition without modifications must mean re-study. They have done a pretty good job of trying to maintain what is old. Remarks were made that it is an attractive house and that all of the modifications proposed make it all attractive and that they do preserve the integrity of the house and enhances the house.

Motion by: B. Gibson, for project #132-09, 663 Fillmore St., I move that we approve the project as presented by the client with any further details to come back to staff.

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

Meeting adjourned,
Submitted by:

Judith Blake