



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, April 1, 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, Ronald Roybal, Christopher Meza, Stephen Leonard, Edward Shalkey, and interim architects, Fran Mishler, Steve Oliver and Greg Savage.

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

Chair called meeting to order at 1:08 p.m.

I. Other Business

Election of Commissioners

Motion by: S. Leonard, move to nominate Dennis Humphries as Chair for the new term.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

Motion by: J. Bershof, move to nominate Carla McConnell as Co-Chair for the new term.

Second by: S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

II. Review And Approval of Minutes

A. March 18, 2008, 2007

Motion by: C. McConnell, move to approve minutes of March 18, 2008 as amended.

Second by: C. Meza

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

III. Applications for State Income Tax Credit

Reports & Recommendations by Preservation Staff

Motion by: B. Gibson, move to approve the one Preliminary and the two Final State Income Tax applications.

Second by: S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

IV. Committee Reports

C. McConnell reported that she attended Councilwoman Jeanne Robb's committee which was formed to discuss the B.O.A./LPC zoning jurisdiction issue. In attendance was Jan Tilden for BOA, and they remain neutral. Joe Halperin represented the Alamo Placita Historic District and he was concerned for the applicant's ability to appeal. Councilwoman Robb left a requested that the draft ordinance be prepared by K. Buckey, and that it be circulated to the LPC for review.

V. Design Review

1. **Project 438-07** **461 Gilpin St.**

Staff Report:

C. Murata – This is a large addition on a very small house, in fact the smallest on the block. The addition is appropriate, as it successfully kept the scale down to allow the original front to show. If there is a way to raise the ridgeline up, it would keep the memory of the original form in the neighborhood. The front arched window is out of character with the little cottage. The mass, form, scale and roof all seem to come together. The tile was original on the roof and should be a consideration.

Applicant's Presentation:

Patrick Cashen, AIA – On P.7 see the current/original ridgeline that runs into the existing chimney of the house on the south side. The original ridgeline continues to meet the chimney in the middle. Chris's suggestion was to raise the entire roofline. The north setback was prior to zoning, and Brian (owner) would like to talk about the roof.

D. Humphries – We need to talk about the site and mass.

C. McConnell - Is the wall shown connecting to the front wall of the house to be a second wall?

Brian and Mary Minturn, property owners (Brian) – Yes.

A. Jennison – The tile seems to be a character-defining feature, so I think tile would be a better choice than composition shingles.

B. Minturn – Along Gilpin St, 56% of the homes do not have tile. The roof on the garage of this house has no tile, it is tar paper, UV covering, and it is flat. The second garage has composition shingles on it. This house roof is unique, as the roof is about 50% tile and 50% is a flat, tar paper UV. We did consider the extra structural work and the cost to use tile everywhere. Most colors of the roofs in the neighborhood are gray or black.

D.Humphries – I have a question on the windows of the existing house, the casement looks painted and they don't seem to match? The staff is suggesting that the arched window over the entry may not be appropriate.

P. Cashen – There are storm windows there now. We are trying to have something slightly decorative for the front windows on the 2nd floor.

M. Minturn – The iron arched gate in front is to match the window.

D. Humphries – Personally, I think the house would be better without that gate and that concept.

C. McConnell – In thinking about Chris's suggestion regarding the roofline hitting the chimney, I wonder about extending the line to the north the way she suggests but not change the way you have handled it on the south side. The roof is a character defining feature and I would agree with Chris to simplify the windows and to not use arched windows. Did you consider maintaining the tile on the original roof and then using another complimentary material on the new construction?

C. McConnell – I would urge you to consider an all tile roof.

P. Cashen – I think mixing roof materials seems bothersome to me.

C. McConnell – Is the front wall brick?

M. Minturn – It is stucco now.

P. Cashen – The brick wall was built earlier.

B. Minturn – We have talked about adding stucco over the brick to match the house.

J. Bershof – I think that taking the ridgeline up higher brings a whole set of new problems, and one is that it could become a zoning issue. There are alternative ways, such as; you could take up a more gradual slope, or introduce a ridge in the middle that goes back to slope both ways. I think it would be worth looking at. I am uncomfortable with the current design because it causes a triangle, as well as it seems so foreign to the rest.

P. Cashen – The triangle parts certainly could be eliminated or either gabled.

D. Humphries – Are we okay with the windows and the roof, or are there further questions?

A. Jennison – I think the arch is too decorative.

C. McConnell – I would suggest getting away from the arched window, as it is not in keeping with the simplicity of the original structure.

B. Gibson – This is a very large addition and it is tough to make it subordinate, so I think also the arched window is a little bit too much and should be more simple.

P. Cashen – I think we can agree to give up the arched window and we could agree to a slightly shallower roof pitch.

D. Humphries – I struggle with the 2 roofs, it should be 1 or the other. Especially because one of the things that he has done successfully is to try to not overwhelm the house. So we all agree it should match, so tile or composite shingle?

C. Meza - I think it is very attractive, and I have no problem with the composition.

B. Gibson – As much as we like tile, I think tile on the entire structure would be overwhelming.

C. McConnell – What would be your material for the site wall?

P. Cashen – Because it would be consistent with the house we were thinking about using stucco.

C. McConnell – I liked the brick and stucco contrast.

Motion by: C. McConnell , for Project 438-07, 461 Gilpin St, I move that we approve the proposed addition with the changes that the roof slope be taken from the original ridgeline in a more gradual line to the second floor; all of the arched windows will be simplified to rectangular shapes, and that you will agree to the use of the composition roof material on the whole structure. This approval is in support of Guidelines, Section 3 and 4 and also that any construction details are to return to staff.

Second by: C. Meza

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

2. Project 75-08 725 Williams St.

Staff Report

C. Murata – I brought this in because it is a Jacque Benedict house, and I wanted the LPC to see it. I did want clarification that the rafter tails are subtly different.

Applicants Presentation

Steve Ekman – This is an unusual Benedict project, that the south elevation of this house has a distinct formality from the front to the back of the house. We think the original was brick and later stucco was put on the brick. The garage has brick and a simplified hip roof. The rafter tail is simple without any detail at all. We are using a 2' bed mold and small brick detail. We are adding a gable roof over the master bedroom to get the arched transom in. The idea on the back elevation is for a strong access from the front to the back, with arches, continued to give a focal point. We have worked to save all significant trees. The windows are in great shape, with the need for some tuck pointing and some needed sills. We are adding scrolls back on the railings.

J. Bershof – Are the historic windows remaining?

S. Ekman – Yes, and the remaining windows will be true, divided lites.

D. Humphries – This is a wonderful job, and great presentation.

Motion by: J. Bershof, Project 75-08, 725 Williams St., I move to approve this project as presented.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

3. Project 79-08 2835 Welton St.

Staff Report

C. Murata – This was reviewed in September of 2006. The district only has seven contributing structures, and this is not one of them. The proposal is to consider demolition with replacement approval.

Applicants Presentation

Steve Shepard, 2835 Welton St., LLC – We have repaired all the masonry and electrical, and moving along, by June we should be complete on the adjacent structure. This building is an eyesore, and at this point it is impossible to know what the replacement would be.

D.Humphries – By the Guidelines, we cannot approve without condemnation or replacement approval.

K. Buckley – Per Ordinance 30, 6.7 says that if the building inspector or the Health department were to direct this building to be taken down, then it could.

C. McConnell – Your original plan was to renovate, and this is a non-contributing structure, so I wonder if it would be valuable or even necessary to have any photographs as a record for review of the replacement structure?

J. Bershof – The guidelines were pretty clear, and I'm guessing if it comes back that it might be bigger.

S. Shepard – The plan is to incorporate the smaller structure with it.

D.Humphries – Do we need to take any action today?

J. Bershof – If we do that, then that would be an approval to demolish without an approved replacement.

D.Humphries – You could contact the Inspector or the Health Department to ask for condemnation.

4. Project 331-07 1009 Grant St.

Staff Presentation

C. Murata – In this application they are only referring to 10 windows and we need to know which windows and how they compared to the existing windows. This is not a landmark structure but it is in a historic district.

Applicants Presentation

Lisa Fitzgerald, Sr. Finance Rep, Credit Union Strategic Partners, Inc.
Cole Finnigan, Attorney for Credit Union Strategic Partners, Inc.

L. Fitzgerald – I am passing out documents showing the replacement windows. This property was purchased in 2006 to be the main headquarters. We want to renovate and bring it back to a quality structure. Vandal's have thrown rocks and destroyed the windows. We want to replace with double, aluminum clad windows by Kolby and Kolby.

J. Bershof – What about those windows that are not being replaced?

C. Fitzgerald – We are currently reviewing the costs of what to do with them. We are committed to replace 10 and come back to talk about the others.

C. McConnell – Are the existing windows painted wood, and have you considered a painted wood replacement rather than clad?

L. Fitzgerald – We have looked at the options of the painted wood rather than clad, but the aluminum clad have a longer warranty, and the maintenance would be much less for us.

C. McConnell – One of the comments that was made at the LPC window committee was that refurbishing historic windows, even though is a costly thing, they can be repaired, and 20 years from now you may not be able to repair new windows but may have to replace them again.

S. Leonard – I am the most left wing window person on the commission, but I don't think the LPC has a fixation on insisting on unreasonable restorations of windows. It is an issue that we have struggled and spent a great deal of time to come up with a position to maintain. I think the LPC is trying to come with away to retain the integrity of the historic windows in the district. We have DPS who went through a lot of window replacement a couple of years ago, and they have been coming back with the issue the their windows replaced in the 50's and 60's are breaking down. So I don't think we should give sanction here for replacement of all windows.

D. Humphries – On the Grant St. elevation, is it just one window?

L. Fitzgerald – It is one window on the side of the tower.

D.Humphries – I was wondering if you would be open to considering using the painted, Kolby unit based on the one on the Grant St. elevation, as opposed to using the clad?

L. Fitzgerald – We would be fine with that.

C.McConnell – It is appropriate to have use just the painted finish on the south side, because the south exposure is subject to more wear and tear of the elements, so the new and existing units will weather the same.

Motion by: J. Bershof, Project 331-07, 1009 Grant St, I move to approve the window replacement for the ten (10) specifically cited windows in the project proposal with clad, Kolby and Kolby, and that we ask the applicant to explore the idea of using painted wood solution rather than clad solution on the one (1) window on the east façade and discussion occur with staff.

Second by: C. McConnell

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

Motion by: S. Leonard, Project 331-07, 1009 Grant St, we move that any added changes for this structure shall be brought back to the LPC for approval.

Second by: C. McConnell

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

V. Designations

1. Rescind Designation of Central Bank

A. Gilbertson – The applicant's deal fell through and the applicant no longer has any interest. I have asked the property owner to write a letter to support this Rescind of designation.

K. Buckey – We could still go forward as planned.

2. Public Hearing extension request for 3125 E. Exposition Ave.

The agreement at the last LPC meeting had set the public hearing for April 15, 2008. The property owner and applicant request to extend the timeframe and postpone the public hearing. The property is currently under contract by a couple who is very interested in restoring it and have even been over to the public library and pulled out the original Fisher and Fisher architectural drawings, as the new owner plans to completely restore it. So the house is under contract and the due diligence period is over on April 25, and by then I understand that the roof should be back on house. The perspective property owner is expected to close on May 30, so with that timing we have an agreement that would extend the period of designation out for 72 more days which would be up to and including the date of July 28, 2008. We would set the public hearing for July 1, 2008 and that would give the new property owner time to be involved in the process.

Also with us today is Bill Wilber, son-in law of Barbara Norgren, and he is the Real Estate agent representing the new owner.

Motion by: C. McConnell, for the designation of 3125 E. Exposition, I move to extend the period for designation for 72 days, to and including July 28, 2008, and that we postpone and re-schedule the public hearing to July 1, 2008

Second by: A. Jennison

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

VI. Information items

B. Gibson – I just want to give you an update on the group meeting on Sustainability issues sponsored by the Downtown Partnership, Historic Denver, the National Trust, and the USGSA. The talk was about how green buildings sustainability are all on our plates today, and how best to get that information out to the public. There was a tendency to go back to the issue of windows; particularly with historic structures. Historic Denver is doing a project with the support of the National Trust, to put together some educational information which may help with this discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Blake