



**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](http://www.denvergov.org/planning)

## LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, February 19, 2008 at 1:00 p.m.

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

**Members Present:** Chairwoman Carla McConnell, Barbara Gibson, Dennis Humphries, James Bershof, Alice Jennison, Stephen Leonard, and Edward Shalkey  
**Absent:** Ronald Roybal and Christopher Meza

**Staff Present:** Judy Blake and Kerry Buckey, (City Attorney), Tyler Gibbs  
**Absent:** Everett Shigeta, Christie Murata and Alice Gilbertson

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

### I. Review And Approval of Minutes

**Motion by:** B. Gibson, move to continue minutes until meeting of March 4, 2008  
**Second by :** E. Shalkey  
**Vote:** Unanimous in favor, Motion carries

### II. Applications for State Income Tax Credit

Reports & Recommendations by Preservation Staff

**Motion by:** S. Leonard, move to approve the tax credits for preliminary approval.  
**Second by:** A. Jennison  
**Vote:** Unanimous in favor, Motion carries

### III. Committee Reports

Window Committee update

J. Bershof – Our first meeting was last Tuesday. We had good attendance and a good meeting. In attendance was Steve Turner from Historic Denver, Chris Jones, Architect, National Park Service, Tyler Gibbs, Chris Murata, Dennis Humphries, Charlie Brown and Carla Madison and myself. We made assignments. Chris Murata will be looking into what other municipalities are doing now with this issue. Dennis Humphries is going to get some information on what window companies are doing as far as profile, and the products they are making that lend themselves well to the possibility of being used in a historic district. Whether they are wood or wood clad windows, obviously we're not talking about vinyl. Seeing what issues there are right now at the Federal level is being looked into by Chris Jones because of the fact that we have the Secretary of Interior Standards. There was some discussion that the Secretary of Interior Standards might relate to what we are doing. Our next meeting will be on the second Tuesday in March.

**IV. Public Hearing**

Epiphany Episcopal Church  
100 Colorado Blvd.

The application was prepared and submitted by Boyd Berryman, a church member, on behalf of the current owner, Epiphany Episcopal Church and is considered complete. The period of significance is 1941-1960.

The application demonstrates that the property meets the criteria required for designation in all 3 categories. It meets criterion 1C regarding history; criterion 2B regarding architecture; and criterion 3A regarding geography.

**Applicants Presentation**

Boyd Berryman – I want to commend the LPC for their time and also Alice Gilbertson for all of her time spent on this application.

The Epiphany Episcopal Church goes back to 1896, and its first service was Christmas Eve of 1941.

Two things we want to do, one is to preserve this building, beyond Landmarking, and have it continue for the purpose it was built for. The second is that the roof is about 10,000 sq. ft., so we also feel that Landmarking will help us maintain funds to keep the church going.

Father Stace Tafoya – A lot of churches in our size range rent out for various needs, and we try to ensure that if we rent it out, that it supports our purpose. Our church is a real resource for the community. We have Dorothy Smith, who is 103 years old, and she is a founding member. A non-denomination group is at the church for 10 weeks, and they are a part of Denver HOPE.

**No questions from the Public**

**Motion by: B. Gibson, for the Public Hearing for Designation of Epiphany Episcopal Church at 100 Colorado Blvd., we move to close this Public Hearing and approve the proposal as submitted to be forwarded to City Council for Approval, citing the Staff Report.**

**Second by: S. Leonard**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries**

**V. Designations**

**1. Preliminary Review  
2142 S. University**

**Applicants Presentation**

Carolyn Etter, 2278 S. Milwaukee, member of University Manor Association. – We have surveyed 403 apartment buildings built between 1925 and 1931. We have met with the owner of this property who is not in agreement but is very fond of the building. He has owned it since 1967. We have kept the owner up to date with everything. We also think University Manor is Denver's first 4 family flat to be designed in the American Art Deco style. It is one of the 3 earliest Art Deco apartment houses in Denver. Each one of the 3 represents a very different interpretation of Art Deco. In reference to the survey report, we had 3 teams of residents working on this. Of the 403 buildings surveyed, 173 have been demolished.

S. Leonard – Why stop the survey at 1931?

C. Etter – 1931 was the first year that this building was entered into the City Directory. You didn't have to pay to have a listing in the City Directory.

Don Etter - We did a preliminary survey and ran it up to 1939. Between 1931 and 1939 in the south sector we found only 2 other 4 family flats and they were not Art Deco.

S. Leonard – I think you have made your case stronger, but is it strong enough.

David Elowe – I currently have the property of 2142 S. University Blvd. under contract to purchase. I oppose this action, as my goal is to re-develop this to the corner. I am no stranger to re-development. Also, I am here on behalf of the current owner. If the units were a bit larger, maybe it wouldn't be such an issue. Economically speaking, I think it is past its prime. There is nothing about the 1<sup>st</sup> floor that lends itself to retail use.

B. Gibson – Are you familiar with the process and our responsibilities today?

D. Elowe – Yes

C. McConnell – We will set a Public Hearing and we have seen many examples of very successful incorporation of historic structures into new development projects.

D. Elowe – I am not sure that this old façade would fit into my plans.

S. Leonard – We make a judgment if it meets certain criteria, and then refer it to a Public Hearing, and to City Council, who has the power to designate the structure.

D. Humphries – Kerry, is there a time line for the owner and buyer to work it out?

K. Buckey – There are 120 days and that would be the last date to have the hearing, and if we don't meet that date, then the whole issue is lost and it could not be designated in time. If not designated in time it would get the Certificate of Non-Historic.

C. McConnell – The staff recommendation is to set the Public Hearing for March 18, 2008.

**Motion by: D. Humphries, for designation preliminary review of 2142 S. University Blvd., we move to set the Public hearing for March 18, 2008, noting that the application of January 25, 2008 is considered complete and meets the criteria for designation.**

**Second by: S. Leonard**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries**

## **2. Rescind Designation**

Central Bank (demolished, empty land) 1100-1108 15<sup>th</sup> St.

### **Staff Presentation**

C. McConnell – The staff recommendation is to approve the rescind designation of the 1100-1108 15<sup>th</sup> St. application, due to the fact that building no longer exists. It was taken down with legal action

### **Applicants Presentation**

Christine Nida – I wrote the application. What do I have to do next to get an appeal?

K. Buckey – This will go forward to City council.

**Motion by: B. Gibson – For 1100-1108 15<sup>th</sup> St., we move to rescind the designation for the Central Bank building, based on the February 2, 2008 staff report, due to the fact that the building no longer exists. The landmark Preservation recommends to City Council that they support this request to rescind.**

**Second by: D. Humphries**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries**

## **VI. Design Review**

### **1. Project 466-07 595 High St.**

*\*Continued from 1-15-08*

#### **Staff Presentation**

C. McConnell – The motion of 1-15-08, requested a restudy of the garage addition and approved the residence structure, requested return to LPC with material samples to be submitted.

#### **Applicants Presentation**

Robert Hickman , 1652 Humboldt St., - Part of the review by C. Murata, requested a roof change. Chris also indicated that she wanted submittal of detail, which I submitted last time. We talked the wall connecting in the garage, the balcony, the chimney. We talked about the pro's and con's of the Mansard roofs. To start with, I like how the garage connects to the roof and how there is some brick to look at.

I have a preferred solution and one that came in as a close 2<sup>nd</sup>, a more simplified form. We tried to put a nicely done tidy form garage next to the house. I brought straight roof in the yard and 6<sup>th</sup> Ave. side, and projected a slight sloping roof on the alley, to coincide with the existing roof of the alley. I have proposed a new garage roof and parapet with a stone cap. There is about 2' retaining wall between grade in the alley and garage. (passing around 2 models for review)

E. Shalkey – You have eliminated the Mansard roof element. Personally, I like the second solution.

J. Bershof – Is the garage all brick with stone caps on parapets that extend out?

R. Hickman – That is correct. Brick is what I have focused in on. This brick is older and larger than what we commonly use today. This sample is a “sand” brick. I think this brick will blend with the garage. The sill work that is there, I think is a flagstone material.

C. McConnell – They are seeking approval of the preferred garage and brick.

R. Hickman – My client requests that I angle the chimney as seen on the sheet 5 north elevation.

C. McConnell – I would lean towards the chimney as you are showing, and also along with the preferred garage.

**Motion by: E. Shalkey, for Project 466-07, 595 High st., we move to approve the preferred garage as submitted and the chimney profile as submitted with outstanding details to return to staff.**

**Second by: B. Gibson**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries**

2. **Project 40-08 225 Gaylord St.**

**Staff Presentation**

C. McConnell – The issue is Determination of contributing vs. non-contributing status. The design of the house at 225 Gaylord Street clearly represents a more contemporary architectural approach, representing the later years included in the period of significance cited for the Country Club Historic District in its designating ordinance. As such, this residence is an important example of the overall development of Country Club and should continue to be recognized as a contributing structure.

This does not preclude certain sympathetic changes as the house is updated to meet the needs of today. Any submitted architectural proposals for the purpose of updating the house would be reviewed by the Landmark Preservation Commission in relationship with The Design Guidelines for Landmark Structures and Districts, in particular with consideration of the guidelines included below.

**Applicants Presentation**

Janet Kritzer, Fuller Properties

John DuPriest, Personal Representative of Barbara Cunningham, and my Aunt

J. Kritzer – It has been made quite clear that this will be considered Contributing and we need clarity with what the owners could do with the property, and the scope of changes that might be allowed. The brick is several colors, they want to know if they can change the windows and the doors, and add an addition if wanted?

C. McConnell – Do you have a copy of the Landmark guidelines for the Country Club neighborhood? We work from what the characterizes are from an individual structure, we look around the neighborhood, and you don't want to create something that is radically different.

J. Kritzer – Yes

S. Leonard – We can't sign a blank check, and there any kind of variations that could come in. For example vinyl windows are not acceptable, if windows are redeemable, the likelihood is that we would want them to be redeemed, rather than torn out and replaced.

J. Dupriest – I am impressed with how sympathetic your commission is. I love the house and have been in it often over the past 30 years.

B. Gibson – There are siding and brick options available. Our goal is for older buildings to be used, not just sit there.

S. Leonard – Things that are added in the back are much more likely approved.

**Motion by: D. Humphries, for Project 40-08, 225 Gaylord St., the motion is that this structure be a contributing structure.**

**Second by: E. Shalkey**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries**

**3. Project 2-08 319 Lafayette St.**

**Staff Presentation**

C. McConnell – I spoke with Chris Murata who felt that this and she thought that the proposal was acceptable.

**Applicants Presentation**

Jim Mitchell, Architect for Mariner and Megan Kemper – This project is two fold. One in the front yard and one in the back. The homeowners want to provide some type of weather protection at the front door to be a front porch. We are talking about preserving every aspect of that pediment structure. The current structure has flat columns on either side of the front door. Part of the proposal if for the roof structure itself is basically following the existing slope from the front door up the roof. The columns out front would be free standing and could be 8"x8" square or 8"x8" in diameter round in a smooth format. The finishes would be painted white. We would put on a copper clad roof to make known the upper level Georgian design. The proposal is to shift one upper window over about 8" to make it symmetrical in center line with the front door. The homeowner would like the spires, detailed wrought iron railing out front to be kept, but to detail with step up in the detailing and introduce a horizontal about 4" down. Chris said she would work with me on the final detailing. The back upper 2 bedrooms have an open area between them and they want to close it in. They also want to dismantle the Bay window and put it out front. The north bedroom wings roofline is actually lower than the south roof wing so we would actually carry the north roofline across to even it up. The Bay window currently has a shed roof on it, it doesn't play up the importance of the window, so we propose to take the same shape of the other bay window roof from the south side of the house.

C. McConnell – Will the existing front door surround remain?

J. Mitchell – Yes, it will remain in-tact.

\*Committee agrees to leave the upper front window as it is.

A.Jennison – I like the old style railing.

J. Mitchell – Are you more interested in more detail in the wrought iron, rather than the circular?

D. Humphries – I agree with Alice that the railing should be re-studied.

**Motion by: D. Humphries, for Project 2-08, 319 Lafayette St., we move to approve the new covered porch at the entry with the modification of square columns, approve the second floor addition at the rear, and that we not approve the shift of the window above the entry, and we ask for a restudy of the proposed railing addition and that it be re-submitted to staff with final details to return to staff.**

**Second by: E. Shalkey**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries**

**VII. Other Business**

**I. Retreat agenda**

C. McConnell – Everett had asked for ideas on the retreat and I guess we are doing it jointly with the LoDo board. I like that idea. I like the ideas that you and Chris had about showing some examples about Good and bad projects.

D. Humphries – We need more discussion on item 2, NAPC Forum in July.

K. Buckey – For the BOA responsibility shift to LPC. The boards position in part is that were being unfair to everybody else, because LPC people are get a break. Let's face, it people in a historic don't get a break. They have to get their project reviewed before they can proceed. The meeting of the 28<sup>th</sup> at 3:30 needs LPC representation. This is the 1<sup>st</sup> of 4 meetings.

C. McConnell – There will be an election of a new chair and vice chair person in April.

Meeting adjourned

Respectfully submitted:  
Judy Blake