



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, August 5, 2008 at 1:00 p.m.
MEETING LOCATION – 201 W. COLFAX, RM. 4.F.6

Members Present: Chair Dennis Humphries, Co-chair Carla McConnell, Ronald Roybal, Stephen Leonard, and Edward Shalkey

Absent: Jim Bershof, Barbara Gibson, and Christopher Meza

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

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

I. Review And Approval of Minutes

II. Design Review

1. Project #254-08 2013 Grove St. Residence
Staff Presentation

S. Oliver – This application is to do work for the foundation and brick restoration, and it could have been administratively approved, but there are two items that I wanted to bring to the commission today. They are the replacement of asphalt shingles with a product that looks like a steel panel with deformation to simulate the shake. The second is to replace the front porch with Trex. My recommendation on the shake is a denial, as I didn't think the form of the steel would provide the sharp edge shadowing that you would get with the original product and that you would get with the dimensional asphalt shingle. The applicant also provided an alternate, the cedar shake and in conversation, they elected to bring the original material to the commission for review. Secondly, I tried to do an evaluation of what was historical and in the neighborhood of like design, and felt based on what we had observed on the street, that the original house probably had concrete on the porch and steps, and to change that to Trex or a wood porch would diminish the character of the relationship of the traditional character of the house.

Owner and Applicant's Presentation

Roy Vestal, property owner – The porch is not a consideration at this time, as we are not sure about where we are going with that. We have found that the foundation is falling apart and have made that a priority.

I have lived in this house for 8 years, and want to bring the house to its original character.

- 1) Our goals are for the roof, as we wanted the shake shingle look like what is still there underneath.
- 2) We want to get ventilation into the attic. This type would provide a ridge type and this would provide the ventilation.

This product would reduce our insurance costs and this product would do that. Cedar has the shake look, but it is not proven yet. Fire hazard is a consideration. It also fades quickly and not a look that we want.

Scott Hiram, Gulf Eagle Supply representative – This technology is new, but the product has been out about 50 years. This is a long term fix, not a short term, and provides about a 28% insurance reduction. Decra is the name of this product. It is expensive, but like most things that are, it is really good. From an engineering and design standpoint it really is a matter of opinion. This also has zero maintenance.

D. Humphries – Wood shakes would be less in width.

S. Hiram – This product comes in 49" in length by 14" in width.

C. McConnell – How durable is the coating?

S. Hiram – It has been tested up to 112 mph, is galvanized aluminum and zinc and will not rust or be compromised by the elements.

R. Roybal – It will not have the shadows as shake provides.

C. McConnell – What was your decision with Cedur?

S. Leonard – It looks not much different than asphalt.

E. Shalkey – It does not look like shake.

R. Roybal – Originally, I was opposed to this, but I would probably support it.

S. Leonard – I would agree that is better than asphalt.

C. McConnell – I wouldn't approve a standing metal, but I think this is close in character to wood shakes and a reasonable compromise.

D. Humphries – Typically we approve shake, this has such a long straight line.

S. Leonard – We will probably see some offset of joints.

E. Shalkey – In the world of preservation, we go for shake.

C. McConnell – If you can't use original material, you have to look at the characteristic and this product looks like it becomes too regular, too uniformed and too machined.

Motion by: S. Leonard, for Project 254-08, 2013 Grove St., I move to approve the use of the Decra material on the roof for this project.

Second by: R. Roybal

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

R. Roybal – This is an attempt to mimic the texture of asphalt shingle, the character and feel of original material.

S. Leonard – By doing this on an experimental basis and we are not setting a precedent.

2. Project #207-08 3400 E. 7th Ave. Residence
Staff Presentation

G. Savage – This project is to enclose an existing patio, also utilizing the existing concrete brick foundation wall, relocating an existing fence on the north side and adding similar fence. The applicant wants a put standing, seamed metal roof of the patio, rather than the tile roof which in on the existing roof of this structure, which is not in keeping with the district. I think the setback of the fence, we did work with the applicant and got it moved back 3', and they will do some landscaping. One other thing that is of some importance is that 7th Avenue Pkwy has a setback of 20' and this is only setback 16'6", but given that the house doesn't meet the existing Pkwy setback, I felt that they did make an attempt to move it back as far as they could.

Applicant's Presentation

Sandy Thompson, Architect – We would like to continue the gate around feature around to the 6th street side of the property, and we have worked with Parks and Recreation. Yes it is a 20' setback, however we are utilizing basically the existing footprint of the building, that porch and brick, to enclose the existing summer porch. They have replaced the existing roof with clay tile and copper, and wish to continue this.

R. Roybal – Are these fixed windows, and are you maintaining the door opening size? What is the exterior sheathing?

S. Thompson – No, we would like to match the double hung look with casements. We are maintaining the door opening size, because the lot is long and narrow.

R. Roybal – If you had a choice, would you have gone with the tile roof?

S. Thompson – Yes.

R. Roybal – The windows do distinguish it from the original house and the shingle would continue that.

C. McConnell – This addition will be very visible. There is one step of design evolution that is needed. It lacks articulation, required by its very visible position along 7th Avenue.

D. Humphries – Even a flat roof might be appropriate, and I am not sure this is ready for approval.

S. Leonard and E. Shalkey both voices their agreement with D. Humphries.

Motion by: C. McConnell, Project 207-08, 3400 E. 7th Avenue, we move to deny the proposal for the addition based on its lacking sufficient architectural development to reinforce characteristics of the contributing house. Also to deny the proposal for the change of character of the fence and the extension of the fence, based on the staff report.

Second by: S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

**3. Project #169-08 777 Marion St. *continued Residence
Staff Presentation**

S. Oliver – After the last meeting, I met with the applicants, and we had a conversation about lowering the columns. I tried to convey what could be approved; subsequently they submitted something that reduced the columns, but not enough. I recommend denial.

Dennis Green, attorney for Mona Diaz – The applicant has spent over \$31,000, but were misled by contractors. My understanding was that the mass of the columns should be reduced.

Gail Berry, Architect – I came into this project after the first denial. I felt that it was very massive and I think that the color is too white. We lowered the pillars and move the gate up the steps. We thought we could stain or cover it with vines to help them “go away”. I suggested capping the pillars and a 4” cap on the wall. I also suggested shrubs.

D. Green – As you can see, we have been responsive and reduced the mass of the pillars. The only tall columns that are left in this concept are the ones at the corners.

D. Humphries – I see in the motion that there are two issues; one is to reduce the mass which is what we just discussed. The other is says that the material presented better relate than to materials found to be prevalent to that particular district.

G. Berry – That is why I put the cap on there.

R. Roybal – Comparing the south elevation, it looks like the coursing is higher.

D. Green – They have already spent about \$10,000 in taking it down some.

Ellis Merith,, Mona’s Diaz’s husband – A jackhammer could loosen or crack the stone.

S. Leonard – If this fence didn’t have the wrought iron fence, would it need a permit?

Multiple commissioners – Yes

C. McConnell - During our initial consideration we were concerned about the detailing of the stonework. There was no jointing, masonry or finish that reflected typical masonry characteristics of this district. Gail's suggestion of a cap is good; however, I think that the wrought iron is not the correct approach, and the fence design is way too ornamental. Also, the south wall is too high and out of character for this district.

E. Shalkey – I'm more neutral on the fence. I am most bothered by the wall, the masonry itself I think you should take the walls down to the step level.

S. Leonard – The fence design is better and should be less ornate. I agree with Ed, to take the masonry down would be better. I think they have tried and a reasonable compromise would be to simplify the wrought iron. I think the cap helps it to be less informal.

R. Roybal – I agree that the stone should have been different, and I would support simplifying the fence on top of the wall.

C. McConnell – The compromise is to leave the masonry and eliminate the wrought iron.

E. Shalkey – The right thing should be done, with no compromise.

S. Leonard – I'd rather be right with the City. I'd ask that sandstone be used to cap the whole masonry wall and that the design of the fence be more in keeping, and that on the south side either the masonry be taken down to a level equal to the east side or if left, that there be no railing on top.

Motion by: C. McConnell, Project 169-08, 777 Marion St., we move to approve the proposal for renovations to the garden wall, with the requirements: regarding the garden wall, require a sandstone cap to be used on the columns and wall, on the south side the site be lowered to the same as on the east wall, and that any ornamental fencing not be over six feet to top and the wrought iron be simplified to simulate what was shown in the submittal, and that the applicant bring this back to staff.

Second by: R. Roybal

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: E. Shalkey

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Blake