



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, September 2, 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, Ronald Roybal, Christopher Meza, Stephen Leonard, and Edward Shalkey

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

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

I. Review And Approval of Minutes

A. Motion by: C. McConnell, I move to approve the minutes of the August 5, and the August 19, 2008 meeting with corrections.

Second by: C. Meza

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

II. Public Hearings

Chair opened Public Hearing at 1:15 p.m.

1. East High School De-designation of land parcel **continued*

Applicant – Larry Nelson

Staff Presentation

S. Jameson - There is no evidence that the property included in the de-designation application was ever intended to be a part of the formal composition of the East High School site.

Using the current criteria, 2405 East Colfax Avenue, 1530 Josephine Street and 1525 Josephine Street do not meet the minimum criteria for designation in categories 2d Architecture or 3a Geography. Given the lack of citations in the original landmark application or current evidence linking these properties to the design of East High School or the City Park Esplanade these properties should be considered for removal from the property contributing to the East High School designation as a structure for preservation. There is no record of notification ever having been made to the property owner of 1525 Josephine St.

Applicant's Presentation

Jim Borgel – I am here on behalf of Beverly Clark Investments. I think there was clearly a mistake, and the best way to resolve this is to take care and move forward so Beverly can sell and retire.

The reason we are here today is the Ordinance. The fact that the survey expired in 1961 clearly shows that an error was made. This ordinance was adopted incorrectly.

Public Comment

Carolyn Etter – I signed up against this de-designation. If you decide based on the kind of information provided to you, that you make the reason for de-designation very clear. The reason we are all here is that East High is an extremely important Landmark and the Esplanade, and the 35' setback are critical elements of this designation.

Non-committal

Richard Cooksen – I arrived here 20 years ago, and it is nice to see Colfax come back to life again. I attend the Church of the City. I have listened to the evidence presented two weeks ago. It was disturbing and I have tried to talk to people and talked to a key person who was the secretary of the commission in 1990. I spoke to Robert Dencroix, and asked of the intent. He said that the designation of East High was for the school and the parking lot, and that there was no intent to designate the gas station and the old Safeway. Approve

Commission Discussion

- Mistakes were made by the city with regards to the legal description and lack of legal notification to property owners.

Motion by: C. McConnell, I move that we recommend de-designation of the property at issue to Council for the following reasons;

- 1) Lack of notification of the owner of the property**
- 2) Legal description in error**

Second by: C. Meza

Vote: Unanimous in favor, motion carries.

III. Design Review

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

Staff Presentation

G. Savage – This project received conceptual approval on June 17, 2008, and is back for final submittal. My recommendation is to approve the final design.

Applicant’s Presentation

Jim Bothwell, Bothwell Davis George Architects – The height and massing previously showed the roof being too tall and we have changed the location of the rooftop access to the back of the building and brought the height of the building down about 10 feet. We intend to use aluminum, clear, anodized windows with a dark brown finish.

Public Comment

Phillip Danielson – I believe the amount of metal siding is not in keeping with the neighborhood. This does a nice transition to commercial, and well uses a vacant lot. All I ask is for it to be more fitting. Approve

Gregory Holle – I am not for or against this project, just ask that you commit in your deliberation. Non-committed

Mark Waddell – I applaud the architect for the meeting with the neighbors. This is closer to where I would like to see it. I support this. Approve

Motion by: J. Bershof, Project 214-08, 1450 Franklin, regarding the issues related to this site, we approve, related to mass and scale be approved, and related to windows and doors be approved. But related to form, we ask that the canopy/porch be re-looked at in order to be more consistent with the guidelines for contemporary construction, especially Guidelines C3, B and C having to do with relating more to the historic elements in terms of the to scale, especially porches. We also approve for materials and that this be returned to staff.

Second by: C. McConnell

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

2. **Project #267-08 2801 W. 35th**

Staff Report

G. Savage - This construction was stopped by NIS and has been to the BOA for violation of the front and rear setbacks. My recommendation is that this does not comply with the guidelines and to deny it. This is a non-contributing structure in the district.

Applicant's Presentation

David Damon, Colorado Home Additions, LLC – We did not build the original structure, and I was contacted by the homeowner to solve this problem.

Commission Discussion

- Discussed whether this is a part of the house or an enclosed porch and how it will be used.
- There is an opportunity for other materials to help it blend more with the house.
- Concern was expressed over setting a precedent for enclosed porches on block.
- Concerned about the existing concrete ledge that caused other mistakes.
- Perhaps the porch could be slightly narrower and pulled in, as well as more vertical expression in the siding, and this might be helpful and more in keeping with district characteristics.
- The existing concrete base is massive

Motion by: J. Bershof, Project 267-08, 2801 W. 35th Ave., I move to deny this application as it is being presented and ask that the applicant return to the Landmark Preservation Commission, working with staff for a design that is compatible with the district, and based on the concept of enclosed porch, citing Guideline 9 and 34 and the Staff Report. We add the idea of the concept under New Construction, Landmark District Guidelines, that both reinforce the integrity of the district, Guideline 2., and that this returns to Staff and only return to the Commission if not resolved by staff.

Second by: S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

3. **Project #207-08 645 Race St.**

Staff Report

G. Savage – This project was previously reviewed and now comes back with a change to the roof material and shape: The slope of the new roof form is not compatible with the existing house. Guideline 9. The new roof form should be re-considered.

Applicants Presentation

Keith Krebs, Architect – This house is on the market with potential buyers. We thought a more traditional roof would be better. The materials are the same except for the roof.

Commission Discussion

Why did we feel it appropriate to approve? Could be as simple as “proposed changes are supportive of district characteristics”.

Motion by: S. Leonard, Project 207-08, 645 Race St., we move to approve as presented in the revised version, with the exception of the flat roof and horizontal siding area, and ask that it be brought back to staff.

Second by: B. Gibson

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

4. **Project 237-08 80 Fox St.**

Staff Report

S. Oliver – The proposal is to re-align the driveway and come straight out to the street, also this should go to the BOA. Particularly in historic neighborhoods the access is through an alley. Along Fox Street access to the lots is via the alley. There is one lot next door that has direct street access because it does not back to an alley. In order to keep the historical relationship to the street, alley access should be maintained.

My recommendation is to deny the curb cut with street access. I feel that the driveway can be adjusted to allow for a fence.

Applicants Presentation

Erin Gasner, applicant and owner – There are quite a few houses on my block that do have curb cut. I am trying to create something secure and it requires a 4' fence wrapped. Things have been stolen off my patio, and my car is not secure. Safety is an issue.

Commission Discussion

- This goes against the character of this district.
- A fence could build from the wall of the garage to the street which would be appropriate for the district.
- Applicant could return.
- This is counter to how vehicular access issues have been typically addressed in landmark districts.

Motion by: R. Roybal, Project 237-08, 80 Fox St. , I recommend that we deny the ability to put a new curb cut on this property.

Second by: C. McConnell

Vote: Two opposed and four in favor, motion does not carry.

IV. Applications for State Income Tax Credit
Reports & Recommendations by Preservation Staff

A. Applications for Preliminary Approval

Motion by: B. Gibson, I move to accept the tax Credits as presented.

Second by: C. McConnell

Vote: Unanimous, motion carries.

Meeting adjourned

Respectfully submitted,
Judy Blake