



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 May 6, -2008 at 1:00 p.m.
MEETING LOCATION – 201 W. COLFAX, RM. 4.F.6

Members Present: Co-Chair Carla McConnell, Barbara Gibson, James Bershof, Alice Jennison, Ronald Roybal, Christopher Meza, Stephen Leonard, and Edward Shalkey

Absent: Dennis Humphries, Ed Shalkey, and Chris Meza

Staff Present: Tyler Gibbs, Steve Oliver, Greg Savage, Fran Mishler, Karen Aviela, (City Attorney,) and Judy Blake

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

- I. Review And Approval of Minutes
None approved this date.
- II. Applications for State Income Tax Credit
Reports & Recommendations by Preservation Staff

Motion by: B. Gibson, Move to approve the State Income Tax Credit applications as presented.

Second by: R. Roybal

Vote: Unanimous in favor, Motion carries.

III. Public Hearings

1. **Project 142-08 City Park Boat Dock Kiosk**

Applicant – Helen Kuykendall *Continued

Property Owner – Denver Parks & Recreation

Staff Presentation:

G. Savage – The scope is to install a temporary kiosk for a secure structure adjacent to the existing boat dock for the concession for ticket sales and money collection, and to store supplies. The structure will be stored offsite during the off season, and there is no permanent foundation. There is also provision to add two floating dock extension's by the existing docks. This is brought to the commission to have your opinion on the temporary nature of the project and also the design. The design is basically like a "Tuff" shed, with a shed roof, painted simulated stucco on the outside. The paint will be a cream color with green trim around and red shingles to try to match the structures around it. We feel that this really does not relate well to the existing boat dock a bit farther to the north. Also the shed roof does not relate to the hip roof on the structure to the north. We wanted to have the opinion of the commission on this temporary structure.

R. Roybal – Was there ever a permanent structure there for boat rental?

H. Kuykendall, City Park Administrator – We have had a concession there for the past 12 years which catered food and their contract has expired this year. We have changed the operations of the pavilion somewhat to bring that into the Event Facility Management. The lake was built in 1896, and there has always been a concession. In 1930 there was a tour boat operating there. We have always envisioned having a permanent structure there but have never had the funds. We gave the operator the option to set up a temporary concession. The RFP went out in February and received only one application.

The concession company Real Fun has applied and they actually run the concession and the boat concession at Washington Park, and are good to work with. In a quick turn around the owner has submitted some documentation so that we could file the application and we didn't have a lot of time to work with this. I did get Chris Murata and Greg Savage's comments, and I talked to the owner about re-designing or modifying that shed structure with a pitched roof. It would be a temporary structure which would be stored offsite during the off season. We have the paint colors to match. It is in their contract that there is to be no permanent structure and therefore would be stored offsite during the off season.

C. McConnell – Is this in use every day or only on weekends?

H. Kuykendall – No, everyday during the summer. It usually 11:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m..

S. Leonard – How long is the contract for?

H. Kuykendall – I believe it is a 3 year contract, with an option.

B. Gibson – If Parks and Recreation wants to do something permanent, is that in the plans?

H. Kuykendall – No, there is no funding.

C. McConnell – Is this a Tuff Shed product, and do they have a hip roof option? Is there something like a double shutter to close up the window?

H. Kuykendall – No to the hip roof option, but we probably could do a double shutter.

B. Gibson – Do you have any rules regarding signage?

D. Kuykendall – They may put a sandwich board and a small sign on the structure.

C. McConnell – A little fabric awning could give it a little more character.

S. Leonard – Do the colors match like the green on the fence?

H. Kuykendall – An awning could be looked at and the colors do match.

Carla, Alice and Ron agree that the hipped roof would look good.

Motion by: S. Leonard, Project 142-08, City Park Boat Dock, I move that we approve this project, with the request that the roof form be restudied and a suggestion that the hip roof might be more appropriate, and that the restudy be made of adding shutters and that we review in 3 years, and also return to staff with anything additional.

Second by: B Gibson

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

2. Project 40-08 600-616 16th St.

Staff Report

G. Savage – This project is for the design for the exterior signs on the Steele Building. The first issue is for the signs, canopy and lighting. These play an important role in helping establish the liveliness and safety of downtown street life. The next issue is that the sign guidelines show a variety of signs including wall, projecting, and window signs which they address in their proposal with several different types of signs shown on the proposal. The next guideline is that the sign should be encouraged to be lit by goosenecks, which should be encouraged not required. Lighting of the signs on this building will be pretty much concealed. All of the signage of the sign band will be lit by up-lights mounted against the building and fixtures and the signs on the canopy will be concealed as well as the signs along the basement will be concealed along the handrail. All signs are coordinated with relationship of the building.

Applicants Presentation

Maria Cole, Klipp Architecture – We are today asking for approval for the master plan for the signage. The idea is that the tenants are currently being approved and are looking for approval of the concept. They will then each go through their own review for approval.

Bob Nagey, Tacedo Design – On sheet 3a, showing the elevation on the Welton St. façade, you see the sign type. AA is the building name, in terra cotta, and in the sign band we would set the limit to 10' in height to fit in the band. The second type is the BB, which is the primary tenant ID sign, and would also fit in the 10' height. The third type is to be restricted to be within 6". We have that visual as well as commercial to add to the store front. EE shows the tenant arcade sign, which projects out to be perpendicular and limited by height. FF shows a door and window graph, where a logo would appear. This is an interesting pedestrian scale element. And last is a street and address sign, which is non-illuminated.

R. Roybal – On EE, did you have a specific width restriction?

B. Nagey – We thought we would use Everett Shigeta's suggestion.

B. Gibson – Is the handrail in the ROW?

M. Cole – Yes, and we will address that.

A. Jennison – Is the font that we see, what would be used?

B. Nagey – Yes.

C. McConnell – Is there a canopy over the lower band?

M. Cole – No.

Motion by: R. Roybal, for Project 140-08, 600-616 16th St, we recommend approval of the signage package as presented.

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

3. Project 306-08 1416 Platt St. DLM #24

Staff Presentation

G. Savage – The Proposal here is to increase size of the sign from 11'x12' to 14'. There were two previous administrative approvals for enlargement proposals. It seems that this is too large and taking over the building. We want to keep it within the sign band.

J. Bershof – When the building first re-opened, it was black metal, I think. The sign wouldn't be noticed as much if it still were black.

Perry White, Rush Signs, Representing the Patterson Sign Group of Canada – From my standpoint if you look at the shadows on new size that was installed recently versus what was taken off of the building, the new size is smaller. This black background goes completely opaque at night. They are proposing to make it more visible. My thought is if we could make the cabinet a bit larger to get that REI copy about the same size of what it was.

R. Roybal – On page 3, what is the shadow, as it almost looks like maybe there were some windows there?

P. White – That is the shadow from the old sign. All the corporate stuff has gone to the black boxes.

C. McConnell – Do other signs light up at night?

P. White – Yes, it is lit up internally.

B. Gibson – It is a huge tourist destination.

J. Bershof – I would have liked the original best. At least with the new one it is more consistent.

Motion by: B. Gibson, for Project 306-07, 1416 Platt St, REI, DLM #24, we move to approve the sign proposal as submitted.

Second by: S. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

4. Project 147-08 3500 E. 7th Ave.

Staff Report

S. Oliver – The applicant desires to change the orientation of access from the street to his residence. We have met with Mr. Bowlby a few weeks ago and indicated to him that staff would not support his proposal as presented to us, and gave him the option to re-submit or to meet with the commission. One of the characteristics of the E. 7th Ave. Historic District is the direct link between the street to the front door.

Robert Bowlby, Owner – The existing stairs are rather steep and uncomfortable. We want a more gracious and less steep way up to the front door. Instead of having 10 steps straight down, we propose to add 7 more to wind downwards. It would be similar to one across the street.

B. Gibson – Would an option be to keep visual but make it easier to get up these steps?

S. Leonard – The idea is to keep the memory of that entrance preserved.

R. Bowlby – We propose 6” steps. We also wanted to make it more accessible for the opening of the security screen.

C..McConnell – This takes the entrance so far out to the corner, maybe a symmetrical way could work.

A. Jennison – The direct approach is very characteristic of the district.

R. Roybal – The address of 2701 E. 7th Ave. does the same thing, it goes up and then across.

J. Bershof – By extending so long as you did, and because you cut off the grade, you eliminate 3 risers. What if you started east of the tree and you had a landing flush off the sidewalk, could you do something closer to the front door.

R. Roybal – Once you get out of the steps, you would have a ramp, near the fence, and you would create a situation of pilasters.

T. Bowlby – I could do that.

R. Roybal – We are talking about bringing it in on the west side of the tree.

J. Bershof – Making it more rectangular and maybe you could make the steps a bit wider.

Motion by: R. Roybal, Project 147-08, 3500 E 7th Ave., motion is that the applicant should take a look at running the sidewalk to the west, parallel to the existing sidewalk and steps and as one passes to the west of the existing tree, runs perpendicular to the front sidewalk to try to create a more formal relationship to the front sidewalk. Also try to widen the steps larger than the original to provide for more formal presence to the entrance, based on Guidelines 26 and 28.

Second by: S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

5. Project 136-08 100 Vine St.

Staff Report

G. Savage – This proposal is to build a 2 story addition on the east side of this home. Also to remove a portion of the 1970's addition, to modify some of the 1970's addition windows, and to restore some original details to the house. This house was built in 1929 and was designed by Temple Buell, and the applicant has provided some of the original drawings. The two issues of concern on this project are: one the relationship to the neighborhood setback from lot coverage, and second, that the 2 story rear portion of the property doesn't meet the rear setback or the bulk plane, so this would have to go to the BOA for that to have a variance. We ask the commission to discuss how much to replicate the addition to the existing house versus how to make it a product of its own.

Applicants Presentation

Kristin Park, Architect – The homeowner researched and found the original drawings by Temple Buell as well as the addition that was intended for this house, and this addition would be set on the back of the property as we know Landmark would like for it to be. This could also provide some privacy and buffer the street noise. There is a subtle wavy pattern in the brick on the original house, and we want to use a straight pattern for the addition to distinguish it from the original. The north side addition has very little detail, and there is still a lot of open space.

B. Gibson – How closely are you following the Temple Buell design?

K. Park – We are following it to sketch, and we propose that we put the coins on as it is in the original design.

C. McConnell – What is the square footage?

K. Park – It 250 sq. ft. and the roof material will match.

C. McConnell – With the change in the coursing of the brick, is it hard to find someone to do this?

B. Gibson – How much do you replicate, I think it should be a subtle difference.

K. Park – We could find someone to keep the wavy pattern if you wish.

Motion by: S. Leonard, Project 136-08, 100 Vine St., I'll move to approve this project as presented.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

Motion by: S. Leonard, Project 136-08, 100 Vine St., I would move that the intent of the Landmark Preservation Commission is that the owners have the option to use the original wavy pattern in the brickwork and to use any original details of the Temple Buell design

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

6. Project 107-08 1325 E. 16th Ave.

Staff Report

G. Savage – This project to build a handicap ramp on the south side of the building and to replace windows, glazing and for a fixed windows in the basement for the egress requirement. There are two issues:

- The relationship to the neighborhood, with minimal effect on the appearance with building, with a simple handrail.
- Some of the windows were installed illegally, and they have stopped, as the owner had not realized that this was in a historic district. Some of the windows that were replaced, were not original windows when it was originally built. So I think that a study should be made to determine what kind of windows were there when the building was built in 1946.

Sue Reily, Owner – I will be a tenant and also another office tenant will be my fathers law firm.
Bruce Obermeier – General contractor for this project.
Bruce Blen, Architect – We did the interior architecture plans.

S. Reilly – We purchased this building in January of this year. It has been empty for a year, and our intent is to occupy it as an office and that is what it has always been. We really didn't know that this was a contributing building. The windows are different on every elevation. The windows on the north side had old aluminum casement, the other half had some fixed single glazed, and the east side had fixed windows, and we intend to redeem those. We would like to replace the glass and not do anything else to those. We did try to retain the character of the buildings when with the replacement, as they are aluminum clad, casement, and are really nice.

B. Blen – The owners wanted to replace for long-term functionality as well as provide some enhancement. We suggested that they look maybe match the aluminum storefront on Humboldt side.

S. Leonard – How many of the original windows have been lost?

B. Blen – Probably 75% or more, the west side appears to have been an addition, you will see the old original aluminum from the 70's which were double glazed. On the north face, west side you will see the old aluminum casements, and we think that the fixed glass was from the 70's. The aluminum entrance is very old.

S. Leonard – In the photo it looks like wood.

B. Blen – The corner wrapped window is original but is double-glazed and have a film on them

G. Savage – We recommend a study to find out what type of windows were originally installed.

Motion by: S. Leonard, Project 107-08, 1325 E. 16th Ave., we move to approve the ramp as presented.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

Motion by: S. Leonard, Project 107-08, 1325 E. 16th Ave., we do not approve the replacement of the windows, but the Landmark Preservation Commission does not require any remediation of this replacement because:

- 1. The windows are not consistent with the building style.**
- 2. 70-80% of the original windows have been lost prior to the replacements.**
- 3. No openings were changed.**

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

Respectfully submitted by:

Judith Blake