



**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, July 1, 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, Christopher Meza and Ronald Roybal

**Absent:** Chair Dennis Humphries, Steve Leonard, and Ed Shalkey

**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: B. Gibson, move is to approve the minutes of the June 3, 2008 meeting.**

**Second by: C. Meza**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.**

II. Design Review

1. **Project 230-08 200 Cherry St., DLM #259 Zone Lot Amendment**  
**Staff Presentation**

S. Oliver – This is a proposal to amend the Zone Lot so that a 25' x 73.5' portion of the lot in the NW corner is combined with approximately one half of the lot to the north. The Landmarked area will not change.

J. Bershof – Is the small portion a residential parcel?

S. Oliver – The requirements need a 75' lot frontage. This amended portion is for a pool house. This would be a separate lot.

R. Roybal – What does zoning think?

S. Oliver – They have complied with all of the rules of zoning.

B. Gibson – At some point could this lot be sold?

S. Oliver – Yes, however they couldn't build on the driveway part.

K. Buckey – They can't split the lot without getting a frontage for the back.

S. Oliver – The original lot in the middle is owned by the two parties on each side and was split by both owners, and there is some type of regulations that says there can only be two driveways through the park as part of the dedication.

**Applicant's Presentation**

Rusty Brown, Semple Brown

J. P. Kelley, Semple Brown

R. Brown – The driveways are through the lot but there is no grand fathering in, and no additional driveways will be allowed.. It is our desire to build a pool and pool house there. Based upon the topography, we would need the Zone Lot.

J. Bershof – What type of setbacks and side setbacks are there?

R. Brown – That has not been decided yet, and we will not be touching the new area.

R. Roybal – Is there any way we can approve contingent on the project going forward?

K. Buckey – We have no purview or cannot make conditions.

R. Brown – There is about an 80' high tree by the driveway and we are not touching it.

**Motion by: J. Bershof, for Project #230-08, 200 Cherry St., we move to approve this proposal for the Zone Lot as presented.**

**Second by: B. Gibson**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.**

**2. Project #191-08 2750 E. 7<sup>th</sup> Ave.**

**Staff Presentation**

S. Oliver – The scope of this project is to replace 10 windows. P.1 shows the front window with a pair of casement windows there, and the applicant has decided that the original windows probably were these offset , single hung, like the other windows on the front with the stucco. We asked the applicant to pursue the idea of putting in a single lite to match what was there before. The second ones, P.3 and P.4, have in inward opening function, and the proposal is to put in a standard casement with an opening function, and with respect to preservation, we felt that we should deny, to preserve the inward function. It is the same with item 3 which is the front of the house, similar situation, with a pair of inward functioning windows with a fixed in the middle. With item 2, maybe the option of a hopper or some sort of replaced hardware, but not replace the whole window. The final are some hung windows in the rear and we request approval with conditions be met that that the functions of the weights be retained.

R. Roybal – It seems like the argument of functionality?

Bob (Robert) Williams, property owner – The front was an addition built in the 1970's. The sills have rotted and I would prefer "like with like". I would be willing to put in single lite, but I am asking for not "like for like" but for a sealed. The feature above the windows should be matched. I want to change out the small window on the second floor, as it has broken hardware. They are basically serviceable, but the stick periodically. The side windows on P.3 are the same on the east and west side. Some are metal storm or screen. By going with the opening on the outside it would greatly improve the functionality of the windows inside the house. On P.4, there are two windows there and they open to what is now a storage area, and when they open in, they completely block it. There is a major issue at my age of sixty-two, I don't like to climb up one the roof to change out the storm and screens, which is the only way to access them. On P.6 it shows the windows that I would like to replace on the upper front with. The difference is only that the square windows are on the sides, and there is a fixed window in the middle, and I would like to replace that whole unit with a new unit, which has two square windows of the same dimension that open outwards and the steel middle window. The big problem on P.5, these are a major problem, when these windows open, they block the pathway through the main hallway on the second floor. For these windows they are either open or closed. These are primary ventilation for the house. These don't have the same historic character as those in the original structure. And finally, the rear windows, on P.7, the sashes are very weak. I want to get rid of the metal storm screens and put in double pane windows with one complete, wooden frames, so that we don't have the metal anymore.

J. Bershof – In terms of the replacement, what are you thinking about for the type of product?

B. Williams – Square windows, with an all wood casement.

C. McConnell Would you be removing the security bars?

B. Williams – Yes, I put them on about 19 years ago, and don't have a need for them any more.

C. McConnell – It seems like the profile would change quite a bit. Are you using standard or custom profile windows?

B. Williams – I am not quite sure how to answer that, they are custom size, but part of the standard line.

R. Roybal – I can't guess without seeing a cross section, but Marvin probably could match the depth.

J. Bershof – I think it is important that the window set in, but it is okay if it opens our or in.

B. Gibson – If the windows are fixable, we have to talk.

R. Roybal – We have had a similar care, and this could be a safety issue and it is an issue with opening inward.

C. Meza – I thing it is a life safety issue.

B. Williams – We have a new child and it is a safety issue.

C. McConnell – I agree with Ron and Chris, but we are faced with various window issues, and are concerned about the precedents we set. I would agree with Jim that replacement of the 1970's additions windows is acceptable and am not in favor of changing the second floor windows.

J. Bershof – What about life safety?

C. McConnell – This is a residence, not a commercial situation. The owner's have lived with this situation for many years.

C. Meza – I feel strongly about the safety issue.

A. Jennison – If we approve, it seems that we need more details.

J. Bershof – The thickness of the wall is important

**Motion by: J. Bershof, Project #191-08, 2750 E. 7<sup>th</sup> Ave., I move that for Group 1, we approve window replacement, either with in-kind of the operable casements, similar to what is existing, or to do two larger fixed units, one on each side, based on the fact that is on the newer addition rather than the historical portion of the structure.**

**Second by: B. Gibson**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.**

**Motion by: J. Bersof, Project #191-08, 2750 E. 7<sup>th</sup> Ave., for Group 2, move to allow the three square inward opening casements be replaced with outward opening casement windows, that the windows need to set to the inside of the wall allowing adquete shadows, that the details of the installation be brought back to staff and we allow the replacement due to safety issues, and that it is the secondary façade, and that the original window proportions be maintained.**

**Second by: R. Roybal**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.**

**Motion by: J. Bershof, Project #191-08, 2750 E. 7<sup>th</sup> Ave., for Group 3, move that we allow the replacement of the two inward opening windows with outward opening casements and that the fixed middle window remain as historic element and that we agree to allow replacement of the two end windows due again to life safety concerns, and that the new windows will maintain the original window proportions and that the details be brought back to staff in terms of the placement of the windows with the wall and that the windows will be in similar character to the ones being replaced.**

**Second by: C. Meza**

**Vote: One opposed, motion carries.**

**Motion by: J. Bersof, Project #191-08, 2750 E. 7<sup>th</sup> Ave., for Group 4, move to approve this replacement on a secondary side of the house, and the original proportions and the character of the window be maintained. The window has some fragility due to the framework and the mullions have been reworked to the point that lifting the existing windows could cause damage. Replace with new structurally stable sash.**

**Second by: R. Roybal**

**Vote: One opposed, motion carries.**

**3 Project #233-08 466 Pearl**

**Staff Presentation**

G. Savage – There was a lot of discussion previously and this is a contributing structure in the Alamo Placita district. The applicant wants to add to the top rear of the house and build a new garage. This is a very large addition and the original structure is 765 sq. ft., and the new addition will be about 1,725 sq. ft.. and renovate and maintain the existing structure. This house was built in 1924 and is within the Period of Significance. Even with this addition it would be pretty compatible with others in the neighborhood. The issue of mass and scale, most of the addition is in the rear of the house, and the rooftop addition in the front has been kept simple with minimal type of detailing. The issue of roof and gables and materials for orientation for existing roof has been addressed by using a similar roof line, and the materials are compatible. The windows and doors in the new addition have similar proportions and patterns as in the original structure.

B. Gibson – How tall is the tallest point on the roof for this addition?

G. Savage – We don't have those measurements.

R. Roybal – You mentioned that the windows are the same, aren't they using double hung versus casement on the addition?

M. Piper – Correct.

**Applicants Presentation**

Matt Piper, Piper Architecture – I want to give the owners credit for their always wanting to do it right. We could have cut corners but we chose not to cut the dollars and do it right. A lot of time was spent on the dormer. We are trying to capture the original look of the front façade. This addition is merely making it more compatible to the neighborhood.

William Henry, owner – There are double hung windows and we will keep them

R. Roybal – On P.5 of 8, the west elevation shows a door to the enclosure, is that the entrance to the house?

M. Piper – Yes, it is.

R. Roybal – The gable on the front and north start to loose the piece of existing fabric of the house. You could increase the size of the windows to differentiate for a different look. I thought it should look different from the house.

J. Bershof – It is almost like merging two different buildings. An interesting intersection and I think the double hung's reinforce it.

M. Piper – In the dining room, we took out and added double hung's.

C. McConnell – I think you have done a really nice job. You kept the back yard open, and the building is not too large. It seems like an appropriate enlargement.

**Motion by: R. Roybal, Project 233-08, 466 Pearl St., I move to approve this plan as presented based on the Staff Report.**

**Second by: J. Bershof**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.**

**4. Project 215-08 8<sup>th</sup> and Emerson *Continued***

**Staff Presentation**

G. Savage – This is the final review for these condominiums. The issue of site relationship to the neighborhood, on sheet 6, it shows that the building is still the same. It does, however provide more landscaping. For the mass and scale, the new construction seems still higher than the neighboring structures. The second and third floor doesn't look to be setback more.

R. Roybal - Are there any issues with bulk plane?

G. Savage – There are two bulk planes to be considered with, one being the typical bulk plane with the R3 zone district and the other one is the protected district, controlled district bulk plane, and the one to the south is an RO, and this is an R3, so this has to be looked at. They have already made a presentation as far as the site plan review. It does look like they have already met the R3 bulk plane, but I think that the protected district bulk plane might be a little bit of a problem because it is a shorter point.

**Applicants Presentation**

John Matthews, John Matthews and Associates Architecture and Planning – We do meet that. We have responded to your comments from the last meeting. We want to review the R3 zoning with no height limitation, so we are able to build a very large apartment block, but the team has decided to build three, four-plex buildings that relate in character and scale that we think is a better fit and more harmonious in the neighborhood and on that corner. The board seemed to like the direction but had some details that they thought we could work on. First of all with the site, there were some exhibits that we provided exhibits showing the horizontal setbacks both in relationship to the homes to the south. The other important item was the simplification of the front terrace walls to be more in keeping with the rest of the block, which has more landscaping in what we call the vertical dimension. We have pushed the walls back and created a berm affect off the sidewalk which is similar as you go down the block towards 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The other thing that we looked at is the height and the massing of the proportions of the porch and worked carefully to create the front porches on our buildings that are similar in height and scale to what is going on for the block. Some of the other specific items that were commented on were the visibility, the massing, and the hipped roofs which are up on the third level. We have worked to simplify the roof forms. There were comments about the building on the corner of 8<sup>th</sup> and Emerson being simplified in terms of its ornamental looks. We have decided to bring more masonry out to 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, we have added some brick and stucco now instead of shingle and lap siding. The siding is gone and we are trying to simplify rather than overpowering the block. It is less ornate. The entry along 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue shows that now we have broken this into two building masses, to create the feeling of two separate units, and enlarged the porches.

Ernie Cordova, Matthews and Associates – Building 1 on the corner, building 2 is the middle and building 3 is the furthest building in on the block.

Building 1, we have taken all outriggers off, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor roof terraces are stepped back and there is a walkout deck on the second floor. The third floor massing has been pushed back more. There are wood columns on the first floor.

Building 2 has Italianate brick arches. The entry in back is smaller than on the 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Building 3 is a Bungalow style, and we have pulled the porch out, and the pediment is at street level and it is larger on the second floor. For the bulk plane we have to push back and allow 15' from the dormer.

J. Matthews – For the materials, we are using a Robinson brick that is reddish orange brick on Building 1 and using trim detail to unify it to the rest of the block. The windows are wood clad, and the windows, colors, mullions and fascia will match the rest of the block. For Building 2 we are using a washed, a white washed type of brick.

J. Bershof – You have reacted well to the things we suggested, like the façade along Emerson, and the issue of bulk plane on the south side. The R3 is controlled district and R3 is protected district.

Heath Kennedy, Block C Ventures – That was changed recently.

K. Buckey – It was changed so that both bulk planes are 45 and 63.

**Motion by: R. Roybal, for Project 215-08, 8<sup>th</sup> and Emerson St, we approve the design for this project as presented, with details of the windows and the materials and the retaining walls in the landscaping to come back, and the approval is based on the Staff Report.**

**Second by: J. Bershof**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.**

**5. Project 19-08 (Tax Credit) 3332 Alcott St.**

S. Jameson – This is to determine whether this structure is contributing for tax purposes. The Period of Significance is up to 1943 and this house was built in 1905. It has been maintained with integrity and I would recommend it be found contributing.

**Motion by: A. Jennison, for Project 19-08, 3332 Alcott St., I would move to approve this as a contributing structure.**

**Second by: R. Roybal**

**Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.**

III. Information Items –

**1. Civic Center Park Guidelines**

F. Mishler – The Parks and Recreation group are writing guidelines for the Civic Center Park. They want Landmark to adopt them. Kerry Buckey will help us to decide if it can be piggybacked with parks and Recreation's. I do have lot of concerns, and you will all get a copy.

**2. Zoning Update**

K. Buckey updated the board with discussion for the proposed zoning issues that may effect the Landmark decisions. He also was not sure it would go through. Perhaps in a week or so the decisions would be known.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Blake