



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 17, 2008 at 1:00 p.m.
MEETING LOCATION – 201 W. COLFAX, RM. 4.F.6

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

Absent: Co-chair Carla McConnell and Alice Jennison

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

A. May 20, 2008

Motion by: B. Gibson, I move to approve the minutes of the May 20, 2008 LPC meeting.

Second by: C. Meza

Vote: Unanimous in favor, Motion carries.

II. Design Review

1. **Project #214-08 1450 Franklin St.**

Staff Presentation

G. Savage – This is a concept design review submittal for form and mass. This is to have 19 residential condo units with below grade parking. The north side will have 14 flats and 5 two story town homes at the south property line. It is in the MS3 zone district. There was some conflict with zone district requirements and some of the Historic Landmark considerations. MS3 requires that 75% of the building to be within 1.6’ of the property line, and in this case they are at about 40%. Reviewing this we can see that the arrangement works better because it seems to transitions the setbacks of the remaining houses on the block. The next submittal should show more of the surrounding neighborhood for setbacks, also the landscaping and details. For the mass and scale, the building has been broken into 3 divisions of the taller buildings to the north, the central courtyard of the lower building to the south. The other issues are roof and gables, and I think that going with a flat roof seems to be appropriate solution to make the transition between Colfax and the residential units. For windows, doors and materials, since this is only a concept, we will look more at those at a later time.

Applicant’s Presentation:

Jim Bothwell, of Bothwell Davis George Architects for Halo Group, owner Burger King Corporation -The general location is Franklin off of Colfax. The context that we looked at was the adjacent homes along Franklin St.. Predominantly they are two-story homes with grade first floors, porches, and with window patterns that vary some. We wanted to identify with the porches, etc.. We are looking to effectively match the setback of the existing homes. We sought to pull back the front porch, have a parapet height and to provide solar access. There are vertically orientated windows, with aluminum frame systems. We set the upper two stories back to separate some and de-emphasize from the lower.

B. Gibson – Are you seeking formal approval for mass and scale now?

J. Bothwell – We didn't get into that detail.

E. Shalkey – I think it would be good to know what the east side looks like. I think that elevation is more important.

B. Gibson – Is the tower in front of the elevator, and is that the only place it can be.

J. Bothwell – We have a stairwell tower in the rear. We need to have them separated. We can bring the elevator overrun down some.

R. Roybal – Did you look at making the stair tower transparent?

D. Humphries – You don't articulate the north side and that would be the more dominate. Are you trying to treat it as a curtain wall? That is one of the more important elevations.

S. Leonard – Have you done a study of that area, in terms of other 4 story buildings that are recessed from Colfax?

J. Bothwell – No, we have not.

B. Gibson - Maybe there is a way to transition smaller.

E. Shalkey – I am not sure I agree, maybe it should be taller.

J. Bershof – The relationship to the courtyard and the historic residences is successful and in general the overall direction is good.

C. Meza – I think the tower is a little heavy on the south entrance, and maybe you could play with the windows some.

Public Comment

Scott B. – I just wanted to say that the buildings along Colfax are falling down and congratulations to Jim Bothwell for what he plans to do.

***No motion required.**

2. Project #215-08 775 & 785 Emerson, *continued*

Staff Presentation

G. Savage – This project has been looked at previously. The proposal is for 12 condo's, with parking access in the alley and underground. The issues of concern are the size relating to the rest of the block. They have a series of low walls stepping up. They may want to look at the percentage of coverage on the lot versus the rest of the neighborhood. We have reviewed the site previously but not the project.

Applicant's Presentation:

Heath Kennedy, Pram Development Group – Last week we met with 19 neighborhood groups and had unanimous approval as well as with the Capitol Hill United members and we took in a lot of comments before we submitted to the commission.

John Matthews, Matthews & Associated Architecture & Planning – We felt that the context of this site was very important. We could do something much more massive, but wanted to continue the same front porch relationship. We felt that the eve line was important along Emerson. The third floor terrace is actually stepped back about 20'. What we want with this project is to be a good neighbor.

D. Kisseberth, CHUN – I am a resident of the Capital Hill United Neighborhood. We called a general meeting and 19 people showed up. When asked if they would approve this project, 15 felt good and some abstained.

S. Leonard – What was your philosophy in the design? The rest of the block is rather simple. My reaction is that you have tried too hard for the 1885 look.

B. Gibson – The guidelines say to be subordinate.

D. Humphries – I question how the third floor setbacks, and think that the roof may look too mansard.

J. Bershof – Your rendering shows that your close to being two big mansions.

S. Leonard – The building across the street is fairly high. The building to the east works as it is good looking and simple.

D. Humphries – I am not sure about giving any approval today, as pieces such as dimensions are needed, and the wall sections to wall setback is missing.

Motion by: J. Bershof, for Project 215-08, 775-785 Emerson St., I move that the applicants return to to the Landmark Preservation Commission and re-present he design and they address the following issues:

A. Site

- 1. Related to site, the plan be presented that shows the dimensions setbacks to the porches and and principal walls of both the new construction and to the adjacent structures to the south. Citing guidelines C-1, site, a, c, and d.**
- 2. Visibility of the landscape to be increased in relationship to the sidewalls.**

B. Mass and Scale

- 1. That a model be presented at the next meeting.**
- 2. Vertical dimensions be provided and that they show the main floor levels of the adjacent house to the south and the new structures and similarly that eve and roof heights be included, so we can get a true understanding of the relationships, are of the existing house to the south. Citing guidelines C-2, Section b, under Mass and Scale.**
- 3. Re-evaluation of the second floor setbacks to better relate your new structures to the south on the block.**
- 4. That the façade on 8th Ave. is a major façade, citing guidelines C-3, for form, and particularly #e which related to the typical scale and portions.**
- 5. To simplify the middle and the north buildings to better match the south building.**
- 6. Requesting possibly a masonry and siding samples and other materials.**

3. Project #144-08 3027 Meade St.

Staff Presentation

S. Oliver – This project is for the determination of contributing versus non-contributing status for the demolition of this structure. The applicant has received a “Wreck or Repair” order this morning. The applicant hired a structural engineer and contacted a City Inspector who prepared this order based on his examination of the structure.

Steve Erickson, property owner – I own this property and live next door. I am sorry that you didn’t get the report from the inspector, but the damage is beyond repair. This house is only 700 sq. ft. in size. I think that Mr. Oliver is incorrect, as to repair this home you would have to tear it down to repair it. I can not make the deadline for repairs.

J. Bershof – It looks like a contributing structure.

S. Leonard – I would rather not bend the rules.

K. Buckey – You should be strict regarding the determination of contributing or non-contributing status.

Motion by: E. Shalkey, Project 144-08, I move that 3027 Meade St., be determined to have contributing status.

Second by: S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

D. Humphries – How do we feel about the demolition of this structure?

B. Gibson – I feel it is worthy of demolition based on the two reports presented.

C. Meza – I agree

J. Bershof – I think there is a hardship here.

S. Leonard – I agree that this is a borderline case.

K. Buckey – Only demo under the “danger hazard” decision.

Motion by: B. Gibson, Project 144-08, 3027 Meade St., I move to approve the demolition of this structure based on 30-6 Peron 7, of the ordinance, citing the building inspectors violation quoting that the inspection reveals certain conditions which are hazardous to life, health and property.

Second by: C. Meza

Vote: Unanimous in favor, Motion carries.

4. Project for contributing status, 303 Vine St.

Staff Presentation

F. Mishler – The designated ordinance for Country Club does not list a Period of Significance nor does it contain a listing of structures that are contributing. There is a Period of Significance listed in their Design Guidelines. That is 1902 to 1945. Country Club is also on the National Register of Historic places. This structure was built in 1955, and outside the Period of Significance and is not listed on the National Register as buildings listed as a contributing structure. We recommend that this structure be designated as non-contributing in the Country Club historic district.

S. Leonard – As time goes on we will have expansion of the Periods of Significance. This is a 53 year old structure but we don't want to set a precedent.

S. Jameson – We did a site visit and it is not in keeping with other structures around it.

S. Leonard – We ought to put this in the motion.

K. Buckey – You might want to consider legally expanding the Period of Significance.

Motion by: S. Leonard , for 303 Vine St., I move that we find this structure non-contributing on the basis of the site visit by staff.

Second by: J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

4. Project for contributing status for tax Credit, 3332 Alcott St.

This project is tabled until the July 1 meeting.

IV. Designations

1. Curtis Park F

Staff Presentation

F. Mishler – We have a letter of support from neighbors. The application was submitted by Bill West, and assisted by Joel Nobel. The neighbors were very involved and researched various areas in Curtis Park. The Period of Significance is 1870-1902, except for one commercial building which has been converted to residential use. This application is complete and meets the criteria in all three categories of:

1-a, historical importance

2-a, architectural importance

3-b, 3-c, geographical importance

We recommend that this application for the Historic District of Curtis Park F, be moved forward to a public hearing for July 15, 2008, and then on the Planning board on July 2, 2008.

Joel Noble , Rich Maginn, Sue Glassmacher and representative Erin Worzel of Historic Denver, feel that this application should be designated.

Motion by: J. Bershof, for Curtis Park F designation application, I move that the Landmark Preservation Commission should hold a public hearing on July 15, 2008, based on staff report.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

1. Structure Designation for the Petrikin Estate, 2109 E. 9th Avenue

Staff Presentation

S. Jameson – This application for designation is for the Petrikin Estate, built in 1917 and completed in 1919. It meets the criteria in all three categories:

1-a, historical importance

2-a, architectural importance, and it is Georgian Colonial style.

3-b, 3-c, geographical importance. This is a prominent location within the Morgan’s historic district.

We recommend that this move forward to a public hearing for July 15, 2008, and then on to the Planning board meeting.

Motion by: E. Shalkey, 2109 E. 9th Ave., I move that we schedule a public hearing on July 15, for the designation of this structure, on the basis of the items noted in the staff report.

Second by: C. Meza

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

IV. Designation withdrawal

1. Withdrawal of demolition/designation for: 3125 E. Exposition

F. Mishler – This memo was submitted to the LPC for an update regarding the reasons surrounding the property known as the Florence Kuntz house at 3125 E. Exposition St.. The commission reviewed this on March 4, 2008, and voted to refer it to the LPC. The history of the property began when we received an application for demolition.. In May this property was sold to a couple in Texas who plan to move in and to restore this house rather than demolish it. They have sent a letter to “withdraw” the demolition affidavit. We recommend to cancel the public hearing scheduled for July 1, 2008 and re-schedule it 120 days, which is no later than October 21, 2008.

R. Roybal – I live adjacent and have no ties to this property.

Susan Livingston – As a neighbor, we neighbors are happy to sit for a while waiting for the new owner.

Motion by: S. Leonard, for 3125 E. Exposition, I move to cancel the July 1, 2008 public hearing and reset it for October 21, 2008.

Second by: C. Meza

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

V. Applications for State Income Tax Credit

Reports & Recommendations by Preservation Staff

A. Applications for Preliminary Approval

Motion by: J. Bershof, I move to approve the Preliminary and Final Tax Credit applications submitted in this meeting.

Second by: E. Shalkey

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Blake