



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, February 5, 2007 at 1:00 p.m.
MEETING LOCATION – 201 W. COLFAX, RM. 4.F.6

Members Present: Dennis Humphries, Barbara Gibson, James Bershof, Alice Jennison, Ronald Roybal, Christopher Meza, Stephen Leonard, and Edward Shalkey
Members Absent: Chairwoman Carla McConnell
Staff Present: Everett Shigeta, Christie Murata, Kerry Buckey, (City Attorney,) and Judy Blake

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

- I. Review And Approval of Minutes
Motion by: C. Meza, motion to approve minutes of January 19, 2008 meeting
Second by: S. Leonard
Vote: Unanimous, motion carries

- II. A. Applications for State Income Tax Credit
Reports & Recommendations by Preservation Staff

Motion by: S. Leonard, Move to approve the preliminary and final tax credit applications.
Second by: R. Roybal
Vote: Unanimous in favor, Motion carries.

- III. Public Hearing
 - 1. **Project 372-07 321 Emerson St.**
Applicant – Scott Parker, NEST Architectural Design, Inc.
Property Owner – Sean & Monica Doyle

Staff Presentation
C. Murata – This is a very successful submittal with 3 dimensional drawings. It helped to scale down and kept the footprint very similar. The west façade presents problems like overtaking the little porch. The 2 balconies in front are a little excessive but help to tie it together.

D. Humphries – Are the windows not being replaced?

C. Murata – No, they are not replacing windows.

R. Roybal – The height of that chimney was based on the 1 story structure, and now we have a very tall structural look and the chimney is not in proportion at all, did you look at that Chris?

C. Murata – I did some and it could be just the angle of the drawings.

Owner’s Presentation
Sean Doyle – 321 Emerson St – We desire to stay in this house, love the house, and are proud to be a part of the community. I would love to sit on the front balcony and look out over the playground and watch my kids play.

Applicant's Presentation

Scott Parker, NEST Architectural Design, Inc. – We are trying to fulfill the clients wishes, and at the same time the LPC. We want to add a larger kitchen, create an adjacent family room, add a mud room, and a small study. We wish to move the 2 bedrooms upstairs and add a 3rd along with 3 bathrooms. We have tried to respect the front of the house, and keep the plan compact and in scale with the neighborhood. On the outside, we have tried to pull the sides of the house in 1' from the 1st floor. On the north elevation, we have made an arch that terminates into the back of the porch. For the rear elevation we did recess the central portion at the back and created a balcony. The new corner wraps back under the porch. The new roof is simple; it is a hip roof and it is keeping the same characteristics. We have a new gable on the 2nd floor at the bedroom and are using a very basic fascia detail.

Board questions and discussion

J. Bershof – In print L 21, is the wall masonry and it looks like the windowsills are rowlock?

S. Parker – The wall would be wood frame with stucco, to bring some or the original look to the 2nd floor.

B. Gibson – I would like to understand the height of the chimney, and is it a working chimney?

S. Parker – Yes, it is a working chimney, and it would be as minimal as we can make it.

B. Gibson – On the back height, had you thought about not using brick and cutting back on that visual mass?

S. Parker – That was discussed, but the clients really prefer and like it that way.

R. Roybal – On print GL.17 there is a break line between the existing brick and the new brick; what happens at that point and is it your intention to match the brick?

S. Parker – It is a 4" stepback and about 12' at that point. And yes, we intend to match the brick and materials of the original, for more representation of the original house.

D. Humphries – I wonder about the railings and details on the 2nd floor, and are roof tiles to be used?

S. Parker – We want to represent the original railings with a very simple wrought iron. The roof Tiles will be matched as close as possible.

D. Humphries – There is also a question about the rafter tails, as on the do show on the drawings. Would the gutters go there?

S. Parker – The rafter tails are pretty straight up, we would leave those simply as they are. The gutter didn't get put in on that drawing.

D. Humphries – Is the south elevation of the garage consistent with the north?

S. Parker – Yes.

R. Roybal – I agree with Chris Murata about the west elevation, it seems like you went around the house and tried to be respective of all the details and elements of the house, and at the back you are not saving much of anything, and you choose to move in the direction of a curvilinear direction, is that a preference of the owner, or is it to show that this is not part of the original house?

S. Parker – The owner wanted to differentiate from the original house.

S. Doyle - We wanted to save as much yard space as possible, and cut off some sq. footage and be less intrusive into the yard.

D. Humphries – What materials will be used on the elevation on the front?

S. Parker – We haven't decided yet, probably will be brick.

*No public comments, no one from the public present.

Board Discussion

R. Roybal – Are we being asked to approve the design?

D. Humphries – Yes, for the amount of demolition involved and required to accommodate the design proposal.

J. Bershof – They pushed the mass back, which seems appropriate. The house next door has a 2nd floor which is a-symmetrical, and it looks okay. I think it is a successful addition and more livable for the owner.

R. Roybal – I understand your direction and I am okay with it.

D. Humphries – I think you have done an excellent job trying to add square footage without impacting the amount of open space. I think your submittal is quite good.

Motion by: S. Leonard, For project 372-07, 321 Emerson St., move is to approve the demolition and approve the design of the new structure as submitted.

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

Motion by: J. Bershof, Project 372-07, the motion is to close this public hearing.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

IV. Design Review

1. **Project 451-07 576 Circle Dr.**

Applicant – Patrick Cashen, Architect

Property Owner - Keith & Rebecca McCoy

Staff Presentation

C. Murata – This is the Jacque Benedict house, and in general it is very successful. It is keeping the same footprint and turning the garage back into a garage. The only question I have is on the west façade. What is the logic, what is happening, and how will the roof's come together. We need to discuss the 8' fence, otherwise it is a very successful project.

Applicant and Owner's Presentation

Rebecca McCoy – We are moving from Kansas to Denver, and we are very excited to make this house more functional.

Patrick Cashen (for Scott Parker) – We have tried to tread very lightly with this house. The intent was to try to simplify and a lot of that has to do with the windows and the doors. Every window seems to have some curvature. The arch top doors and radius either have wood or stone lentils, primarily stone on the front and wood on the back. We have taken an effort to eliminate those lentils altogether. The clay tile roof is pretty fragile, but I think we can match them. There could be some simplification on the roof line and we have tried to mitigate the irregularity.

Board Questions

J. Bershof – Are the muntins being put back?

P. Cashen – We may remove them, we are not sure yet.

D. Humphries – There were a few questions in the staff report about other details, and my question is, are they forthcoming? Also there was a question about the bracket, and other details.

P. Cashen – If you look at P.19, the bracket has curves, and we would probably just have one. The soffit would be “B” joint paneling. With the 8’ fence along 6th Avenue, we are trying to provide noise reduction and provide privacy.

Board Discussion

B. Gibson – I like that they are taking it back to the original design.

R. Roybal – I would like to commend you, wonderful job.

Motion by: B. Gibson, for Project 451-07, 576 Circle, we move to approve this project as submitted, with details as requested to come back to staff.

Second by: C. Meza

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

2. **Project 450-07 510 High St.**
 Applicant - Patrick Cashen, Architect
 Property Owner - William Clements

Staff Report

C. Murata – This is a request for demolition, and it is non-contributing. The massing is in keeping with the area. I think the roofline could be simplified. The scale is okay with the area. The north elevation is massive and needs break in it. There needs to be more detail in the front porch, and I am not sure about the porcelain tile base.

Applicant’s Presentation

P. Cashen – This client has a prior commitment at the courthouse. There are a lot of houses with hip and gable roofs in this area, and there are 2 with wainscoting. The porch is simple and trying to take a clue from 2 other houses for color on the base and the porcelain tile used is like a glazed brick. The tile color is brown and the brick is wheat color. The tile is 39” wide and 13” high. All of these houses are set up from the sidewalk.

Questions/Discussion:

D. Humphries – In terms of the staff report you answered the questions about the porcelain tile and also the issue about the contemporary front porch.

R. Roybal – Why did you choose not to deal with any kind of breaking up of the glass, was it to simplify?

P. Cashen – I think that is exactly it, to simplify.

Board Discussion

D. Humphries – The gable portion looks very horizontal and flat and too suburban, and yet in plan it looks very traditional and appropriate. I’ll throw that out there for discussion.

J. Bershof – I think consistency for the block would have been strengthening with a hip roof. We should also talk about wainscoting.

C. Meza – I like the wainscoting, and I am not sure about the gable, it is not matching some of the other gables in the area.

D. Humphries – It seems like the gables either are a steeper roof pitch or they have a vertical expression on them and I think it is the lap siding which reinforces the width of them that makes the roof look flatter, and I think possibly putting a hip there would be probably supportive.

R. Roybal – It seems like you could carry this further, and there are some things that you could do. The placement of the windows doesn’t seem to carry with the area. There is nothing very bold about the elevation’s based on the plan.

J. Bershof – The upper gable makes it look more horizontal and maybe on the upper level maybe the hip roof would be a better way to go. On the porch I don't feel as strongly, but I think that it doesn't feel quite as sheltering in a way that I'd think that you'd expect the porch to feel. I understand Pat's idea to differentiate. I think that the open porch element is just going to break too much with sense of the street.

P. Cashen – I can see your point. In filling in the gable on the front porch, I think it works there, but once again I think we have a gable wall with some materials that is the only place that it occurs.

D. Humphries – You could take clues from other porches in the area that are open and have vertical support. I'm hearing that the roof should be re-evaluated in terms of the gables versus the north elevation. It sounds like the porcelain tile for the wainscot is okay.

J. Bershof – We could talk about the windows. This is a house of today. It is a better idea to go with some divided lites.

R. Roybal – This is a traditional house and the windows don't seem to work for me. It looks like you are trying to take some elements but you are not there yet.

D. Humphries – I tend to agree that the windows, roof configuration, the porch and the north elevation are issues of concern along with some requested details, windows and soffit details.

C. Murata – I am concerned with the porcelain tiles, possibly falling off with any shift or bad weather.

P. Cashen – Usually when the house is built it settles right away when the weight is first applied. This product has actually been used in commercial buildings. I can explore it with the manufacture.

Motion by: R. Roybal, Project 450-07, 510 High St., we move to deny the design at this point and have the applicant resubmit based on:

1. solid to void ratio of the windows
2. a study of the north elevation in terms of articulation
3. looking at simplification of the roof lines and looking possibly different applications of gabled roofs and the hip roof
4. study the porch to make it more considerate to others in the neighborhood

citing guidelines C.5 for windows, C.3.b for the front porch, C.4.a for the roof

Second by: S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries

3. Project 435-07, 119 Park Avenue DLM #276

E. Shalkey recuses from this project.

Staff Report

C. Murata – There is very small and subtle impact with this project. There needs to be some clarification of the entry, and I do have some questions about the materials. There is brick on all sides except on one. I feel that it would be more successful if they continued the brick all around. The fenestration is very good and there are a lot of things that are very successful.

Applicants Presentation

Ryan Tobin – Denver Housing

Chris Carvell, Architect – 1037 Cherokee St. – This is a final completion element for Hope 6. This is meant to be an ADA stair, lobby, and tower element. We would have an outdoor performance area. All the parking area that used to be out front is now contained in the parking garage in the back. The historic entrance is not being touched and this new element is positioned at the back of the building.

R. Tobin – The new addition will incorporate a new training area in the basement.

C. Carvell – The break in glass does not compete with the masonry and detail of the church.

R. Roybal – Which is the surface that does not have any brick? Is that the connection to the potential expansion?

C. Carvell – Yes, on one side we have the ability to take out some glass and come through and on the other side we have the ability to take out part of that wall and right now we are just guessing at what the future holds.

Board Discussion

R. Roybal – I like the glass separating from the historic structure from the new structure, and obviously it is very contemporary. The windows setting and the rhythm of the existing elevation, this is probably the best approach to separate and provide accessibility.

B. Gibson – I agree with Ron, it stands on its own and yet is subordinate to the historic structure.

J. Bershof – I agree, it seems appropriate to me. In the staff comments there was a request for some kind of detail in the sloped glass in the north east entry. Perhaps that is something that we might want to have submitted to staff if we go forward with this.

Motion by: R. Roybal, for Project 435-07, 119 Park Ave., we approve the design as submitted based on Guidelines Section 2. 9 & 10.

Second by: C. Meza

Vote We received this application after the property had been posted and noticed.

4. Project 452-07, 1300 E. 7th Avenue

Continued from December 18, 2007

Staff Report

C. Murata – We have options A and B roof forms of the garage expansion. I felt that option B with the continuation of the existing clad roof most clearly responded to for the motion comments of the LPC meeting of December 18, 2007. Also, Keith did improve the trellis as we had discussed.

Questions

D. Humphries – The outline of the bulk plane cuts through the garage, is this something to be discussed?

K. Krebs, AIA – Yes, the flat roof is pre-existing and a new violation

Applicants Presentation

K. Krebs, AIA –

Ann Quallick – Keith Krebs, AIA

K. Krebs – We addressed the window on the existing house and added the window instead of doing a one for one on the façade. The 2nd issue was the profile of the roofline on the garage. The question was about the pitched versus a flat roof. I think a pitched roof is more in keeping with the house. The bulk plane is an issue and the owner is not willing to go to that effort. Today we are asking for approval of the flat roof today.

Board Discussion

D. Humphries – Based on the staff report we will need some detail on the trellis.

K. Krebs – The previous drawing submittal did have call outs for all of those and how we are going to do that.

J. Bershof – Is construction of the addition double masonry?

K. Krebs – We are not sure yet, probably will frame with exterior masonry.

J. Bershof – Are the French doors a clad wood?

Bob Nettleton – Property owner – Yes, a painted wood.

D. Humphries – I think option B is the right approach.

R. Roybal – The last time we talked about this, the existing garage was not a part of the original and I think this is the appropriate way to go.

J. Bershof – I agree with Dennis, I also think solution B looks good

Motion by: E. Shalkey, for Project 452-07, 1300 E. 7th Avenue, that we move to approve this project as submitted, with option “B” as the preferred garage roof, based on the staff report.

Second by: S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

C. Murata – I agree with everything but I think a comment commending him on the massing itself as It is a good job.

J. Bershof – The overall massing was very comfortable.

R. Roybal – I think the design and plan were laid out was good, and I think you can get there very quickly.

V. Chair Time

1. Window Committee

J. Bershof – We are having our first meeting a week from today at 4:00. We will have Carla McConnell, Chris Murata, Dennis Humphries, people from Parks and Recreation, someone from the National Trust and maybe Larry Nelson. I have to put together an Agenda, and we need to have assignments.

2. Dan Corson Seminar

This seminar will be in Ft. Collins on May 2, between the hours of 10 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. Chris Meza will represent the LPC.

3. LPC Retreat

The retreat will be on April 22, 2008, and Peter Park will be present.

VI. Other Business

1. Civic Center Park, Design Guidelines

Helen Kuykendall – Denver parks and Recreation

Tina Bishop – Sr. City Planner, CPD

D. Humphries – We will allow C. Murata and E. Shigeta talk about the goals and objectives. This is not a public hearing, but we will allow public comment if there is any. Today is for informational purposes.

H. Kuykendall – We are embarking on a set of Design Guidelines for Civic Center Park. We completed the Master Plan in 2005, and we had always intended to follow up with the Master Plan. Now we have \$9.5 million dollars to improve Civic Center. That money is intended to restore the Greek theater, the Broadway Grove, and other elements for restoration, to also include the walks, and the area in the center of the park and the tree area.

Before we get into any projects, we want to look at design guidelines. We always would have liked to have Design Guidelines, it will be good to have a set of guidelines as a tool. We need to focus on the park itself. We want to tell you what we hope to do and ask for Landmarks input.

T. Bishop – I have a handout to pass out. As Helen has said the Design Guidelines are meant to give further direction and build upon the Master Plan. There are three things to review.

- 1) Principals
 - Conserving principals
 - Park Master plan
 - View plane
 - District plan

- 2) Guidelines
 - Character
 - Park Zones
 - Standard versus performances
- 3) Experience
 - Civic Park

For the park plan, we need new features to activate not only daily but year round.
 Conservancy - We hope some of the guidelines will extend out to the state capital building and beyond.

Content and connectivity – The City has asked us to look at the contributing features, to look at guidelines for vegetation and every proposal that comes forward will have these guidelines to use.

Public Comments

Brad Camerian, Founder of Coalition to Save Civic Park, served on the Board of Directors of Capital Hill Neighborhood. – I think it is obvious that a lot of members in the public are interested in their input regarding Civic Park at critical stages before decisions are made. There is a great interest in what will be done with the Carnegie Library building. We would like to talk about that.

Carolyn Etter, UPCC – I am pleased that we are back to where we were 2 years ago. This community has been taken through an unbelievable period of options, and decisions over the last 2 years. We went through the Livinski plan and are glad to get back to the plans to take care of these guidelines.

Bridgett Fisher, Head of Board for park People – I am pleased to report that there is a proposal to have Civic Center Park put up for National Landmarking.

H. Kuykendall – Working with the civic Park design committee, we have had some preliminary discussion and would like to formalize this committee and talk to neighborhood organizations. I am hoping that 1 or 2 member from the LPC would join this committee.

*Edward Shalkey, Ronald Roybal and Alice Jennison volunteered.

Board Questions

D. Humphries – How might this go forward and when would you come back to the Commission?

S. Leonard – I think Carolyn's comments were very appropriate. I think without the public's help, we would have a large building in the park. Hopefully we can get a committee who can do great things.

J. Bershof – I agree with Carolyn's comments and now I can look forward. Steve, I think your integrity helped my guidance in this.

B. Gibson – I appreciate the Parks position in this and we appreciate your support.

E. Shalkey – In the last 2 meetings, I learned that the largest problem in the park is access and the street system is like a go around track. I have had occasion while traveling to go to Bryant Park in New York. Every time I went to that park, which was maybe 6 times, there was an activity there.

R. Roybal – All these proposals have stirred peoples feelings and a realization of a park that we didn't want to loose. It has created awareness about the need for activation.

S. Leonard – When there is non-interference good things can be done.

D. Humphries – When this is just an agenda item, it is exciting to see so many people here who are interested in having guidelines for Civic Center Park. This is tremendously important.

K. Buckey – We have 3 people, and with 3 we have top post the meetings as public meetings. If there are 2 LPC members it must be posted, a 10 days notice, and we could have 2 plus 1 alternate.

H. Kuykendall – We would like to have the guidelines approved by the LPC.

*It was determined that E. Shalkey and S. Leonard would be the representing members.

Motion by: B. Gibson, the motion is that R. Roybal and E. Shalkey serve as advisory members.

Second by: C. Meza

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

VII Designation Committee

E. Shalkey, J. Bershof, and S. Leonard

I. (University Manor) 2142 S. University Blvd

Staff Report

A. Gilbertson - There are no formal presentations as it is not a public hearing at this point. We received this application after the property had been posted and noticed. The staff finds this application to be complete and meets criteria required for designation in all three categories, that being history, architecture and geography. The period of significance being 1930 to 1931, which is also the period of construction. It is remarkably intact and has not had any additions on to it, so it is a very short period of significance. Under historical importance it did meet criteria 1.a, which is to have direct association with historical development of the city, state or nation and specifically this four family apartment building is representative of what I feel is the intertwined and mutually beneficial development that occurred in the University Park neighborhood in the early twentieth century. It reflects the insurance of a number of factors, those being the growth and development of University of Denver, Iliff School of Theology, and the street car line. It is not often that one sees historical importance having a direct and substantial association with a person or group of persons who had influence on society and in looking at who lived in University Manor; there were a significant number of residents who academically associated with the University of Denver, the Iliff School of Theology and one of those was David Shott Duncan, who had an extensive career both at the Iliff School and at DU. He quickly rose to become Dean of the Graduate School and despite his ill health he accepted the position of Chancellorship position under very financially trying times for the University. With respect to architecture, embodied distinguishing characteristic's of an architectural style and type, and it is a rare example of the art deco style. And as the applicants have indicated it is the only Art Deco family flat identified in this housing sector of Denver and it is remarkably intact with incredible work and Terra Cotta detail. And lastly under geographically importance, it promotes understanding, appreciation of the urban environment by means of distinctive physical characteristics of rarity and it has a prominent geographic location, which is right across the street from the University of Denver and just a half block south of where the number 8 street car used to run along Evans Avenue. In terms of the comments that we received at the end of the 21 day posting, we have received 4 letters in support which you have in your packets, and 1 came in today from Historic Denver. We did receive a letter after the posting period from the owner who indicated that he intends to oppose any application for historic status. Staff recommends that this application be forwarded to the full Landmark Preservation Commission, noting that the application is complete and meets the criteria for documentation.

S. Leonard – Was the owner informed of this meeting today?

C. Etter – Absolutely, he has been kept in the loop. The applicant actually met with the property owner as well and provided him with a copy of the application before we received it here at the City.

J. Bershof – So the application came down because the property owner was requesting demolition?

A. Gilbertson – Yes, for example if we actually signed off on a Certificate of Non-Historic, that would allow the owner to demolish the building at any time over a five year period without any further noticing or process.

S. Leonard – I would assume that this application for Non-Historic if not signed off would stop him for demolishing for a period of time, but if it isn't Landmarked, what happens?

A. Gilbertson – Then he has the right to demolish it.

J. Bershof – Is the brick detailing consistent all the way around?

C. Etter – It wraps around, but more simplified. We all got intrigued about this building. We concluded that there are very few 4 flats in South Denver. We drove through Capital Hill and found only two others. We suspect we may find about 2 dozen in the City. We think that this may be The first Art Deco style building in Denver We have met with the owner who has owned it since 1977.

A. Gilbertson – I have spoken with the owner, and he wanted to know what he could do with it if this building were landmarked. We have discussed his options. He could build in the rear and there are other expansion options that he is aware of.

K. Buckey – How many parking spaces does the property have?

Bill Winn – 2210 S. Saint Paul, University Park – There are about 6-7 which includes the 4 garage spaces.

E. Shalkey – I think the application is complete, but I think this building is a little weak architecturally and I am not sure about the history and geography.

J. Bershof – I think the same thing, but we probably should let the full Commission review this. We should move it along to the LPC.

S. Leonard – I agree, this is the thinnest ice we have been on. If we are weak or lukewarm, what might City Council do? If there are only a few of these buildings left in the City, then the argument becomes stronger.

A. Gilbertson – In Park Hill there was only 1 other building built in 1930.

Motion by: S. Leonard, Project 2142 S. University Blvd, the sub committee finds this application meets the criteria cited in the Staff Report and recommends it to the full LPC.

Second by: E. Shalkey

Vote : Unanimous, motion carries.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Blake