



TAX CREDIT STAFF REPORT

This document is the staff's comparison of the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation, Design Guidelines for Denver Landmark Structures and Districts, the Landmark Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 30, Revised Municipal Code) and other applicable adopted area guidelines as applied to the proposed application. It is intended to provide guidance during the commission's deliberation of the proposed application. Guidelines are available at www.denvergov.org/preservation

Project:	#2026-TAXC-010	LPC Meeting:	February 17, 2026
Address:	2600 N Milwaukee Street	Staff:	Kara Hahn
Landmark:	Henderson House		
Year structure built:	1963 (Period of Significance: Not noted)		
Council District:	#9 - Darrell Watson		
Property Owner:	Conner and Tessa Piretti		

Application: Residential Tax Credit Part 2 Review

Scope of Work:

1. Reroofed – removed asphalt shingle, and replaced with matching asphalt shingle
2. Replaced nine original aluminum windows with Marvin Essential Glider windows in bronze

Total Qualifying Costs: \$34,275.99

Tax Credit Amount: \$6,855.20

Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation

S.O.I. Standards for Rehabilitation	Meets Standard?	Comments
1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.	Yes	The reroofing and window replacement allows the long-term continued use of the house.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.	Yes	The roof reached the end of its lifespan and required replacement. It was replaced in-kind. The original aluminum windows were leaky and let in wind and rain/moisture. The owners completed an extensive search for windows that would be longer-term weather-proof, while matching in size, color, operation, and profile.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or	Yes	Neither the windows nor the roof created a false sense of history. Both are compatible with the property.

architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.		
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.	Yes	Both the roof and windows reflect the original construction and nothing that achieved significance on their own were impacted by the work.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.	Yes	The original windows were an important component of the property's character; unfortunately, they were no longer weathertight and cannot be repaired. Replacement windows that matched the size, color, operation, and profile of the historic windows were selected.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.	Yes	Unfortunately, the windows are no longer weathertight and could not be repaired. Replacement windows that matched the size, color, operation, and profile of the historic windows were selected.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL

END