



LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, April 15, 2008 at 1:00 p.m.

MEETING LOCATION – 201 W. COLFAX, RM. 1.D.1

Members Present: Chair Dennis Humphries, Co-chair Carla McConnell, James Bershof, Ronald Roybal, Christopher Meza, Stephen Leonard, and Edward Shalkey

Absent: Alice Jennison and Barbara Gibson

Staff Present: Everett Shigeta, Christie Murata, Kerry Buckey, (City Attorney,), Steve Oliver, Fran Mishler, Greg Savage, and Judy Blake

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

I. Review And Approval of Minutes

Motion by: C. McConnell, move that we approve the minutes for April 1, 2008 as amended.

Second by: S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries

II. Applications for State Income Tax Credit

Motion by: S. Leonard, move that we approve the Preliminary and the Final Applications for Tax Credits as referenced.

Second by: E. Shalkey

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries

III. Public Hearings

Designation 2142 S. University

Staff Report

A.Gilbertson – This afternoon we were supposed to have the Public Hearing for 2142 S. University, University Manor, and once again the property owner and the applicant have requested both an extension of the Designation, and the Public Hearing, based on the fact that they are in negotiations based on an agreement. Specifically we would be looking at an extension of the Designation to June 20, 2008, and then schedule the Public Hearing for May 20, 2008. We also have Bill Winn here today who is representing the applicant.

Motion by: S. Leonard, for 2142 S. University, I move that we extend and postpone the hearing as per the agreement, numbers four (4) and five (5).

Second by: C. McConnell

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

1. **Project 85-08 2160 S. Cook St Zone Lot Amendment**

Staff Presentation

You may recall when this came through for Designation, there were quite extensive negotiations on what Was to be designated and what portions of the site would be available for development. After quite extensive negotiations for the 8 lots which are a part of the Fitzroy Place, DLM #322 which was just designated on November 16, 2007. This application today for zone lot amendment is for the additional development on the east side. The proposed lot amendment and access easement minimize the visual impact on the mansion and the physical impact on the landscape. The two lots (Parcels 13 and 14) are to the rear of the mansion, and the lot to the north of the mansion (Parcel 1) is far enough away from both the mansion and the carriage house so that visual access to both of these buildings is not significantly impacted. I believe the applicant has complied with the University Park Council, who does support this being 2 lots which are Parcels #13 and 14 and which are at the rear of the mansion. Staff recommends the LPC approve the requested lot splits because they are consistent with the designation ordinance, designation agreement, and Section IV-Site features of the LPC Design Guidelines.

Questions from the Staff

J. Bershoff – With the carriage house being sold off, are there any issues with the garage location?

A. Gilbertson – Currently we are looking at drawings for the garages.

E. Shalkey – What did we approve last time?

E. Gilbertson – We approved the designation of the south ½ of the block as Fitzroy place.

Carl and Judy Peterson, property owners – (Carl) I understand we will have to look at the garages after the BOA meeting. We have an architect here who has prepared a set of plans.

A. Gilbertson – You can submit the Design Review after the BOA meeting, to see the way the parcels are divided regarding the bulk planes and the setbacks.

Applicant's Presentation

Bill Winn, President of University Park Council – The agreement was lengthy and over 1 years time. Alice shepared it, and we have agreed to lot splitting and garages, and not to the style. We support the conceptual proposal. We will be in support with the LPC and BOA.

Motion by: S. Leonard, for Project 85-08, 2160 S. Cook St., we move to approve the zone lot change as outlined in the Staff Report

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

2. Project 108-08 547 Marion St.

Staff Report:

C. Murata – This is a conceptual review, and it is a very unusual project. The sign is very small and the garage remains in the back. One half of the duplex would like to add on and the other half would no at this time. The applicant would like conceptual approval on how to approach this. We understand that perhaps in the future anybody who decides to build on the other side would have to match this. The size of the addition is very small, and the garage would remain in the back. The building is up and the impact isn't as strong by trying to mitigate it helps as the roof is high. I think it is about as good as you can do it. I think they have been very sensitive and I recommend that this project be approved. To make this work is going to be how the pieces come together. I think how the NW corner comes together is the most difficult. Also, how what happens to the interior space, and some things need to be worked out and studied and carefully resolved.

Questions/Discussion:

C. Meza – Does the dividing line abide by the setback?

Diane Lynch, Homeowner – I am the owner and I have spoken to the other homeowner who is good with this and only wishes he could do it but cannot at this time.

Sophia Ricard, Architect – We added a south elevation and tried to show hypothetical view of what would happen if the neighbor also were to extend. In some ways this is defined more by bulk plane setback than I visually prefer, but we tried to work as artfully and sensitively as we could with our physical constraints.

D. Humphries – Are there windows on the south elevation or any kind of opportunity for fenestration?

S. Ricard – That is my error as there are windows.

K. Buckey – The building department will need an agreement between the both owners for openings on the south side.

C. McConnell – I think this is very interesting, and if we look at the characteristics of the structure, I would encourage that the second half be simpler. Chris made a proposal that the viewing position and that the building is set up, and the thing that bothered me was that maybe the roof should be hipped and lowered some.

R. Roybal – I have more problems with the north elevation, as I think it is bland with no articulation, and think it should be restudied more.

J. Bershof – Your projected plan is good and interesting, and since it is possible that you could lose these windows, maybe you could add more elsewhere.

D. Humphries – If the neighbor decided that he wanted to do something very different it would be up to them to come back to us for approval.

K. Buckey – You should make it compatible.

C. McConnell – I think this is precedent setting. The abrupt gable end of the roof concerns me, but this is possibly a temporary condition as we can reasonably assume that the owner of the other unit will eventually want to complete the addition

J. Bershof – Some existing back siding on the structure, which is not uncommon, but you might consider changing the second floor addition changes in back to add a bookend look instead of the long horizontal.

Motion by: J. Bershof, Project 108-08, 547 Marion St., move is to give conceptual approval to the general direction of this project and that they come back to the commission in its next stage and the applicant explore several ideas including the number and location of windows on the south side of the second level, and that the north elevation be re-studied for articulation in relation to the functions going on inside That the furthest west elements of the addition be studied for possible use wood siding on both levels as a way of better articulating that element of the design.

Second by: C. McConnell

Amendment by: C. McConnell, We appreciate the applicant's providing the overall elevation drawing of the projected completion of both side of the duplex showing the potential similar addition so that the final build out will reinforce the basic symmetry of the structure.

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

3. Project 91-06 1106 S. Race St. Myrtle Hill School/Lofts

Staff Report:

E. Shigeta – This is a simple application, as the applicant desires to change the orientation of the access from the street to his residence. There are two issues which are simple, and the third issue is about tie rods. The tie rods were put on after the building was built, requested by a tenant, and structurally they are not required, and I think that they should be removed. I think that adding to the front of a Landmark structure is important to keep it simple. There are patios on the ground floor and the balcony is completely different.

D. Humphries – I could support issues one and two but not issue three.

Applicant's Presentation

Kevin Koerning, AIA, Lawrence Group Architects –I have a letter that I received last night from the structural engineer that contains information for the questions of the balcony. It was originally designed as Everett described, completely cantilever. At some point during the construction without consultation of myself, the contractor decided to put a concrete deck in which then added significant weight to the cantilever which then caused a pretty significant bounce. The contractor contacted the Structural engineer, and said “oh yes, we can fix it by putting up the tie rods”. About a month ago I was out at the sight and since this has happened, I guess were coming and asking for forgiveness, and to try to mitigate this, my solution would be to paint the balcony with a sympathetic color to the brick, and paint the tie rods black, similar what one would do with a chain link fence, where you paint the fabric black, which basically disappears and then the porch on top a sympathetic color of the brick.

D. Humphries – If the tie rods were removed what would happen?

K. Koerning – We would have to go back to the original design and the diamond plate.

R. Roybal – Is that a metal/concrete deck and how far back is it?

K. Koerning – Yes, about 2 1/2 “of concrete, and it goes back about 18’ into the building.

D. Humphries – Is there any ability to put cantilever support?

R. Roybal – We are looking at something that we didn’t support.

E. Shigeta – It originally came in with brackets and we agreed that those had to come off.

C. McConnell – It is unfortunate when things are done that shouldn’t have, however I wonder if they took off the tie rods now, that maybe in 2 years the applicants find the deck deflection uncomfortable and they want to again install tie rods. It may be it is better to find some mitigation with colors now and allow the tie rods to remain..

D. Humphries – Adding the concrete deck would make it less noisy.

E. Shalkey – Is this the only cantilever deck?

K. Koerning – Yes.

D. Humphries – Other homeowners may want this and this may set a precedent.

K. Koerning – they all have outside decks.

J. Bershof – It is like of an industrial solution. It doesn’t look as obtrusive in the photo as in the drawing.

D. Humphries – Everything should all be painted the same color.

Motion by: S. Leonard – for Project 91-06, 1106 S. Race St., I move to approve changes one (1) and two (2), on the Myrtle School, and that we allow tie rods to remain on the balcony, with the provision that all of the balconies, including the tie rods be painted color sympathetic to match the brick. Also that any changes to the Myrtle Hill School to come back to the commission.

Second by: C. McConnell

Vote: One opposed seven in favor, motion carries.

IV. Other Business

Union Station Presentation - by students of UCD College of Architecture and Planning.
Presentation by 4 students and 18 students present.

V. Other Business

Motion by: C. McConnell, move is that we make a motion in honor of Christie Murata, Everett Shigeta, and Alice Gilbertson’s service. For Everett for all he has done to organize the Landmark’s Division, document the reviews, and to generally keep the CCD Preservation program on the right track. For Chris, for her diligence, her energy, her efforts to promote preservation, and for her diligence regarding windows in particular, and for her great sense of humor. And Alice for the new energy that she has brought unfortunately for the short time that she has been with us, for the tax credits, designations, and for the forum last fall. LPC should officially thank them.

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

Bill Winn – From the neighborhood, we will miss their energy and skills put into neighborhoods and this will be a loss.

F. Shalkey – I have a deep respect, and I regret that I didn’t get to know Alice better. Good job, thanks.

J.. Bershof – You will be retired and as you drive through the city, you will see places that we thank you for.

C. Meza – For me is has been a short time, and I wish it was longer.

R. Roybal – You staff reports have made our jobs easier.

S. Leonard – A quotation from E.L. Gutkind , “Let it be stressed that beauty is most important aim of city planning. Your strives will be a legacy for your hard work. Everett and Chris’s promoting beauty has left Denver an with an important legacy. In addition to their hard work, Everett’s tact, Chris’s sense of humor, and Alice’s negotiating skills have collectively made an amazing contribution to Denver. Alice’s work has been an amazing contribution.”

Everett addressed the LPC with praise.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Blake