



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, June 3, 2008 at 1:00 p.m.

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

Members Present: Chair Dennis Humphries, Co-chair Carla McConnell, Barbara Gibson, James Bershof, Alice Jennison, Stephen Leonard, and Edward Shalkey

Absent: Christopher Meza and Ronald Roybal

Staff Present: Fran Mishler, Savannah Jameson, 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

Motion by: C. McConnell, move is to approve the minutes of the May 20 meeting.

Second by: E. Shalkey

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

II. Public Hearing

1. **130-07 673 St. Paul St.**

Staff Presentation

S. Oliver – There are 2 parts to this project, and the first part is a two story addition to the rear of the house and it is not visible from the front. The roofline is subservient to the existing house detail. They will be using brick of a different color to suggest the different time period. In the front, they will be adding a stoop, railings, descending to an existing stair to the street. The also will have to go to the BOA review for the side lot. I don't feel that this overpowers the original house or the neighborhood.

Applicant's Presentation

Chris Seremet, of Seremet Development Group – I am the general contractor and representing Dr. Levy. In this particular project, the architect was the owner's father. The older pool house, and stucco wall was there prior to the current owners. It does provide a break from 7th Ave.. We will take extra care to work within the confines and differentiating to the historic doors and windows to compliment the original house.

Dr. Stewart Levy – I am the current homeowner. The brick will be similar but not the same, as the original has iron spots and the new brick while a similar color will not have the iron spots in it.

Questions

J. Bershof – Is that the same as the terrace that you are creating?

Dr. Levy – Yes

C. McConnell – Is there any change to existing windows?

C. Seremet – One window, the existing West bedroom and the SW will have to be covered.

D. Humphries – It looks like it is well thought out and conceived.

Motion by: C. McConnell , for Project 130-08, 673 E. St. Paul St., I move that we approve this project as presented.

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

2. Project #169-08 777 Marion St.

Residence

Dennis Green, Attorney, representing the applicant

Mona Diaz, owner and applicant

Ellis Merith, owner, husband of Mona Diaz

Staff Presentation

S. Oliver – It is my recommendation to deny this project. I don't feel that the material is compatible. The sloping front lawn is a defining characteristic of this neighborhood. The retaining walls/fence could be installed and still retain some of the slope. The pilasters in the neighborhood are either brick and in some places were actually CMU and finely detailed. The limestone units have a tumbled, rough-hewn appearance, which is not characteristic, and should be re-done.

E. Shalkey – One photograph is prior to this project and one is with fence, so is the one that is there now, the one with the fence, so is this the proposal?

D. Green – The history is that the applicant is from out of town and didn't know the protocol for a historic district, and you will notice that the brick on the house has also been painted and that protocol was not known also, but that is water under the bridge. I don't know how they were stopped at this point, but they are now looking for Landmark approval. We do have additional photographs of the landscaping which is to soften the appearance. The proposal is for wrought iron. The clients do have some safety issues and the contractors told Mrs. Diaz that they did not need permits.

M. Diaz – As a former lawyer, I am embarrassed and this was an honest mistake and I would like to mitigate this situation. I chose limestone because it ages and has patina.

D. Humphries – What is your reference to security?

M. Diaz – On the North side there are many young people living there and in the basement is a known drug dealer.

E. Shalkey – Do you know what the dimensions of the columns are?

M. Diaz – They are all 24" x 24" and were designed to be 18" x 18" but something got lost in the translation with the contractor. I got home and they were built larger.

D. Humphries – Is the gate single?

M. Diaz – I wanted to do a double, so the columns can equally bear the weight.

J. Bershof – Is there and cap plan for the top of the lower walls where the wrought iron will go?

M. Diaz – Yes, but I am waiting for approval. I am leaving off the middle pilaster but the caps will all be applied to each of the columns.

J. Bershof and E. Shalkey (both said this) – The cap is to protect the wall.

D. Humphries – Kerry, is there any problem with the gate opening into the ROW?

K. Buckey – Public Works would have to approve that.

D. Humphries – The staff recommended denial, as it was too high and the pilasters are inconsistent with the neighborhood.

D. Humphries I have heard about the cap and the wall being too tall but the cap would make it taller.

C. McConnell – I think the materials such as the stone are not appropriate in this neighborhood. The proportions of the wall are inappropriate. I think the sides are an issue also. To take a large wall back is radical, and I would propose to take it down to the front.

J. Bershof – The craftsmanship is good. I visited the site and found it to be not fitting with the neighborhood.

A. Jennison – I visited the site and found it to be not fitting with the neighborhood

E. Shalkey – I agree with all the commissioner’s comments, and one option might be to reduce down, leave some rock exposed.

C. McConnell – Looking at photo #12, with care to the joints, your contractor did a sloppy job.

B. Gibson – A part of that visual, the scale coupled with the stone seems heavy for that house.

S. Leonard – I would be comfortable with a motion that give the applicant direction that requires the least amount of re-doing necessary to make the wall compatible with the neighbors.

D. Green – My recommendation to my clients is to reduce the overall mass of it, bring some of the columns flush to wall .

E. Shalkey – I think it needs visible foundation and bring up the proportion.

C. McConnell – Maybe you should engage a designer to reduce the mass.

Motion by: J. Bershof , for Project 169-08, 777 Marion St., the Landmark Preservation Commission finds the application as presented, should be denied and return within 60 days with design drawings for a new approach to the landscape and wall concepts being presented. Reduce the mass of the current concepts, that the materials presented relate better to the materials found to be prevalent in that particular historic district, especially in relation to Guideline 42 that in the process of reducing mass and consider retaining original open space at the sides of the structure, particularly the south side and on the front be more in relationship to the natural topography.

Second by: C. McConnell

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

3. Project #135-08, 78 Milwaukee St.

Staff Presentation

S. Oliver – In essence my recommendation is to deny the height of this proposed 7’ fence. The standard height is 6’ and we felt that there wouldn’t be any more noise mitigation by increasing this fence in height.

Lisa Tyler, Owner/applicant – I have 2 pictures of fence’s that are 10’ and one that is 9’. The house is on a hill, and there is a basement at garden level. Across the street is a 10’ tall fence. Steve Oliver says it will not mitigate noise. My husband is a scientist and he went on line and found that the 1’ extra would mitigate noise by 11%.

B. Gibson – When you re-do the fence, how are you doing the base?

L. Taylor – Basically there is just stone there to retain the soil.

C. McConnell – Is the fence on the property line?

L. Tyler – Yes

C. McConnell – Would you be willing to pull in some from the line?

L. Tyler – It is already pulled in a foot. No, what is the reason?

C. McConnell – A little more room for pedestrian appears visual.

D. Humphries – This still has to go to the BOA.

J. Bershof – When driving 8th Ave from Colorado Blvd, there is plenty of precedence already. She has some examples of the ones that I saw. I don't feel that the one foot of additional height is going to make that much difference. I feel that this is attractive and a good trade off.

E. Shalkey – I am with Jim on this, it is a temporary thing being a wooden fence and not going to last a long, long time and not do a any permanent damage to the rules.

A.Jennison – I am worried about precedent. I think 6' is set for a reason for the community.

J. Bershof – Speer Blvd has 8' walls. If this was on a side street it would be a different thing.

Motion by: S. Leonard, for Project 135-08, 788 Milwaukee St., I move to approve the 7' height along the alley along the 8th Ave. side and up to 6' on the south side, citing the guidelines in the Staff Report.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous, one opposed, motion carries.

4. Project 176-08 2114 14th and 1360 Vine

Staff Presentation

S. Jameson – According to the Wyman Historic District the Period of Significance is 1930. The Wyman Historic District application lists this structure as non-contributing. Further research has determined that the building does not add to the historical or architectural qualities of the district. Staff recommends that both of these structures be determined as non-contributing.

Motion by: J. Bershof , for Project 176-08, 2114 14th and 1360 Vine, we move that we find both of these structures to be non-contributing to the Wyman Historic District.

Second by: S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

5. Project 159-08 80 Fox St.

Staff Presentation

S. Oliver - In the process of the applicant submitting this project, she provided a sample of the proposed window. I would recommend denial per guidelines 12.b. The original storm sashes are evidenced by a few existing wood-framed screen sashes, which are still present on the house. The proposed aluminum storm windows have an ambiguous extruded frame that is not in keeping with the simplistic profile of the originals. My basis for denial is based on that tenant that we seek to have replacements brought back to original.

Applicants Presentation

E. Gasner , Owner/Applicant – I have provided additional information and brought in a sample. The plan is that the contractor will use a foam seal to adhere.

J. Bershof – The discussion of storm windows has not been too extensive at the committee meetings. If the house has double-glazed windows and is well sealed, the RU value is similar to a new double-glazed window. This is a good and valid approach. This is a summary of the National Parks type of information. “Consider storm windows as an alternative to window replacement. (Storm

windows can increase efficiency and should be considered as an alternative for replacing original windows. Install storm windows inside when feasible.) Match the sash of the original windows when storm windows are on the exterior. Metal storm windows may be appropriate if the frames match the proportions and profile of the original window and that the frames are anodized or painted so that the raw metal is not visible. “

E. Gasner – what about the doors?

S. Oliver – My unofficial feeling was that the storm doors probably couldn't be discovered.

C. McConnell – If there was an original door, an added security door does not require a permit, but it does require Landmark's approval.

Motion by: C. McConnell, Project 159-08, 80 Fox St., I would move that we approve this project for storm and screen windows which are fully removable and urge the applicant to paint them to match the windows.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

III. Applications for State Income Tax Credit

Motion by: C. McConnell, move to approve the Applications for State Income Tax Credit as presented.

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

IV. Designations

1. University Manor application withdrawal.

F. Mishler – For University Manor. Bill Weir made an effort for designation. They did reach an agreement with the developer who has purchased the surrounding properties. So the UPCC wants to withdraw the application to designate University Manor and a Certificate of Non-Historic has been issued. The major part of the agreement will have a waiver on it that all the acquired property will be re-zoned to RMU30, which will have a limit on the height to 120'. They have also agreed that the proposed that the street level will have some retail and the parking structure will be screened along S. University and Evans. Also that the street level will be masonry.

If an interested party is found, the developer will fund up to \$15,000 to move the building. They planned high end apartments not for students, as the community felt that it could enhance the neighborhood.

D. Humphries – There must be a flow in the system that we were not aware of.

F. Mishler – If we find someone who would want to save it.

S. Leonard – It seems to me that the LPC should have the position to save a Landmarked building. If we say it is a historic structure we can't un-say it.

J. Bershof – We missed the deadlines and found nothing to save it.

K. Buckey – The commission can control it, but in this case we lit it slide.

2. Tax Credit Update

F. Mishler – Four of us from the Landmark group went to a workshop in Ft. Collins. Issues came up on Tax Credits, and we would want your comment when you have read the staff notes. I also went to Kerry for guidance, since we are a CLG and we are doing this appropriately.

V. Designations

2109 E. 9th Ave.

S. Jameson – The designation committee met in the May 20 LPC meeting and has recommended that This application for designation be brought to the full committee. This application meets all 3 criteria. William L. Petrikin lived in this house, and he was the president of the Stock Show from 1925 through 1932, and was associated with St. Luke’s hospital. This structure retains its original architectural integrity. The pool house was built in 1970. It is a distinguishing Landmark feature in the neighborhood and it borders the Botonic Gardens.

Motion by: S. Leonard, 2109 E. 9th Ave., I recommend to the full LPC to set a Public Hearing for designating this as an individual structure, and that we recommend that the designation document as it comes to us from you that that we mention the landscaping as contributing and all other structures as contributing to this structure.

Second by: E. Shalkey

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

2. Curtis Park F

F. Mishler – The neighbors in this area have been involved for the past several months with preparing this application. The Period of Significance is 1870 to 1902, except for one commercial building which is now converted to residential use. This application is complete and meets criteria in all 3 categories. I would recommend that this be submitted to the full LPC on June 17, 2008 and that we do notifications.

S. Leonard – Are you stating that 1870 to 1902 and what about the 1949 building?

K. Buckey – It could specifically state to include or reverse to exclude a non-contributing building

S. Leonard – Are you stating 1870 to 1902, and what about the 1949 building?

K. Buckey – It could specifically state to include or reverse to exclude a non-contributing Building.

Motion by: S. Leonard, for Curtis Park F, we find this application meets the designation criteria and recommend that we move to the full LPC on June 17, 2008.

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Blake