



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 20, 2009 at 1:00 p.m.
MEETING LOCATION – 201 W. COLFAX, RM. 4.F.6

Members Present: Chaired by Carla McConnell, James Bershof, Barbara Gibson, , Christopher Meza, Stephen Leonard, and Dennis Humphries

Absent: Ronald Roybal and Edward Shalkey

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

Absent: Judy Blake

Chair called meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

I. Review And Approval of Minutes
Motion by: S. Leonard, move to approve the minutes of December 16, 2008 and January 6, 2009.
Second by: B. Gibson
Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

II. Applications for State Income Tax Credit
Motion by: B. Gibson, move to approve the Tax Credit credits as presented.
Second by: R. Roybal
Vote: Unanimous in favor, Motion carries.

III. LPC consensus
Discussion for action on extension of designation applications for the Hornbein & White buildings.

Motion by: S. Leonard, the motion is to approve an extension of matter relating to the Hornbein and White buildings at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Campus until April 20, 2009.

Second by: J. Bershof
Vote: Unanimous in favor, Motion carries.

IV. Design Review
1. **Project #409-08 1656 Vine St.**

Staff Presentation

S. Oliver – This is a request for demolition of a contributing garage, and replacement with a new three car garage. The staff’s position is that we deny this as the existing garage appears large enough to be useable and the feeling is that it could be added on to. If the commission chooses to vote for the denial then I would put conditions on the proposed structure that it be fully bricked on the alley side, and that it be six-light fixed windows as what is shown in the photographs.

Applicants Presentation

Robert Erickson, contractor for Best Built Garages – This is an 18’ by 18’ garage which the owner considers adequate, but the depth is not good enough. We would like to build it to be 24’ deep by 36’ wide, making it a three car garage. So actually I’d be adding 18’ feet to the south side of the garage and 6’ to the back. The way the garage sits is that it is an old double brick foundation there is deterioration of the mortar from all the snow and weather. We are going to keep the style, the gable ends, the same matching scallops as the house does, and the same barn style door slider that matches the house. On the south side would be an extra man door out to their patio with the grape vines which we are not going to destroy.

Board Discussion

- Discussion regarding the barn style doors, which will be replicated as the old ones are damaged.
- Discussion about retaining the brick if 2 to 3 of the walls were taken down. Commission was assured that the brick would be used on the face for full or a 4’ face.

Motion by: J. Bershof, Project 409-08, 1656 Vine St., I move that we allow for the demolition of the contributing garage to be replaced by the new three car garage with the stipulation that the side facing the alley shall be completely brick except for the doors and that the brick will be the re-used brick from the demolished garage on the side and that the drawings be brought back to staff for approval.

Second by: C. Meza

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

2. Project #418-08 2529 W. 37th Ave.

Staff presentation

G. Savage – This house was built in 1928 and has been determined to be a contributing structure. The proposed addition is a 2 phased project. Phase 1 consists of a dormer on the west side of the house above the dining room bay to add a upstairs bathroom. Phase 2 consists of removing the existing back porch and extending the house to provide additional space for a new kitchen, bedroom and bath.

We recommend approval for Phase 1. After some discussion we have come up with the recommendation that on Phase 2 we ask for approval with the condition that the round wood columns on the back of the structure be made more square brick columns.

Applicants Presentation

Sara Knight, property owner

Chris Chidley, Fury Design – I’ll make a few points of what I think we have addressed. The addition is secondary and diminutive so that the existing scale of the house as to what the guidelines require. In addition we believe the architectural design of the approach for the columns are fine. The stone and brick base unite the existing masonry house with half height wooden columns. We are making a more transparent look and different from the original house. This is a large lot, 6,525sf; the addition is behind the back of the house and we believe it to be discrete. My point is simply this, the Landmark guideline’s, you are not supposed to replicate the look of the existing house. There is not enough brick for full columns. The intention is not to duplicate the house.

Board Discussion

The use of wood distinguishes the rear from the front which comes with agreement from several board members.

Motion by: B. Gibson, Project #418-08, 2529 W. 37th Ave., we move that we approve the project and addition as presented by the applicant, with either round or square columns on the porch backside with the discretion of the owner and with details to return to staff.

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

3. **Periods of Significance**

Staff Presentation

S. Jameson – Today I will present 5 more districts for the Periods of Significance.

Presently only 25 of the 49 Historic Districts in Denver have official periods of significance. It wasn't until 2000, with Alamo Placita Historic District #36 that periods of significance began to be routinely included in the designating ordinance.

(6.1) **Period of significance** shall mean the time period during which a structure or district gained its architectural, historical or geographical importance. A district's period of significance may cover a longer period of time than a structure's, in order to encompass the period during which the district developed.

It is important to establish a period of significance for all historic districts that are under the design review purview of the Landmark Preservation Commission (LPC). This period of significance identifies the time frame for which the district was established and aids in establishing a more predictable and comprehensive design review process for the applicant and for the LPC.

The following five districts are being proposed as below:

	<u>Historic District:</u>	<u>Period of Significance (prior to and including):</u>
D-4	Clements Historic District	1910
D-8	Morgan's Subdivision Historic District	1942
D-10	West 28 th Avenue Historic District	1900
D-19	Quality Hill Historic District	1932
D-22	Wyman Historic District	1938

Board Discussion

- Question to determine flexibility established that a 3 year span was used for each district.
- The fact that a public hearing will be held for February 17, 2009 for these districts.
- S. Leonard expressed concern regarding the Wyman and Morgan's districts dates that may not be included, but rather move the date to possibly 1954, and thinks there should be discussion of this. There are apartment buildings which should be preserved because they would not be individually designated. These buildings were not included in the original application. It is suggested that the owners be informed so that they could object if they didn't want to be included. The building at 1517 Vine is a super building for those who like this style.
- J. Bershof said that he believes that these buildings should be protected. If 1932 was a cutoff, it seems like there was possibly a deliberate intent not to include these, and maybe we would be over-stepping the intent of the district even though he thinks these buildings should be protected.
- Question asked if the inventory was included in the original application for Wyman, and the reply was yes. An extension of the period of significance would include non-contributing structures that were not included in the original application and possibly opening up something that maybe was not intended to be included in the original application.
- S. Jameson called the applicant to discuss moving the Period of Significance into the 30's, and he was absolutely agreeable to that.
- B. Gibson recommended that S. Leonard continue with his study of the districts.
- It was expressed that some commission members are not ready to take action.

K. Buckey – Because it is a new ordinance, new dates can be added. Legally you do not have to send notification.

S. Jameson – The application for Quality Hill reviewed the style, and the Period of Significance stopped after that style ended.

Discussion ended pending further study of the districts and continuation in a future meeting.

V. Committee Reports
Report from Civic Center subcommittee

C. Meza – After the January 6 meeting it was clear that we needed to have a culmination of the ideas of what we wanted to see in the guidelines. we set a date to meet on January 12, with Tina Bishop and Kerry Buckey. We decided what our goal was on that evening and prior to that I had emailed to all of the parties involved to submit their thoughts and also including staff. I put those together and on January 12, we hashed those out and decided what we wanted further action on and submitted them to all of the commissioners for feedback at the January 18 meeting for the final touch for what we wanted to see added to the guidelines and what would be acceptable. That is what you see before you. I broke them out as to what items were clarified and agreed to; items that were agreed upon by the committee and Tina Bishop. , and we don't know what Parks and Rec's would agree to at this time.

Board Discussion

- Questions arose regarding the size of the park kiosks, some with disagreement. A comment was made that the Skyline Park has 800 sf kiosks.
- Chris Meza stated that Kerry Buckey agreed that the subcommittee recommendations should just be passed on.
- K. Buckey said that the goal should be to complete the Design Guidelines and that Parks will look at the guidelines and reverse or not and send them back to the LPC for approval.
- C. Meza said that T. Bishop will make the changes before February 3, 2009.
- It was stated that Chris did a great job and that it was a productive set of meetings by the subcommittee.

VI. LPC Representation - Meetings/Discussions
Denver Union Station Design Guidelines

Frank Cannon, USNC – A Power Point show was followed with a discussion to have these guidelines discussed with a joint meeting of the Planning Board and the LPC regarding the Union Station Guidelines.

Discussion resulted in setting this meeting for Tuesday, April 7, 2009 and scheduled for 3:00 p.m. during a regular LPC meeting.

Meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by,

Judith Blake