



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 MINUTES

Tuesday, January 6, 2009 at 1:00 p.m.

MEETING LOCATION – 201 W. COLFAX, RM. 4.F.6

Members Present: Chair Dennis Humphries, Co-chair Carla McConnell, James Bershof, Barbara Gibson, Ronald Roybal, Christopher Meza, Stephen Leonard, and Edward Shalkey

Staff Present: Steve Oliver, Greg Savage, Fran Mishler, Tyler Gibbs, Kerry Buckey, (City Attorney,)
Judy Blake, and Savannah Jameson

Chair called meeting to order at 1:07 p.m.

I. Review And Approval of Minutes

Motion by: C. McConnell, I move that we approve the minutes of the November 18, 2008 with any corrections as provided.

Second by: C. Meza

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

Motion by: S. Leonard, I move that we delay the approval of the minutes of the December 16, 2008 meeting.

Second by: C. McConnell

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

II. Applications for State Income Tax Credit

Motion by: C. McConnell, I move to approve the preliminary and final State Income Tax Credits as listed on the agenda.

Second by: R. Roybal

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

III. Information Items

Update regarding the Hornbein/White designations.

F. Mishler – The second reading for the Hornbein and White buildings designation at City Council postponed to January 20, 2009. The Shea Developers indicated a willingness to extend the date for this.

IV. Public Hearing *continued from November 18, 2008

Hearing opened at 1:15 p.m.

Civic Center Guidelines

R. Roybal recuses from any motions per his connection with his firms involvement

F. Mishler – Because there was considerable concern during the last meeting I was very careful in my review.

Comments

- This draft of Denver's Civic Center Design Guidelines has strengthened the emphasis on preservation and rehabilitation, and manifests greater sensitivity to the historic design of the park.
- The spatial organization of the park is defined and clearly emphasizes the importance of clear visual access into, through, and out of the park. The views between the State Capitol and City & County Building, as well as between the Voorhies Memorial and the Greek Theater are especially noted in order to reinforce the Civic Center Park's composition of spaces.
- Pedestrian oriented intersections and streets, as well as clear and safe pedestrian routes through the park, are mandated and encouraged.
- New structures and additions are required to respect the scale and proportions of the existing structures and be designed in that context.
- The South Garden is described in such a way as to allow for a variety of approaches in the design that are open, airy and non-habitable, but will not result in a large structure or building.
- The description of possible modifications to the Greek Theater establishes sensitive parameters for the design while allowing for protection from the sun.

While there are still some concerns, one was the use of language that I thought was perhaps creating a concern that maybe isn't intended.

Concerns

- **New Additions:** The term "addition" carries with it the suggestion of a built structure, a building, or an addition to a building. Since the term is also intended to be inclusive of landscape, and any other features that might be added to Civic Center, it should be changed to a word that is more inclusive, such as "element" or "feature." The definition on p. 31 is inclusive and generic, but the term, as used throughout the text, gives the impression of a building.
- The section on Contributing Features, p. 14, encourages "Designing additional contributing features..." The point being made is that quality, contextual design, and design integrity should be part of any new feature added to the park. A feature would still not be considered as "contributing" unless it achieved significance over time and was approved by the LPC as such.
- **Pedestrian Circulation Figure 6, p. 21:**
 - A District Circulation arrow from Lincoln and Colfax through the RTD Station does not relate to Civic Center Park nor impact it in any way. It should be deleted.
 - Standard 3 discusses accessible routes to access the Park and to "check movement." Explain the latter term.
 - Standard 4 should substitute "Provide" for "Encourage" if it is to remain a Standard.
- **New Additions, p. 34:** Question whether it is necessary to "encourage opening the center area of the Red Oak Groves on the Broadway Terrace."
- **Site Furnishings, p. 41:** Explain what is meant by "Design new seating" for New Additions. Using the same seating palette throughout the park is a way of integrating the new with the existing so that the park remains a single seamless design.
- **Signs, p. 41:** Prohibit off site signage.
- **Lighting, p. 42:** Lighting should light pathways in and through the park for security, as well as showcase the formal design and mark transitions.
- **Environmental Stewardship, p. 47:** Maximizing the use of natural day-lighting should not be used as an excuse to enlarge openings in the McNichols Building.
- **McNichols Building, p. 48:**
 - Standard 2. refers to the 1999 Historic Structure Assessment recommendations for the rehabilitation of the exterior. A sub-set of this Standard should briefly note what these recommendations are, for example, if they include the re-establishment of the original entry and stair facing Colfax.
 - Change Guideline 2 into a Standard since the replacement of the parking lot on the south side of McNichols Building should be mandatory. In addition, the curb cut on Bannock should be removed and the tree lawn continued.
 - Explain what is meant in Guideline 4 regarding the "New Addition to the north façade."
- **Central Gathering:**
 - Explain the use of the term on p. 12 that Central Gathering "awaits a commanding feature."
 - Note in Guideline 6, 3rd bullet, p. 55 that scale "d" is 20' not 24' in height.
- **South Garden, p. 57:** Explain what is meant by "park structures" in the Description & Intent so that a building is ruled out..

- Voorhies Memorial, p. 62: Verify that the groves of crabapple trees have not taken on significance over time.
- Park Kiosks, p. 63:
 - The footprint for the kiosks, 625-706 sq. ft., seems too large, and the height of 20' too high. Note that the height for scale "c" is actually 10-12 ft., which is more appropriate. Reduce the scale and mass of the kiosks.
 - Note in Guideline 6 that a temporary kiosk is mentioned for Bannock Street. It should be required to meet the same Standards and Guidelines.
 - Guideline 5 allows the use of new, contemporary materials, but then lists only traditional materials, and wood,. Explain what these acceptable contemporary materials might be.
- Redlines of the document with corrections of typos and grammar have been submitted to the P&R team, but are not commented on in this staff report.

Staff Recommendation:

- *Staff recommends that when the above concerns are vetted and discussed, and the required changes made, that the Design Guidelines be re-evaluated for adoption.*

Applicants Presentation

Mark Bernstein, Parks & Recreation – To recap this process, it started in February, 2008, and on November 13, 2008 was presented to Parks and Recreation and we received some comments from them and then we presented it to the Landmark Preservation Commission. Were here today to request approval of these guidelines so that we can proceed with the bond projects that have been approved by the voters. These projects are crucial in the development of the park

Tina Bishop, Mundus Bishop, Inc. – These guidelines are based on the 2005 Master Plan. We have spent a considerable amount of time going back through the guidelines to make sure that they are much more straight forward and clearer in presenting a case that we really are looking at the intent of the guidelines as the way to really bring forth the idea of preservation and rehabilitation. I want to reiterate that these are guidelines not recommendations for specific places and recommendations are covered in the Master Plan. The roll of the guidelines is for your use and other city agencies to evaluate proposed changes to Civic Center. You will see that we have modified some of the graphics and you will see some of the changes in the more transparent features.

A couple of typo's we found are where you may read "designing contributing features" that is meant to say "designating" additional contributing features.

We did use the Secretary of Interior Standards throughout the document. You will see some of those typo's in verbiage (p.31). For instance one other is under the pedestrian circulation the "check" movement throughout the park is meant to create "movement throughout the park.

Now I would like to address some of the staff comments.

- For the site furnishings, what we mean by "design new seating" is really just that, when we have the opportunity, the idea is to create an integrally designed space for the park.
- Under signage the primary intent is only for way finding and there is no intent for advertising.
- For lighting, we recommend light in the park for security.
- For environmental stewardship, one of the goals has to do with natural daylight. It also says that balance with historic character building in the park .
- One of the projects in the future will be preservation of the Voorhies Memorial and the Greek theater.
- For the classical order we have added a cross section to explain.
- The kiosks are to be appropriate within the park. Your request was regarding the ancillary features such as mechanical, electrical, trash, be included within the kiosk footprint. We have made that footprint and that height to ensure that anything you want to do with that kiosk would be included. Within Guideline 5, it allows the use of new contemporary materials but we will allow the use of the materials in a contemporary manor.

Public comments

*(note that Councilwoman Jeanne Robb is in attendance)

Carolyn Etter – If you adopt these guidelines, it seems that you are accepting. I checked to see what was in the bond issue. I question at what point would Civic Center change and not be historic. These guidelines are the basis of which you would do your review. I recommend a one step at a time approach.

*Carolyn Etters letter:

Brad Camern, Coalition to Save Civic Center Park – Our focus is in the southwest quadrant of the park. On p. 35, fig. 12, I was left wondering what will go in there. Let us focus on what Carolyn suggested that is one item at a time.

Mary Koerning, Executive Director, Colorado Preservation, Inc. – The Civic Center Park Master Plan makes it clear, that Civic Center is the heart and sole of Denver. Civic Center is one of the states most symbolic places and is one of the most complete and intact city beautiful style civic centers in our country. This Master Plan also calls Civic Center the primary green space in the center of the city. It is listed on the National Parks register of Historic Places, it is part of the Civic Centers Historic District, and it is currently being considered for nomination as a National Historic Landmark. It is designated by Colorado Preservation Incorporated as one of Colorado’s most endangered places. The design guidelines should be adopted.

Elaine Assarch, The Civic Center Conservancy Board – These guidelines work because the public has listened. Thanks to all the stakeholders, commissioners, and others. I believe we need to be very sensitive and I would support the guidelines as written.

Ruth Faulkenberg, The Civic Center Conservancy Board – This is especially complicated because of the vital importance of its history. I believe strongly in these guidelines, and they tackle the preservation aspect very well. I urge you to adopt with careful consideration.

Board discussion and comments

C. McConnell – The work that has been done since the last presentation is very productive. On Pg. 37 could the maximum height for the scale of additions be “e” instead of “f”? We could re-evaluate the height if you like us to look at different scales like the national.

T. Bishop – We could re-evaluate the scale.

C. McConnell – Under the central gathering I question the scale “e”?

S. Leonard reads his comments as follows:

*See the next 6 pages.....

Denver Landmark Commission Meeting 1/6/09 Civic Center Discussion

Denver Landmark Commission Authority and Duties

Making Historic Preservation decisions rests on certain standards. Because Civic Center Park is in a Historic District locally and national listed as such, the Denver Landmark Preservation Commission must adhere to those standards. Besides being a dereliction of its duties and ethically suspect, the Commission’s failure to adhere to the standards could endanger Civic Center Park’s National Register status with consequent impact on federal funding.

Secretary of Interior standards are incorporated in *Civic Center Design Guideline February 1996, p 39*. The following standards are particularly appropriate:

- 1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.**
- 2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of original materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.**
- 3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.**
- 4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.**

One of the main reasons for historic preservation is to provide communities with visual anchors--buildings and landscapes that change little, if at all, over time. These features provide a sense of continuity that is lacking and sorely needed in a society threatened by overwhelming and sometimes mindless change.

Civic Center Park, with the exception of the addition of a few monuments and the growth of vegetation, has remained largely unchanged for nearly ninety years and hence provides a sense of continuity to tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of Coloradans. Even well intentioned “improvements” threaten that continuity. Certainly, such “improvements,” in keeping with good preservation practice, must be kept to a minimum.

The *Civic Center Guidelines* of January 6, 2009 envision far more than minimum changes to Civic Center Park. They would permit the addition of a large central feature, the

Denver Landmark Commission Meeting 1/6/09 Civic Center Discussion

Denver Landmark Commission Authority and Duties

Making Historic Preservation decisions rests on certain standards. Because Civic Center Park is in a Historic District locally and national listed as such, the Denver Landmark Preservation Commission must adhere to those standards. Besides being a dereliction of its duties and ethically suspect, the Commission’s failure to adhere to the standards could endanger Civic Center Park’s National Register status with consequent impact on federal funding.

Secretary of Interior standards are incorporated in *Civic Center Design Guideline February 1996, p 39*. The following standards are particularly appropriate:

- 1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.**
- 2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of original materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.**
- 3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.**
- 4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.**

One of the main reasons for historic preservation is to provide communities with visual anchors—buildings and landscapes that change little, if at all, over time. These features provide a sense of continuity that is lacking and sorely needed in a society threatened by overwhelming and sometimes mindless change.

Civic Center Park, with the exception of the addition of a few monuments and the growth of vegetation, has remained largely unchanged for nearly ninety years and hence provides a sense of continuity to tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of Coloradans. Even well intentioned “improvements” threaten that continuity. Certainly, such “improvements,” in keeping with good preservation practice, must be kept to a minimum.

The *Civic Center Guidelines* of January 6, 2009 envision far more than minimum changes to Civic Center Park. They would permit the addition of a large central feature, the

removal of perhaps as many as a third of the Park's trees, a sizeable addition to the Carnegie building, modifications to the Greek Theater, the placement of an additional memorial, three kiosks, and a potentially large number, of pieces of permanent public art. They allow for a sizeable new structure in the southwest quadrant of the Park with consequent diminution of the Park's open space.

In total these additions would permanently and significantly alter the appearance of Civic Center Park.

A secondary flaw in the *Guidelines* is that they are based on the premise that the pre-1920 Bennett plan, which was never fully implemented, should continue to be the lodestar in determining the future and fate of Civic Center Park. That flies directly in the face of Standard 3 above.

This premise is flawed because:

1. It fails to take into account the fact that the Park developed and its surroundings developed over a long period time. If Bennett were to return today there is no certainty that he would favor his own plan because the surroundings of the Park, particularly because of the building of large structures near the Park, have changed considerably since 1920.

2. Even if Bennett rose from the grave and blessed the notion of uninhabitable 48 foot high trellises, or pergolas, or gazebos in the South Garden, the implementation of such notions still fly in the face of good preservation practice which is not based on the resurrection of plans never realized, but rather on the preservation of what actually became reality.

The logic of this is evident if we consider, for example, that the Colorado State Capitol was not built as designed. Would it be reasonable from a historic preservation standpoint after more than 100 years to redo the Capitol to make it as E.E. Myers originally designed it?

Also, consider that there was another plan for Civic Center in ca. 1912 that envisioned four buildings on the site. If we admit the flawed logic of resurrecting old plans as templates for the future, then someday, someone will propose filling the site with buildings.

Civic Center Motions

All motions are predicated on the assumption that what is being approved are general concepts and that design review of all structures and objects placed in Civic Center Park will rest with the Commission.

The motions are based on Secretary of Interior standards as incorporated in *Civic Center Design Guidelines February 1996, p 39*. The following guidelines are particularly appropriate:

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of original materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

Motions I: General

The period of significance leaves out numerous changes that were made to Civic Center after 1932. The period of significance should include all aspects of the Civic Center Park that the LPC deems worthy of protection. These include statuary, memorials, and other artifacts as well as mature trees.

If the LPC were creating a historic district, it would establish a period of significance for that district that would encompass all important structures and aspects of that district (as long as they were at least 30 years old) in order to make sure that they were considered to be contributing. No other district has been established that omits obviously contributing structures or features and then adds them as a kind of afterthought. Adopting that convoluted approach for Civic Center Park is neither sensible, nor necessary.

The effect of establishing a 1909 to 1932 period of significance will be to endanger at least 30% of the trees in the Park including the fruit trees that flank the south sidewalk leading into the Greek Theater. These are important contributing features to the Park and they also enhance the Civic Center district to the south of the Park.

The LPC should, of course, be open to considering the removal of trees that seriously endanger structures within the park.

Motion: That the period of significance for Civic Center Park be fixed in the *Guidelines* as 1909 to 1979.

Motion II: That references to the BenCnet plan as a template for future development of Civic Center Park be removed from the *Guidelines*.

Motion: That a survey of all trees be made to recommend to the LPC their contributing or non-contributing status. That the LPC then determine whether or not the trees in question should be deemed contributing or non-contributing.

Motions II: Approvals with modifications

That the Landmark Preservation Commission (LPC) thank the authors of *Denver's Civic Center Design Guidelines* dated January 6, 2009.

That the LPC approve aspects of the *Guidelines* relating to Preservation, Restoration, and Rehabilitation as outlined on pages 31 and 32 but not page 33 of the *Guidelines* with the exception of d3 on p. 32. Change d3 to read: "New additions include 1) two additions to the McNichols Building 2) Central Gathering (as dealt with in a separate motion below), ^{TWO} three park kiosks .

That the LPC approve aspects of the *Guidelines* relating to materials and site furnishings, pp 38-41, with the provision that the "South Garden" be eliminated from the areas in which commercial signs be allowed.

That the LPC approve aspects of the *Guidelines* relating to lighting, pp 41-43 with the provision that references to the South Garden be eliminated.

That the LPC approve aspects of the *Guidelines* relating to Art and Commemoration, pp.44-45, with the following provision that ~~no~~ additional pieces of public art or other three dimensional features including, but not limited to, memorials, flagpoles, pergolas, gazebos, follies, statues or trellises, be allowed in Civic Center except that one additional free standing memorial be allowed in a position calculated to balance the Columbus statue. The above, however, does not apply to the addition of kiosks, additions to the McNichols Building, modifications to the Greek Theater and to the central gathering area which are dealt with in separate motions below.

Motions III: Restudy

1. Central Gathering:

Although the *Guidelines* imply that the feature planned for the Central Gathering area will not destroy or compromise the civic or cultural axes, this is open to serious question especially since the plan is not sufficiently detailed to allow the Commission to determine the impact of the feature.

Maintenance of the axial relationship between the City and County Building is of utmost importance and the preservation of the relationship between the Greek Theater and the Voorhies Memorial is also of high import.

Motion: That the addition of a feature in the central area be reconsidered.

Motion: That if a feature is planned for the central area that it be no more than four feet high with the provision, however, that water height need not be limited to ~~six~~ ⁴ feet.

Motion: That a survey be made of the Carnegie Building and its surroundings to recommend to the LPC which features are contributing or non-contributing. That the LPC then determine whether or not the features should be deemed contributing or non-contributing.

2. South Quadrant

For nearly 90 years the South Quadrant of the Park has been largely grass covered open space with relatively few trees, no benches or signs, no monuments, and no works of art. Because of its lack of clutter, it gives the Park an air of elegance. It provides the Park with much of its open space. It gives Park users an area in which they can picnic, walk their dogs, throw balls, and stretch their legs and eyes. Because it differs from others areas of the Park it provides a nice contrast. It allows for great views into and from the park and helps to showcase the Carnegie Building as well as other areas of the Park.

Motion: That the South Quadrant of the Park should remain as it is with the exception that the recently installed sign and the utility box near the corner of 14th and Bannock shall be removed as soon as possible.

Motion: That the LPC is open to consideration of changes at the perimeter of the South Quadrant that might facilitate pedestrian access to the Park.

Motion: That the LPC is open to working with Parks and Recreation to assist in the design and placement of signs.

3. Kiosks

4. Other

Corrections to Guidelines

SL suggests some corrections/modifications including:

1. Use of the term Columbian Exposition in all places where Colombian Exhibition is currently used.
2. Dates for Willam McNichols, Jr. as mayor from 1968 to 1983, not 1963 to 1983.
3. Certain other errors such as the statement that Denver was a mining town in 1906.
4. The location of the Powerhouse Plaque should be noted on the site map.

***continuation of Board discussion and comments**

C. McConnell – For the South Garden area, if the Master Plan is indicating something, wouldn't it be prudent to have the guidelines, rather than to make a motion

S. Leonard – It seems that it might make sense for two smaller kiosks, three would be questionable.

K. Buckey – When you do adopt design guidelines, you are not bound by that, nor are you bound by previous guidelines. You have to determine what the appropriate design guidelines should be. This is what Parks believes they should be, but they are your guidelines.

D. Humphries – The Master Plan is designed to be a guiding direction. If we are in agreement with Steve's comments, while elegant, we also want to hear your opinions. (speaking to the Commissioners)

J. Bershof – We discussed the Period of Significance in our last meeting, which I agreed could be expanded and that is where I am. The guidelines look back in history. There is a unanimous agreement that it is something that needs to be acted upon right away.

B. Gibson – I would like for the guidelines to give us future guidance for changes in the park.

C. Meza – This is a lot to bite off in one presentation. Is it possible to present it in levels, such as building, landscape, etc.?

D. Humphries – I see these as a comprehensive guide. I think it is important as it gives global comprehensive perspective. There a lot of enhancements since the last meeting. The work that has been done is consistent with the master Plan. We ought to look at these comprehensively and not partial. We either go forward to adopt or deny. Adopt with the issues Fran has brought up.

C. Meza – If we took it one piece at a time, it could evolve differently.

E. Shalkey – After listening to Steve, I agree with him on the score of public art. This is something that I could go with.

C. McConnell – The South Garden is of most concern to me. On p.5, fig. 1, and p.9, illustration 5, the block shown that gives the feeling of a building. I would ask that those be changed or removed and that the maximum height for the central elevation be reduced to an elevation of four feet. I wouldn't be opposed at going along with Steve's motion of not allowing anything in there. If we could do those two things, I could accept that.

B. Gibson – I appreciate Steve's work. But I think we need to move ahead.

S. Leonard - The guidelines are so broad that in ten years someone could be concerned. These guidelines are major significance, and my objections are not minor typo's but to the amount of change that they would permit to Civic Center. Are the Landmark commissioner's comfortable with the fact that fruit trees could be chopped down? With these guidelines every one of the fruit trees could be chopped down. Are the Landmark Commissioner's comfortable with the amount of public art that could go in there? Are they comfortable with the green change that is envisioned as a possibility? I am not comfortable, because I don't think that the standards will be conformed to if we make ourselves comfortable with that. I plead for Civic Center. We can activate it, as we can have kiosks, improvements, but we do not have to sign it's death warrant here. That is what adoption of these plans as they stand right now would be. I think we should set up a sub-committee to re-write these standards so that they will work for the next ten to twenty or thirty years. Essentially what we have here is an incredibly able team who is attempting to serve a number of different masters and the written standards that they think the Landmark commission somehow would adopt them and I think it would be a mistake to follow that.

D. Humphries – Steve, I take disagreement with you on in terms of some of those comments, but I do believe your comments have great validity and merit. I look at these guidelines exactly as that, guidelines. Any commission would be responsible for viewing any additions by those guidelines and the Interior Standards stated in here. I don't see that we are signing a death warrant at all at this point.

S. Leonard – Guidelines are incredibly important and the central feature could be twenty-four feet high under the guidelines that we are being asked to adopt.

**A discussion followed between S. Leonard and D. Humphries regarding a possible conflict with Dennis's voluntary involvement with the Civic Center Conservancy board which led to Dennis Humphries recusing himself from the Civic Center guidelines votes.*

* Carla McConnell took over as Chair for this project.

C. McConnell – A question for Kerry Buckey. Do we have to have a motion and a conclusion today? Or could we have this deferred to a special session to work through issues and have a closed public hearing, what are our options?

K. Buckey – You may close the public hearing and have the option for a subcommittee.

E. Shalkey – I think it would make things less complicated.

C. McConnell – At this point I will close the Public Hearing for the Civic Center Guidelines.

T. Bishop – The guidelines for public art are quite restrictive, and they do not advocate or suggest. We are very open to the Period of Significance and nowhere are we advocating removal of trees.

S. Leonard – Tina, on p. 56, referring to the South Garden, it says “To define edges and provide park amenities, this new park space may include non-habitable three-dimensional elements such as walls, trellises and park structures. Plantings, trees, water, sculpture and civic art are important elements that may be used to complete the South Garden.” The South Garden is a very large space and it seemed to me that this would allow any numbers of pieces of public art in the South Garden.

T. Bishop – If you read the full guideline on that taking for understanding that an intrinsically designed space. If the South Garden were ever to become a space you would then have the opportunity to evaluate that design. The only places that additional public gardens would be allowed would be in the design of new spaces.

*General discussion among the Commissioners regarding the kiosks size and number of kiosks.
Suggestion of dropping the number of kiosks from three to two

M. Bernstein – We would look at the corner of Colfax and Broadway for opportunities to develop and construct those kiosks and through a separate process pursue a concession agreement.

C. McConnell – Speaking to Steve, “On the issue of tree removal, what in the document causes you to feel that there would be a great number of trees removed?”

S. Leonard – Well, I believe there is a map in here that leaves out a large number of the trees, possibly all of the evergreens and the fruit trees. One of the most beautiful sites in the Civic Center is the access it frames by those fruit trees, and it provides a relief from the concrete that goes past the art museum.

M. Bernstein – As far as the Parks & Recreation policy is on the trees, we do not just go out and remove trees for any reason.

Motion by: S. Leonard, Civic Center Guidelines, I move that the Period of Significance of 1909 to 1979 be accepted.

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: E. Shalkey, S. Leonard, C. McConnell, J. Bershof, and C. Meza voted for approval, with B. Gibson opposed, motion carries.

C. McConnell – We will defer a decision until the next meeting. The subcommittee for the Civic Center guidelines discussions will be chaired by Chris and include, Jim, Steve, Ed and Mark Bernstein.

III. Design Review

1. **Project #433-08 745 Gaylord St. Residence**

Staff presentation

S. Oliver - This house and garage are both contributing structures within the East 7th Ave. Historic District.

There are two parts to this application.

1. *Remodel contributing rear porch, replacing door and window combination with folding door system including partially removing brick wainscot*

I had suggested that they move the door to the south or right and to retain the door. The applicant decided not to take that recommendation and to proceed with a plan to remove the brick and sill. My recommendation is to deny.

2. *Demolish existing contributing, rebuild using existing brick, rafter tails and other elements to face alley.*

The concern is the amount of driveway that exists from the street to the garage. The applicant would like to tear down the garage, turn it around and move it five feet off the alley, rebuild it with the original brick and the details, the rafter tails which are not part of the rafters but are elements that are contributive to the house.

My recommendation is to approve.

Applicants Presentation

Bill DeMaio, W.J. DeMaio and Associates (architect) – This started as a landscape project to rid excess concrete in the back and turn the garage around for safety outing. The rear porch has been modified in the past. The existing windows and doors are replacements, not original. The porch and deck creates an odd configuration in the kitchen. The goal is to open up more space and have a better relationship with the yard and landscaping.

Board discussion and comments

- The removal of the driveway is interesting. Nice architectural gesture using the folding nano wall, but it dramatically alters the historic character of the rear of the structure. The removal of the lattice work and step is an improvement but the window is inconsistent with the house.
- Maybe adding a pair of French doors would be more consistent and allow for the change in egress.
- A re-study for keeping some elements that relate to the original was suggested.

Motion by: J. Bershof, Project #433-08, 745 Gaylord St., I would move to approve the garage portion as presented, and for the addition on the residence that we ask for a re-study to come back to the commission, that they submit the architectural changes for the addition more compatible with the original structure per the staff report. Also, that the applicant bring the details for the porch back to staff.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

2. **Project #396-08 177 Humboldt**

Staff Presentation

G. Savage – This is a proposal to replace sixty-five steel casement windows with Pella Architect Series aluminum clad wood windows. The replacement will also include diamond pattern leaded glass replacement in some locations.

Staff recommendation is to approve this proposal. The country Club Design Review Committee has reviewed and approved this proposal.

Applicants Presentation

William McFarlane, DMD Builders, Inc. – Our business is strictly window replacement. The lower windows are true divided lites. The interior are aluminum clad to match what is there now.

Michael Kennedy, home owner – I have owned this property for the past eleven years. I wish I had done this years ago when I was warned about the damage. We get a sheet of ice on the inside of these windows in very cold weather.

Board discussion and comments

- The opinion is that this is what our window preservation is all about.
- Some concern was expressed about the cleaning of the windows but the applicant stated that the sealant could be removed for cleaning, more easily than any other way of attachment
- The general discussion was to approve this project.

Motion by: J. Bershof, Project 396-08, 177 Humboldt St., we approve this project as presented with the expressed emphasis on the fact that these are steel casement windows and because the deterioration of the sills of the casement windows and the maintenance issues, that is the basis for allowing the change.

Second by: R. Roybal

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

Meeting adjourned 4:00 p.m.

Submitted by:

Judy Blake