



**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](http://www.denvergov.org/planning)

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES**

**Tuesday, May 20, 2008 at 1:00 p.m.**

**MEETING LOCATION – 201 W. COLFAX, RM. 4.F.6**

**Members Present:** Chair Dennis Humphries, James Bershof, Alice Jennison, Ronald Roybal, and Christopher Meza

**Absent:** Carla McConnell, Barbara Gibson, Steve Leonard, and Edward Shalkey

**Staff Present:** Tyler Gibbs, Fran Mishler, Steve Oliver, Greg Savage, Kerry Buckey, (City Attorney) and Judy Blake

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

I. Review And Approval of Minutes

A. May 6, 2008

**Motion by: J. Bershof, I move to approve the minutes of the May 6, 2008 LPC meeting.**

**Second by: C. Meza**

**Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.**

II. Design Review

1. **Project 151-08 100 Marion St**

**Staff Presentation**

G. Savage – The research we did on this structure shows that it was built in 1951. There is no period of Significance and there is no evidence that this is a contributing house. Therefore we have determined it to be non-contributing. This proposal is for demolition and should be approved contingent on submittal and approval of a replacement structure.

**Applicants Presentation**

Chester Kiaha, applicant, representing the owner, Carlo Marzano - In speaking to the realtors and the neighborhood, we have found that this home would be better served to be removed and replaced with a new structure. We are proposing to build a 2 story home with a 3 car attached garage off of the alley in keeping with the design guidelines, and in the neighborhood, we have received tremendous help in terms of what to do and what not to do.

**Board Discussion and Questions**

B. Gibson – Have you been talking to the Country Club Design Review committee?

C. Kiaha – Yes, the owner and I have. The realtors agreed that it is quite simple; I disagree. It is quite convoluted and technical. I have worked with Everett Shigeta and Chris Murata and there are no books or guidebooks to go by regarding brick, stucco, stone, roof line and other steps to go by. We will build our model and bring it in and consider it page one.

S. Leonard – I assume this house differs substantially in terms of size and character from others around.

C. Kiaha – Yes, it does, being a ranch. Currently it has about a 2,200 sq. ft. footprint plus the garage.

S. Leonard – I am not comfortable with the non-contributing status basis of being built in 1951. This could set a precedent, and would prefer defining non-contribution based on architecture. I don't think this house rises to the level of others

**Motion by: S. Leonard, for Project 151-08, 100 Marion St., move to find this a non-contributing structure as it does not add to the historical or architecture qualities as cited in the Guidelines 30-2.6**

**Second by: J. Bershof**

**Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.**

**2. Project 180-08 8800 E. 21<sup>st</sup> Ave. (Hanger 61, DLM 323)**

**Staff Presentation**

G. Savage – We have two items to consider with the Hanger 61 project.

1. The adoption of design guidelines for Hanger 61. These have been developed by the Landmark staff and I would recommend that they be adopted. They are basically a supplement to the typical guidelines for Landmark structures and districts. The four items listed are the character defining features to Hanger 61 are supplemental and should be added to the design guidelines that are setup for Landmark structures.
2. The submittal for the renovation of Hanger 61 into office space. We recommend approval for this also.

**Applicants Presentation**

Larry Nelson, affiliated with Hanger 61 and CPI, the owner - Raymond Oilett is architect for this project. We have been in front of the Stapleton Design Review and have met their criteria for their approval of this project. Our approach for this building is to maintain the exterior structure as much as we possibly can with very few modifications. It was a garage. We have a State Fund Grant for structural repairs and should not alter the appearance of the building. The work will be mostly underground, extra caissons, some cabling and some repairs to the surface of the building. The goal is to not alter the appearance and come back with the same colors. We are proposing to modify the windows in a couple of areas, we propose to lower a few sills, door way sides will remain the same, and in a closed position. The doors are steel frame with 8" steel plate on them. The windows will be the same, steel windows with stopped in glazing. The upper portion panels of the building are fiberglass, and the proposal is to replace them with Low "E" non-reflective insulated glass. Otherwise we will be re-roofing the building with the same silver coat, and the materials will not change in appearance. The rest of the work is site work, just a driveway, parking, and landscaping, etc. We will be adding a small entry on the north side of the building. There are steel doors there now, and we are just going to roll them open, and then build the structure in the same opening, so that we are not altering the structure at all. The head of the air lock height will be slightly higher. We are painting the building Federal green or dark green to match. All the concrete will remain as it was. We will have a mechanical Screen for trash enclosure made of cast concrete on the side of the building.

D. Humphries – Will it be transparent glass?

L. Nelson – Yes, we will also have a mezzanine.

R. Roybal – Is that why you are lowering the sills?

L. Nelson – We are lowering them for human levels.

D. Humphries – Will you provide mullion detail for the windows?

L. Nelson – We have not finalized that detail yet.

R. Roybal – Do you anticipate anything on the roof or mechanical?

L. Nelson – We raised the floor, and the ductwork is under and inside. The mechanical screens are on the sides and away from the street. We want to keep with the industrial feel of the building.

J. Bershof – Councilman Brown has been very curious about how windows would be handled, in terms of energy conservation. So you are leaving the frames, and removing fiber glass replacing it with double glazed glass set into the existing frame, is that right. Will you have the depth for this?

L. Nelson – Yes, and there will probably be a new piece in the frames to match. They are fiberglass which are translucent from the inside, and we will replace them.

**Motion by: B. Gibson, for Project 180-08, 8800 E 21<sup>st</sup> Ave., (Hanger 61, DLM 323) we move to accept the guidelines for Hanger 61 as presented by staff.**

**Second by: A. Jennison**

**Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.**

D. Humphries – I'd like to see a submittal on the clear story window glazing.

J. Bershof – I Think the entry vestibule is interesting, and it doesn't take away from historical significance.

**Motion by: J. Bershof, for Project 180-08, 8800 E. 21<sup>st</sup> Ave., (Hanger 61, DLM 323) I move that we approve the project as presented, and that details for the window glazing and possible frame replacement items be brought back to staff along with information about the actual glazing material.**

**Second by: S. Leonard**

**Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.**

**3. Project 144-08 3027 Meade (Zone Lot Amendment)**

**Staff Presentation**

S. Oliver – This application is for a zone lot amendment, and the owner owns both pieces of Property. The owner has requested that we allow him to take 12 ½' from the property that he currently lives on and add it to the lot adjoining to allow better use. Both structures are considered contributing in the Wolff Place Historic District. I did visit the site and there is a short retaining wall and it would extend into the new property line.

**Applicants Presentation**

Steve Erickson, applicant and property owner – I have lived here for about 7 years, and I felt that there is an inequity in the lot size. We feel it would be better used and balance the block by donating this 12 ½' to the smaller lot. I did feel that I was pushed a little in bringing this to you. I have no intention of utilizing the R2 zoning or building a duplex. We will want to add onto it or come back with a single structure to build in it's place. We would take the wall back and move the wrought iron fence back.

D. Humphries – We should determine the status of contributing versus non-contributing today.

S. Oliver – It has been determined that both are contributing structures.

J. Bershof – So your south neighbor gains 12 ½', is that right?

S. Erickson – Yes.

**Motion by: C. Meza, for Project 144-08, 3027 Meade St., I move to realign the property lines at 3027 and 3029 Meade St., to result in lots approximately in 50' and 62.5' respectfully, because the lot sizes would be in keeping with that community.**

**Second by: S. Leonard**

**Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.**

4. **Project 143-08 536 Williams St,**

**Staff Presentation**

S. Oliver – This is a two phase addition. The reason is because of a zoning code that says you can build a one story addition and the second story requires a BOA hearing. This will be 220 sq. ft. in the rear, with matching windows, roof form, and matching brick.

**Applicants Presentation**

Rick Graeff, Applicant, Architect – The existing sun room is a 70's addition and we will take it off and build a new one to match, only slightly larger. On sheet A.4 you will see the bad stucco board and stained glass that is very bad and we want to match the roof pitch to the existing roof. On page A.6, you can see that the path to the master bath has a 45 degree angle and goes through the rear of the house. If we can do a second floor addition everything would work out better.

D. Humphries – If the BOA doesn't approve, what would happen?

R. Graeff – Then we would do a one floor addition. I think we will get it through, as it is on a really small lot.

D. Humphries – What about the windows?

R. Graeff – We are going to apply divided lite and shadow bar in between. They are wood clad, Sierra Pacific.

R. Roybal – On sheet A.4, are there circular windows? Is that an original portion?

R. Graeff – I think that was added in the 1980's.

D. Humphries – Referring to page A.7 for the one story addition regarding the roof plan, which does have the bathroom on the second floor, is the roof modified?

R. Graeff – Yes, the roof is modified.

A. Jennison – Is there no difference between the old and the new?

D. Humphries – There is a step back there.

**Motion by: R. Roybal, for Project 143-08, 536 Williams St., I move that we approve Phase I and II, based on the Staff Report and Section 4, and not approve the composite material as discussed, and details are to come back to staff.**

**Second by: C. Meza**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.**

5. **Project 133-08 1264 Race St.**

**Staff Presentation**

There are 3 parts with this project. This project has a red tag on it for construction. The owner has plans to renovate this house. The windows were worked on without being permitted correctly. Somehow a permit was issued without someone realizing that this project was supposed to go through the Landmark staff for approval first. The applicant has new windows already installed and is asking for relief for wood windows on the front and would like to leave the new vinyl windows on the back of the house. I feel that this is a contributing structure and it is the only one of this sort of design on the block. Every other house on this block has a gable exposed to the street, and this one has the roof opposed. I am not sure of what style it is, and it has been compromised because it has had stucco put over the brick, and the windows have been changed out. The door on the second floor with the divided lites are probably original. The door on the second floor with the divided lites is probably original.

D. Humphries – Are you recommending that we approve the replacement of the front windows, condition for the front porch and shutters?

S. Oliver – Yes.

**Applicants Presentation**

Denise Price, friend of the owner, Linda Kesserk – This property was purchased in April of 2006. At that time the house was gutted, the market dropped, and Zach Barrow, who is the contractor and son-in law of the applicant had worked on the property. There were the 15 divided lites

in the attic, and the door appears to be original. We are hoping to carry that theme throughout the rest of the house. There original hinges for shutters right at the exterior base of the brick. So that is how I came to the conclusion that it probably should have shutters. This belonged to The Eagle Lodge, which was a Native American Rehabilitation Center. Public records say it was built in 1892. We want to pick up the pieces now, finish restoring it and get it on the market.

D. Humphries – The first issue is determining if it has contributing or non-contributing status.

S. Leonard – I don't know if the application for the Wyman Historic District says it is contributing.

C. Meza – Are the steps and is the balcony original?

D. Price – They are not; and the balcony and wrought iron are probably not.

B. Gibson – Do the front steps need repair work or is it cosmetic?

D. Price – They do need to be replaced.

J. Bershof – Has there been any documentation of any historic pictures of this house that could provide clues of what this house looked like?

D. Price – I have been to the Colorado Historical Society, Western Museum, and according to the fire records, it was 1929 that shows that there was a front porch. It was quite large and wrapped around the house.

R. Roybal – What is the reason for the new front porch?

D. Price – The front shows a balcony, which is not safe, it needs some support. We just want to put some of the historical features back.

R. Roybal – As a committee we are all about preservation.

**Motion by: S. Leonard, for Project 133-08, 1264 Race St., we find this as a contributing structure.**

**Second by: R. Roybal**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.**

**Motion by: S. Leonard, for Project 133-08, 1264 Race St., we move that we do not approve the windows that have already been installed and we do not require any remediation except for the removal of the street elevation of 5 windows, they should install weather shield windows, divided lites, and the front shutters, and not require remediation. And we do require that the details of the front shutters come back to staff for approval.**

**Second by: R. Roybal**

**Vote: One opposed, all others in favor, motion carries.**

**Motion by: J. Bershof, for Project 133-08, 1264 Race St., move that we disapprove of the porch replacement and that the existing landing, steps and balcony be repaired.**

**Second by: B. Gibson**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.**

6. **Project 108-08 547 Marion St.**

**Staff Presentation**

S. Oliver - This is the next stage for an addition to a duplex. I have brought the model again for your review. The first approval was for conception and direction.

**Applicants Presentation**

Diane Lynch, Owner

Sophia Ricard, Architect – We have improved the design per your suggestions. There was one problem which was to break up the north elevation. We have added skylights for texture, and for the windows we will use a weather shield or wood clad. In the rear, you asked that we add more wood lap siding and we did that, and we have changed the windows on the south elevation.

D. Humphries – The gabled entry had a very special detail that I don't see on your drawing, on the front porch.

S. Ricard – I tried to emulate but not copy to make this element subtle. The window in the dormer would be 4 over 1 divided vertically. The massing is identical, and we have added skylights.

D. Humphries – Typically when we see this level of submittal, a window section that would share the installation of how they would be recessed and a relationship of the exterior and interior material. I would recommend that this is something that could be submitted to staff. The railing detail also. Chris Murata was not a proponent of glass sliding doors.

S. Ricard – We will change to French doors since the client also prefers that.

**Motion by: S. Leonard, for Project 108-08, 547 Marion St., we approve this project as presented with details to come back to staff, with the exception of sliders to be considered as French doors.**

**Second by: B. Gibson**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries**

7. **825 Gaylord St. Contributing versus non-contributing status**

**Staff Presentation**

F. Mishler - The applicant is requesting this for the purpose of tax credit. The homeowner went to the library and verified that the 1911 façade is unaltered. Lester Berrian was the architect, and also lived in the home. Based on that information, I would say it is a contributing structure to the Morgan's Historic District.

**Motion by: B. Gibson, for the Sanderson residence at 825 Gaylord St., contributing versus non-contributing status, that we find that this structure contributing based on the Staff Report.**

**Second by: C. Meza**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries**

8. **790 Fillmore St. Contributing versus non-contributing status**

**Staff Presentation**

F. Mishler – This status is for the purpose of tax credit. The home was built in 1918, which was during the Period of Significance for the E. 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Historic District. This is a two story, brick that retains its original integrity, and therefore we ask that this be determined as contributing.

**Motion by: C. Meza, for the structure at 790 Fillmore St., we move to approve this as a contributing structure.**

**Second by: B. Gibson**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries**

III. Applications for State Income Tax Credit

**Motion by: B. Gibson, I move to approve the final Income Tax Credits as listed in the agenda.  
Second by: C. Meza**

**Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.**

IV. Other business

The Window Task Force update

J. Bershof – Marvin Windows made a presentation last week. They did the window replacement Job at Yale University. Chris Murata was at the meeting, and also Charlie Brown. There was discussion of whether or not to stay with or modify current policy. We talked about non-contributing buildings, window issues and Landmark buildings. We meet the second Tuesday of each month and the next meeting will be June 10, 2008 at 4:00 p.m. at Oz Architecture Studio.

Meeting adjourned

Respectfully submitted by:

Judith Blake