



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, July 15, 2008 at 1:00 p.m.

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

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

Absent: Ronald Roybal

Staff Present: Tyler Gibbs, Steve Oliver, Fran Mishler, Greg Savage, Judy Blake, Kerry Buckey and Savannah Jameson

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

I. Review And Approval of Minutes

A. July 1, 2008

Motion by: C. McConnell, move to approve the minutes of July 1, 2008, with any comments provided to staff.

Second by: E. Shalkey

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

II. Applications for State Income Tax Credit

Motion by: C. Meza, move to approve the income tax credits for the Turner residence and the Plank residence as presented.

Second by: C. McConnell

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

III. Public Hearings

1. **2109 E. 9th Ave. Petrikin Estate**

Staff Presentation

The Designation Committee of the LPC reviewed the application on May 20, 2008 and voted 3-0, to refer the application to the LPC, with recommendation for approval. On June 17, 2008 the LPC reviewed the application and voted unanimously to refer the application to a Public Hearing on July 15, 2008.

The application is complete. The period of significance for Petrikin Estate is 1917, when construction was started on the house, until 1919 the date construction was completed. The application was submitted by Darrell G. Hamilton.

The application demonstrates that the property meets the criteria required for designation in all 3 categories. It meets criteria 1C regarding history; criteria 2A and 2B regarding architecture; and criterion 3A regarding geography.

Historical Importance

- *1C, have direct and substantial association with a person or group of persons who had influence on society.*

Petrikin Estate was the home of William Lloyd Petrikin, his wife Eloise and their three children. Petrikin was president and chairman of the Great Western Sugar Company as well as the chairman of the National Sugar Distributing Commission in Washington, D.C. He was active within the Denver community and served as the President of the National Western Stock Show from 1925 to 1932 and was a former director of St. Luke's Hospital.

Architectural Importance:

- *2A, embody distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or type;*
Petrikin Estate, constructed 1917-1918, consists of a large residence, a pool house and a carriage house, all of which are constructed of red brick. The three-story residence is a prime example of Georgian Colonial Revival residential architecture in Denver. The buildings, which retain their original architectural and historic integrity, are architecturally important for their significant exterior design.
- *2B, be a significant example of the work of a recognized architect or master builder;*
The residence and carriage house was designed by noted architectural firm Gove and Walsh of Denver, Colorado.

Geographical Importance:

- *3A, have a prominent location or be an established, familiar and orienting visual feature of the contemporary city;*
Petrikin Estate is a familiar and visual landmark in the neighborhood. The grounds of the Petrikin Estate were ranked among the finest in Denver for landscape gardening in 1920.

Staff recommendation is that this application is moved to City Council for August 4, 2008.

Applicant's Presentation

Darrell Hamilton, Real Estate Broker and applicant – I am the applicant who put this together, and if there are any questions, I'll be glad to answer.

E. Shalkey – This is a good application, looks impressive. I would have liked to have seen the garden, but this from the street it looks impressive and hope it can be maintained. It is good that you have this in process at this time.

B. Gibson – This is already located within a historic district.

S. Leonard – The advantage is that no one can say it should be judged solely on the criteria that would apply to an individual landmark as opposed to a historic districts criteria.

Motion by: S. Leonard, for 2109 E 9th Ave., I would move that the application for the Petrikin Estate and the surrounding grounds, citing the staff report, that we recommend this be forwarded to the City Council on August 4, 2008 for designation as a Denver City Landmark, and that we include in the recommendation that the ordinance take cognizance of the fact that this is also in the Morgan's Historic District.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

Motion by: D. Humphries, move to close the Public Hearing for 2109 E. 9th Ave.

Second by: C. McConnell

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

2. Curtis Park F

Staff Presentation

F. Mishler – This application is for the designation of Curtis Park F, located adjacent to the Curtis Park C and E districts. This application was submitted by Bill West and Joel Nobel. Most of the proposal is in the Curtis Park area. The efforts were consistent with Curtis Park E of October, 2007. The Period of Significance is 1870 to 1902, and except for one commercial building which is now being used as residential use, fall within the Period of Significance.

This application is complete and meets the criteria in 1A, History, 2A, Architecture, and 3B & C, Geography.

1A is the direct association with the development with the city.

2A embodies distinguishing architectural type, and the dominate architectural types are Italianate and the Queen Anne.

3B & C promote understanding of and appreciation of the urban environment. 3C makes a special contribution to Denver’s character.

Our recommendation is that the application for designation be approved and forwarded to City Council for the first reading to be August 4, 2008, and the second reading on August 18, 2008.

Joel Nobel, co-applicant – I worked with Bill West on this application and I am here to answer any questions that you may have.

D. Humphries – I would like to point out that we have received one letter and fifteen emails for Curtis Park F.

Public Comments

Nadine Lee, 1021 29th – I would like to voice my support for the designation of Curtis Park F, and it is inclusive of my residence. I appreciate this effort. Approve

Erika Warzel of Historic Denver – I want to voice my full support. As mentioned in previous meetings that this designation is consistent with the National Register district boundaries for the neighborhood. Historic Denver feels this is the best sort of application in that it not only protects the highly significant collection of historic buildings and that it is fully supported by the community. Approve

Jerry Duran, 2841 Champa – I am here to voice my support for this designation Approve

Reyna Von Vett, 2841 Champa – I am her to voice my support for this designation, and our block has three properties in renovation and I worry about them being torn down. Approve

Keith Pryor, 2821 Champa – My property is very cute, quaint and historically significant. I want to also voice my support. It is incredibly important that this application and others go forward. Approve

Julie Rubsum, 2800 Curtis – I am a co-applicant and in support of all comments. Approve

Josie Cosio– I have lived here in Curtis Park with all of these people who have come in, and I don’t understand the architecture but Mom and Dad worked very hard for this house and I would like to support this land marking so I could leave my house to my grandchildren. Approve

Sue Glassmacher, 1037 & 1029 29th St. – I think some of you know how much we love the neighborhood and community and I am very proud to be here as we inch forward on getting this neighborhood completely landmarked. I think we are witnessing something very historical happening here today, as I don’t see any opposition to any of our landmarking’s. My house is in the district and I will be very proud of this. Approve

John Hayden, 2418 – I would echo the consensus of forming this district. My partner and I own three homes in this neighborhood and bought them to prevent them from being torn down. Approve

Hugh Brown, 2903 Champa – To the Chair and the Commission “thank you” for all of your work. I have been a resident in Curtis Park for nineteen years. My impression is that Curtis Park is the largest concentration of intact historic properties in the City. I think it is awfully important to protect that claim to fame and pride. Approve

John Coniff, 2714 Arapahoe – This piece is very important as it is like a jigsaw drawing other pieces together. This is what we bought in to. Approve

End of Public Comment

Motion by: B. Gibson, I move that this Curtis Park F application presented for Landmark designation be supported and moved forward to City Council on for first reading August 4, and that we include in the Ordinance the Period of Significance and the listing of Contributing Structures.

Second by: E. Shalkey

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

Motion by: C. McConnell, I move to close this Public Hearing for Curtis Park F.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

IV. Design Review

1. **Application for De-designation of land parcel from East High.**

D. Humphries - This is an application for removal of Landmark Designation 2405 E. Colfax and 1830 Josephine St.. I want to disclose that I did have a telephone conversation with Larry Nelson prior to this being submitted and inquiring about what was going to be put on the agenda and I don't believe that the phone call will prejudice me or give me any pre-determined thoughts.

Staff Presentation

Savannah Jameson – This is an application for 2405 E. Colfax and 1830 Josephine St.. This building at 2405 E. Colfax was build in 1925 and was designed with the “City Beautiful” in mind. The staff recommends that these parcels be approved for de-designation.

L. Nelson, representing St. Charlestown Co. – We have acquired the Gas Station and are in process with the old Safeway property being under contract. If you look at the map in your packet you will see that the legal description was amended to include the faculty parking lot. When the ordinance was filed, I think they mistakenly picked a 1952 survey and at the bottom of the legal description it says void after 1961. We are here to correct the mistake and hopefully have your support.

D. Humphries – Kerry, since the property owner for 1525 Josephine is not represented here, is there any problem of de-designation?

K. Buckey – There is no technical requirement that they consent. But yes, they do need to be notified.

L. Nelson – There are two ordinances of record on this property. One is an expansion of right-a way along the esplanade that was done. MS3 zoning is what we are trying to embrace here and obviously very recently the City Council through MS3 zoning for this district and the parcel that we are purchasing has the highest designation of all MS3 which allows the the greatest density, so it is there hope to encourage development. Major bus lines are at that intersection.

S. Jameson – We actually do have guidelines for structures and they are the same as for Districts, so there are specific guidelines that we could give.

L. Nelson – I understand. What we have is a designated structure and so I don't understand how the guidelines could be applied to new construction in the vicinity of a historic structure if it is not a district. This a very large project with a lot of complications with investors and language, and having another process is a difficult thing to explain. I just don't think this a part of the East High structure.

S. Jameson – Unfortunately we tried to contact some of the original applicants for this and were not able to get hold of them to find out why it was not included.

L. Nelson – If you read the language it is clear that it was not included, the map and all the language says that. I think it was in error.

D. Humphries – For right now staff is recommending that we go to public hearing on August 19 2008 for de-designation with the LPC.

B. Gibson – My concern is that one of the features it talks about is the familiar view of the school and the mountains versus a possible very dense and high structure there.

L. Nelson – I would argue that you can't use views as an argument for preservation.

C. McConnell – I feel it is a part of the application that what is there is to protect a detraction from what could happen there.

L. Nelson – Our proposed project is about 65' and 100' is allowed.

S. Leonard – What is the effect if we don't set a public hearing?

D. Humphries – I guess it would remain designated and then Mr. Nelson would have to go with the design review process.

K. Buckey – De-designation has to come through the LPC.

S. Leonard – They are inferring that they see unsightly development and I am not convinced but I am willing to listen to more. The issue of landmark is that we are not sure that this is not designated for a reason.

Motion by: E. Shalkey, for De-designation of the land parcel from East High, we move that is project be set for a Public Hearing on August 19, 2008. We request that staff try to find people or records relating to the original designation to review at the next meeting.

Second by: C. McConnell

Vote: One abstains (S. Leonard), six approve, motion carries.

2. **Project #250-08 728 Lafayette**

Staff Report

S. Oliver – This project is to build an addition. The additional drawings came of my asking the applicant to give the elevations of the south and north of the garage and the third roof type.

A is for phase one and B is for the phase two, which is the second floor.

- 1) Demolition of the one car garage.
- 2) Phase one which is a one story addition
- 3) Phase two which is the second story addition

Visually from the street it has low or no impact. It is a bit of increase in size of the dormer in the front, however this is not noticeable.

Phase two is the addition behind the peak of the roof. The architect has been sensitive to fenestration and roof form.

Applicant's Presentation

Michael and Bonnie Koch, homeowner and architect – We have just bought this house about three months ago. It is Bungalow style of house, and we plan to replace the roof and add a larger dormer. It is my goal to retain the character and still get three bedrooms upstairs. In the rear we are focusing on a two car garage. I plan to salvage the brick and use that on the chimney and courtyard. We put a window in the garage which we wouldn't need, and also a 6' fence there in front of the window. If it is the desire of the board to keep the window, we would do so. This requires a variance and has a bulk plane violation.

Board Questions

C. McConnell – Steve could you go through the changes?

S. Oliver – There will be a double window with a horizontal orientation on the garage. I felt a single punched window was appropriate.

D. Humphries – What are the windows changes?

M. Koch – I am adding one window and all others were not changing. They are French windows that swing in. We are removing a green and white awning that drops down in front.

B. Gibson – Are you going to show the difference in brick of old to the new?

M. Koch – There is a slight color difference.

B. Gibson – What are the neighbor's heights?

M. Koch – the next door home is a three story house, and on the other side house is even taller.

J. Bershof – Is the window being added on the setback? This could be problematic.

D. Humphries – I think your recommendations are very good.

S. Leonard I think the window in the garage is not necessary. I would recommend for the staff to approve.

Motion by: C. McConnell, Project 250-08, 728 Lafayette St., I move to approve the demolition of the existing single car garage based upon the immediate approval of what would what would be the replacement.

Second by: S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

Motion by: C. McConnell, project 250-08, 728 Lafayette St., we move to approve the Phase I, 1 story addition, as presented on the amended plan provided today, with deletion of the window on the north side.

Second by: E. Shalkey

Vote: Unaminous, motion carries.

Motion by: C. McConnell, project 250-08, 728 Lafayette St., we move to approve Phase II addition as per the amended drawings.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

3. Project #153-08 340 Lafayette

Staff Report

G. Savage- This proposal is to remove a one story rear addition and build a new two story addition. The windows used in the addition and the new windows used in the existing house will have the same profile but be differentiated by the placement of the window in the wall. The new addition will have a narrower overall wall thickness and thus the windows will not be set into the wall as far as the original windows. The new entry door and gate will be set in the original openings and be compatible with the original house. This house was built in 1928 and is a contributing structure. The applicant has addressed the requirements very well.

Applicants Presentation

Ann Cuthbertson, Architect - This house is unique but very tiny and a young family needs more space. The owners wish to maintain the front appearance. We want low lightweight connectors. We have met with the neighbors and with Country Club.

We looked at and researched the windows. We are proposing replacing all of the windows, but maintaining the jamb and sill, and they are set back by six inches. We will use a simple brick mold. We have a very small muntin grid. We are proposing a dark gray. The roofing was a shake shingle, and we propose going to a fire resistant and durable product, a dimensional asphalt shingle.

D. Humphries – Why did you choose a hip roof rather than a gable?

A. Cuthbertson – It was very steep and looked odd.

D. Humphries – I think that staff would have to see another submittal if not coming back to us. I think we would want a window evaluation, and I think we would be remiss for not at least requiring some kind of evaluation in this particular case somewhat to what we have done in the past. I am not convinced on way or another.

A. Cuthbertson – I am in favor of keeping it small. We have not had a window assessment done. We are keeping the frames and installing a new unit. We are keeping the exact operable size.

D. Humphries – I think you have done a very good job and deserve compliments that you have followed the guidelines.

J. Bershof – I agree with Dennis to have the windows evaluated. Good job.

Motion by: J. Bershof, for Project 153-08, 340 Lafayette St., we approve the design as presented with the following exceptions; that the window evaluation be performed and the results of that be brought back to the Commission, that the site wall also be brought back to the Landmark Preservation Commission.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

4. Project #24-08 630 Race St.

Staff Report

F. Mishler – This application is for tax credit and establishing the contributing purpose. I recommend That it be found contributing, as we all went out to look at this structure.

Motion by: C. McConnell – Project 24-08, 630 Race St., we move this structure be recognized as a contributing property in the district.

Second by: S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

V. Information Items

Civic Center Guidelines – discussion by Fran Mishler, and Power Point by Tina Bishop

F. Mishler – I met with Helen and Mark, and they wanted to come to you for your input. They would like the LPC to adopt these guidelines. In order to adopt the design guidelines as Rules and Regulations, the LPC is required to hold a Public Hearing, which requires a 20 day notice to all RNO's within 200' of Civic Center Park, as well as notification to all concerned parties and the newspaper publication. We can evaluate whether or not it is feasible to combine, in any way, the CPD adoption process with the Parks and Recreation process.

One of the sections in the design guidelines relates to the interior of the McNichol's building. The LPC doesn't typically review interiors, but you may want to reconsider this in this instance. Along with that, you may want to consider what parts of the building interior to review, for example, you might want to consider the main lobby, but not the restrooms.

The Preservation section of the design guidelines is one of the key elements and guiding principals in this document, but does not currently reflect the importance of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. More on this topic should definitely be added.

For the McNichol's building, we felt it was important to clarify that the new entry facing Colfax is really a restoration of the original entry.

A retractable cover for the Greek theater was not in the Park Master Plan, and it would be a new addition. My concern is that it would require a structure that could hide or obscure the architecture of the Greek theater and would therefore require very specific design guidelines.

The Parks Master Plan discusses the South Garden as an elevated structure with steps leading up to it, which I found to be a little bit intrusive and not the friendliest thing to add.

My recommendation is that we review another draft that incorporates comments from staff and LPC before proceeding to the adoption process.

H. Kuykendall – Mark Bernstein is taking over my position and will see this project through. On June 26 we had a meeting to roll out the draft which you have.

Tina Bishop – We are really looking at a holistic direction for future improvement. We want Civic Center to hold together as a whole. We have bond funding for the Greek theater, rehabilitation for Voorhies memorial and the Broadway Terrace. In doing the guidelines we have convened an advisory committee, of which Ed Shalkey and Ron Roybal were a part of that. We had a number of public meetings and other presentations. On June 26 we had a general public meeting to roll out the draft. As we move forward from here, we will collect comments from now till August 28, and combine the comments and integrate them into the final draft. We would like to also to have a document that works for the whole city not just Parks and Recreation.

Staff Comments

S. Leonard – I am surprised that under the guidelines principals that we don't see mentioned open space at all. The issue of the views is incredibly important. I would urge the issue on views not simply be based simply on north, south, east and west. The other issue that I am concerned about is the south garden as Trojan horse. The south garden is a nice euphemism, but every time it appears it looks like it could become a building. I don't see anything in these guidelines that would prevent that from happening. The other thing is that McNichol's was there prior to Carnegie was there before Civic Center was there, and the choice for nearly 90 years was to do nothing there. I don't see anything in the guidelines that would prevent any other buildings in there.

B. Gibson – I would add to Steve's feeling, if it is an option, helping us to set guidelines or making it not a possibility.

H. Kuykendall – I think the guidelines need to be evaluated with the master plan, which is clear that no other structure other than 2 kiosks would be there.

S. Leonard – Why not just take care of this in this plan and not present us with something that would permit a building.

H. Kuykendall – The intent is to develop gardens not buildings.

C. McConnell – If the intent is not a building, it should not look like a building. Steve really hit it under the guiding principals. There should be a clear statement about the importance. The feeling I got is that it is setting the stage for development.

S. Leonard – We need a huge amount more detail.

F. Mishler – Reading from the master plan, it says “In the spirit of completing original, the new park space will be created in the footprint of the original proposal. A sensible garden (which is the south garden) will be a lively new park space that connects to a park pavilion, a café, and a large garden. The new park space will be an elevated and well defined terrace that will respect the neo-classical design tradition that shall strongly characterizes Civic Center. The garden will be accents from the great walk along the grand staircase.”

S. Leonard – Well you know there is a difference between a trellis and a café.

D. Humphries – I have sort of an opposite view of what goes there. Along that north wall there could be a garden.

Kuykendall – It would be good to get further comments.

B. Gibson – We use the Secretary of State Standards.

E. Shalkey – One of the things that would prevent mischief is more people in the park. You need to encourage less traffic at Colfax and the corner of the Post building. I think it is clear if it is only in that context, but when you look at this as Steve, Mark and Carla said, and you look at the right angles, I don't see any reason why you couldn't say, "and the master plan is hereby ratified and the guidelines is squashed or whatever by saying that there will no habitable space in north quadrant."

C. McConnell – We could look at a change of pavement along Bannock.

E. Shalkey – It doesn't look like we are trying to preserve significant trees. Only the ones that are planted formal arrangement.

T. Bishop – No, the master plan guidelines shows the trees that we thought would be preserved and we haven't really carried it over for specific trees in the guidelines. With the rehabilitation approach for the Broadway terrace it is very clear and we are looking at respecting that. But it also allows for the removal of a large part of the interior features. The interior features diagram shows which trees are contributing. We did not include the grab trees or the evergreen trees in the lower terrace because they came later. Likewise we didn't include the crabapple trees that are around the Voorhies memorial.

S. Leonard – If we had a Period of Significance it would probably be 1928 to 1970. Are you saying that because the tree wasn't there in 1928 but was there in 1944 that it is gone.

H. Kuykendall – What we use is the ariel because it depicts the heights.

S. Leonard – That is of course your definition of before it went downhill.

H. Kuykendall – Well actually we did a very thorough analysis of the evolution and when things started to change and after that period it started losing some of the historic features.

S. Leonard – That is good to know, cause in effect that sort of constitutes the historic period you preclude a building and in fact you preclude anything there where the south garden is going to be.

H. Kuykendall – Well the rehabilitation area adjacent, you can always add to a historic landscape even though the feature wasn't there originally.

S. Leonard – So you are planning to get rid of fifty year old trees?

H. Kuykendall – Parks and Recreation has no intention of removing the trees in the park, we are not going to see that.

E. Shalkey – The concept of what the entire thing would be helpful. This implies something different

S. Leonard – I would like a separate landscape plan.

D. Humphries – We will have public comment on July 28, 2008.

C. McConnell – Where is the need for the cover?

E. Shalkey – The Greek theater is large enough for significant concerts or whatever, but it needs a canopy.

F. Mishler – I think we should be sensitive of the Greek Theater.

T. Bishop – A retractable or something that could be taken down every year might be good.

B. Gibson – The technology may be there

E. Shalkey – I think Fran's and Dennis's points are good, but the guidelines should be in place.

T. Bishop – Many of the historic replicas are not necessarily within the historic pattern and we would like to move some of them. Talking about the light fixtures we added in 1992.

D. Humphries – You will be coming back with the final draft and we will need to get our comments to you.

Meeting adjourned

Respectfully submitted,
Judy Blake