



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, March 18, 2008 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, Ronald Roybal, Stephen Leonard, and Edward Shalkey

Members Absent: Christopher Meza

Staff Present: Christie Murata, Alice Gilbertson, Kerry Buckey, (City Attorney,) Greg Savage, Steve Oliver, Fran Mishler, Tyler Gibbs, and 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 March 4, 2008 minutes, as amended.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries

II. Public Hearings

2142 S. University, University Manor

Staff Presentation

A.Gilbertson - The applicant, the current property owner, and the prospective property owner are working together to re-craft an agreement regarding re-development of that entire site, including that structure that is up for designation. This morning I received from those parties the agreement which they are putting together that they are trying to come with some type of win/win solution, and as a result of this, they would like to request a 31 day time extension of the public hearing. This would take us to and including May 19, 2008, based on Chapter 30 of the Landmark Preservation. Therefore, they would like the public hearing opened and not closed but continued until May 19, 2008.

Motion by: B. Gibson, Regarding the Public Hearing for the property of 2142 S. University Blvd, University Manor, I move that we grant the extension for 31 days per Staff recommendation knowing that it will be re-posted and be scheduled for April 15, 2008.

Second by: S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries

III. Applications for State Income Tax Credit

Reports & Recommendations by Preservation Staff

Motion by: D. Humphries, we move to approve the single tax application for final approval.

Second by: S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries

IV. Design Review

1. **Project 458-07 2555 Walnut St**

Applicant – Paul Campbell, Architects Alliance LLC

Staff Presentation:

C. Murata – This project went through most issues well and everything was in compliance, therefore it was administratively approved. I felt that they did a great job respecting the building. Now they request to replace all of the windows and in that succession I think we should discuss some changes in the parking lot. Originally there was curb cut off of the street and by eliminating the curb cut at the Walnut St. sidewalk this would be more compatible with the pedestrian nature of the district. These are metal windows and the proposal is something similar to what is there now.

Applicant's Presentation:

Paul Campbell, Architects Alliance LLC – The refurbishing of the windows seemed like an acceptable way to go. The existing windows perform at about 1/3 of an insulated new window. Our issue is the performance of the windows. To make the building compliant, a storm window behind the window, is what we're looking at. I have a mock up to demonstrate that we would replace with a fixed glass with the center being pivoted and a thicker proportion for the middle operable portion. This is an "Eagle" window. Today we are looking for some encouragement and information of what would be acceptable. It would be individual panes of glass, with a darker green paint.

Questions from the Board

J. Bershof – Are you proposing aluminum, broken lite, double glazed, insulated glass? If dark green, is that painted? Did you explore the idea of replacing with steel windows with double pane? This would be a closer application.

P. Campbell – Yes, to the windows, and no, we haven't explored steel windows with double panes. We think we have a pretty "green" solution.

D. Humphries- Who did the window survey?

P. Campbell – We did, it was our first time doing this. We felt that the survey questions were pretty straight forward, and we know these windows best. We had 3 different vendors out to look at them.

D. Humphries – The window profile is different than what I am seeing.

P. Campbell – The depth is nearly the same, and the width is within ¼", which is pretty close.

R. Roybal – You mentioned that most of the windows are in an advanced, deteriorated state. What do you consider advanced, deteriorated?

P. Campbell – This building was originally a warehouse and is now being used as an artist studio. Some of the windows were cut to accommodate window AC units, a number of heaters were put in and along with the use of space heaters and things that generate a lot of moisture, over the years these windows have experienced a lot of condensation., so we are seeing a lot of rust.

C. McConnell – When we have approved replacement of original windows, we have requested that original function would be maintained with the replacement, as well as the original characteristic. If we allow replacement we should have the original function.

B. Gibson – I would agree with you in visual for character, even if technically they couldn't open.

D. Humphries – I am not in favor of your proposal. I think it is a dramatic departure from the building and that it is going to change the character dramatically. I would suggest that you speak to some one who has done windows in historic buildings. As Jim Bershof suggested, there are a number of companies that do steel replacements and can preserve the original character. I am not in favor of this as its being presented and I would vote against this.

S. Leonard – I might be persuaded with a closer replacement.

R. Roybal – I'm thinking the same, with no photos, it is difficult, and I want to see the integrity, head and sill, profile and the operation to mimic.

Motion by: D. Humphries – For project 458-07, 2555 Walnut St., we move to not approve replacement of the windows as proposed and ask for further evaluation of the existing windows to verify their condition, citing Guidelines 5 & 6.

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries

C. Murata – Regarding the curb issue, the alley is the way it should go.

P. Campbell – We have already received our encumbrance for the ROW. The curb cut was an existing condition, and we didn't think this would be an issue.

C. McConnell – There is no need for a curb cut motion.

2. Project 11-08 1435 Bannock St.

Applicants Presentation

Ron Scott, Rooftec Consultants – We were engaged to perform a simple and thorough historic restoration of the roof on the Denver City and County building. We will be working on a sloped perimeter. The original plans were found in the basement of the building, and we also found photographs in the historic section of the library. They showed pan and barrel tile, showing original wood battens. What we see now was replaced in the 1960's. We propose to continue with metal roofing and some changes would be made and some big items will be altered. The slope and drainage system would not be altered. Seam spacing on the metal roof would also not be altered. The metal roof is 23 gauge rolled aluminum panel. The goal is to take the metal layer off and place plywood down. It would have a concealed clip and rolled seam. The Galvalume is a fairly close match to what is there now, and we were told that we were good to go with the Galvalume. The current metal roof is original and badly hail damaged. There is a desire to bring color into the roof; a terra cotta color is what we are looking at. I would pick the Colonial Red.

S. Leonard – Initially the color was to be similar to the current color.

C. McConnell – Steve, would you urge that they change the color?

S. Leonard – Well, it seems to me it would change the look of the building significantly if the color is changed.

D. Humphries – What was the original color?

R. Scott – There was some copper on the flat and on the top it appears to be a clay tile.

R. Roybal – Drawings R.3 and R.4, the metal roof shows a metal clip on the top and that is not a metal clip is it?

R. Scott – No, that is not and we don't want a fastener showing.

B. Gibson – I see color more quickly.

S. Leonard – The color was probably not ever that bold.

R. Scott – You need to know for one year, it will be shiny.

D. Humphries – This is a huge issue.

S. Leonard – This had to have been landmarked with the gray color roof. I think if it changes color dramatically, then the City will get letters.

Motion by: D. Humphries – for Project 11-08, 1435 Bannock St., I move that we recommend the color of the metal roof be Galvalume.

Second by: R. Roybal

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries

3. Project 63-08 2711-2715 W/ 37th, Zone Lot Amendment

Staff Report

C. Murata - The issue here is to split the lot. Ed Shalkey, as well as myself, have gone out to view this lot and we think it is appropriate. Maybe they should not keep the later, dated porch which I believe is a more recent addition, and anything constructed on the new lot will come before the commission.

Applicants Presentation

Sandy Thompson, Architect for the property owner. I am here with Cory Jadley, Nostalgic Homes, representing Joy Bowers. This has been a fun project. In order to get permits, we need a variance and have the lot legally split. We want to address the green house. Albert Fisher who fabricated the Royal Gorge bridge, and also this green house, which during World War II was a Victory Garden. The question is should this lot be split. There are 7 Elms, and a pond structure that is still intact.

Burt Melcher – Grandson of 2nd house owner – The focus was on my grandfather and my grandmother. My grandfather built 2 of the Hangers at Lowery. Elizabeth was very accomplished outside the house. Horticulture was her love and she developed the Victory garden. She also was a leading poet.

Corey Wadley, Nostalgic Homes – My wife and I walked the property and didn't find any remnants of 7 Elms or garden intact, and that is why we didn't feel that splitting the lot wasn't inappropriate. You can see that these evergreen trees are in bad shape, and the house is more important. The concern of the neighborhood right now seems to be more about the fact that at some point someone will buy it and someone will develop it.

C. McConnell - I was out there and noticed that maybe the lot could be split and be done a bit differently, so that a new property could be developed and the garden space be shared. The garden seems like an open space which character to the neighborhood.

C. Whadley – It would probably not be a single-family structure. It is zoned R2, which with 9,000 sq. feet it would allow a tri-plex to be built there.

J. Bershof – The zoning rules may say that the setback predominance would preserve that corner.

C. Whadley – If the property was not divided straight, we wouldn't have enough footage for a tri-plex.

C. McConnell – A jog in dividing the property line concerns me, and the crowding it might make for a very important infrastructure. If we agree that the enclosed patio is a critical element, we would want to make sure that there are at least 5 feet around it.

J. Bershof – The normal expectation of preserving the character of the lot would be that you would come 5 feet off, a straight line north and south that would then create what I think would be a consistent lot for the existing structure and allow for whatever happens for the existing lot.

Motion by: S. Leonard, for Project 63-08, 2711-2715 W. 37th, Zone Lot Amendment, we move to approve the zone lot split, that is no closer to the current patio than 5 feet to the east of it; that it is a straight line, north and south on the lot, so that it respects the current building on the other lot.

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries

4. Project 465-07 2636 W. 35th

For the site issue, I have already told the applicant that it is important to understand the zoning implications of the proposed location of the installation on the site. It is the site issue that required this proposal to come back. The massing, particularly with the wrought iron is actually creating a

patio type structure. I was wondering if any consideration had been given to alternative location. This needs massing discussion. I also question the access to the garage. Also, there is the question of whether this can stand up on 4 posts.

Applicants Presentation

Mary Broderick, property owner – I am a master electrician. I have lived in this neighborhood since 1981. The issue of setbacks can be answered as I visited zoning on 3-15-08, and Bob Steinberg agreed that 5' rear setback would be required. I would agree and move it back to allow that. I could also encroach into the rear setback space 1 ½'. I was also told that there is no side setback requirement, and that is based on Code 59.120 section 3. My question is to know if this proposed required variance is from BOA? I had a structural engineer design for dead loads. I have two 1910 pines in the back yard and no room to use the existing house or garage for support. Page 16 of your prints shows post structure is specifying 6" round, steel columns. I don't believe for safety, that I should go with ground mounts. I went with 7' vertical height and could drop that down.

J. Bershof – It is pretty creative, and it does not show from the street.

S. Leonard – Also it is not attached to the building.

C. McConnell – Is the support post in the center?

M. Broderick – Yes it is.

J. Bershof – On the south elevation, do the columns drop off?

M. Broderick – Yes

R. Roybal – If this is 7', could you use your garage?

M. Broderick – Yes; however we only use it for our motorcycles.

R. Roybal – I see this like I'd see a 12' fence along the back line.

E. Shalkey – I am with Jim and Carla, I like this structure, and I think it is a good solution.

Motion by: J. Bershof – Project 465-07, 2636 W. 35th Ave., I move that we approve this project for the free standing solar installation, as presented with the adjustments required per the zoning department, and the elimination of wrought iron and the height of the columns being as show on staff sheet.

Second by: S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries

5. Project 309-07 3225-3233 Zuni

Staff Report

C. Murata – This is a conceptual project, to understand what would and would not be appropriate on this site.

Ryan Holtmann – The intent is to bridge the gap between retail and the residential portion. We are looking for approval of a contemporary design. The setback has been pushed back, and we are respecting light and views of the adjacent lot.

C. McConnell – So you are looking for approval of mass, form and a conceptual approval. I went out there on Sunday, and thought the Weir Building was massive and your approach is good.

J. Bershof – The setback is interesting.

R. Roybal – I like that you are giving parking to the north property.

C. McConnell - The contemporary approach is a good one.

D. Humphries – I question that the 3 story town homes stepback, but the street line starts to do some eroding.

Motion by: R. Roybal, Project 309-07, 3225-3233 Zuni St, we move to approve the concept of the design as presented, based on the site, mass and scale in the neighborhood and that the designer would come back to the Landmark Preservation Commission for the end.

Second by: D. Humphries

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries

V. Designations

1. **3125 E. Exposition**

Applicant – Susan Livingston

Staff Presentation

A. Gilbertson – We received an application for the demolition on this property and did research which led to the determination that it had potential for designation. I also went out and made a visit and saw that the tiles from the roof had been removed and stacked on the roof. Some level of demolition had taken place. There were five people who wrote this application and all five are here along with Scott Dittman, who is the current owner. The five are, Susan Livingston, Kathleen MacDonald, and G. Dagley Arnold, neighbors residing near the property, and by Florence Kountze Best Rolander, the daughter of Mrs. Best, and by Estabrook Anderson, the niece of Mrs. Rolander.

The application is complete and demonstrates that the property meets the criteria required for designation in two categories. It meets criteria 1a and 1c regarding history and criteria 2a and 2b regarding architecture. The period of significance is 1930 – 1937, the period of ownership by Florence Kountze Best. With respect to criteria, we have met criterion 1a and 1c of the historical importance and those have direct association with the historical development of the city or nation and have direct and substantial association with the person or persons who influenced society.

Florence was related to 4 pioneer families who played prominent roles in Denver and Colorado's economic development.. Her influence on society made significant donations of time and money. Specifically her family was the first family that developed the First National Bank in Colorado, they had Real Estate holdings, cattle holdings, they were involved in mining as well. In terms of Florence's influence in society, she was a member of the social elite she made significant donations of her time, talent and money to enumerable charitable organizations. In listing architectural importance, it met 2 criteria, those being 2.a and 2.b. 3125 E. Exposition is an example of the Italian Renaissance Revival (also recognized as Mediterranean Revival) residential style perfected by William E. and Arthur A. Fisher (Fisher and Fisher) through the 1920s-30s. The documents for this house and the original drawings are in the Denver Public Library, and Mrs. Best was very involved in the design of this home. It is one of the last single family homes designed by Fisher and Fisher. The most recent letter regarding the designation is from the Board of Realtors opposing this designation. The staff recommends a public hearing on April 15, 2008.

C. McConnell – We have one commissioner who would like to speak.

R. Roybal – I live at 3200 Bell Caro Dr.. I have no financial interest and I discussed this with Kerry Buckey, and also I have no ties with this property.

C. McConnell – Did the Board of Realtors feel that this didn't have the owners support?

A. Gilbertson – Their primary concern is that it did not have property owners support. They did reference a letter that Mr. Dittman has submitted that he objected to items that were included in the application.

S. Livingston – I live in Belcaro, and we noticed the building demo process start, we called and notified the City of this. The building is of interest to me, the neighborhood, and it is part of the neighborhood integrity. It is on the corner of Bonnie Brae, Stokes and Belcaro. This is a distinct architectural Landmark for Denver.

S. Dittman – I understand this is a very emotional issue for the neighbors. The application claims to meet

1.a and 1.c of the guidelines. I don't think this is proven. For direct association to influence society, I am having trouble finding any record of Florence Best Kountze other than her obituary.

For 2.a, it is missing architectural doors and the arch windows, and it is not looking as Italianate design. I am unable to find where they refer to this house as a Fisher and Fisher house, and I don't see the significance.

D. Humphries – Is it your intent to demolish and re-develop the property?

S. Dittman – Yes, or sell it.

S. Livingston – Scott talks about Florence, and her career was to influence as women of her position didn't have the opportunity to go into banking, as the family was in. Her career was set for her, and it was to be a philanthropist, a volunteer, and too influence society by donating her time and her money. That was well documented, her interest was in supporting women and children, and she became a nurse, and worked at Children's Hospital, and when she died, and her entire life seems to have been marked by fulfilling her fate that she was born into, with the economic background. The description of house completely fits the Italianate Renaissance. For 70 years it was owned and kept by people who did not make any changes to the home.

C. McConnell – I personally think we should schedule the public hearing.

A. Gilbertson – I believe Barbara Norgren could speak properly for it at the public hearing.

S. Livingston – One owner of this property was F. George Robinson and his daughter. In the 1970's this house was only 30 years old, and it wasn't yet being thought of as being a part of historic preservation at that time.

S. Leonard – The sub-committee agreed that this application met at minimally meets the least criteria and that moving it to a public hearing would be appropriate.

Motion by: S. Leonard, for the designation application of 3125 E. Exposition St., I would move to set the public hearing during the April 15, 2008 at the LPC meeting because the Landmark Preservation Commission in this preliminary review finds that this structure at least minimally appears to have met the criteria as referenced in the staff report.

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries

V. Other Business

1. Carla McConnell will attend Jeanne Robb's committee for the BOA meeting.
2. Barbara Gibson will Downtown Denver Partnership Sustainability meeting on April 26, 2008
3. Steven Oliver, Greg Savage and Fran Mishler were introduced as those who will be working with Chris, Everett and Alice for the transition to their leaving on April 30.
4. The LPC/LDDRБ retreat has been postponed for April 22, 2008 to be rescheduled at a later date.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Judy Blake