



JOHN W. HICKENLOOPER
Mayor

CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER
LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION

201 W. Colfax Ave.
2nd Floor, Dept. 209
Denver, Colorado 80202
Phone: 720-865-2915
Fax: 720-865-3056
TDD: 720-865-3055

MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, December 19, 2006 at 1:00 p.m.
MEETING LOCATION – 201 W. COLFAX, RM. 4.F.6

Members Present: Carla McConnell, Dennis Humphries, James Bershof, Barbara Gibson, Alice Jennison, Stephen Leonard, Ronald L. Roybal, Elizabeth Schlosser, and Edward Shalkey

Staff Present: Everett Shigeta, Christie Murata, Kerry Buckey, (City Attorney,) and Robert Atkinson

Chair called meeting to order at 1:13 p.m.

I. Review And Approval of Minutes

December 5, 2006

Motion S. Leonard to approve the minutes of the December 5, 2006 meeting as amended

Second by E. Shalkey

Vote: Unanimous in favor, Motion carries.

II. Public Hearings – Design Review

1. **Project #202-06 552 Humboldt Street** **Residence**
(Continued from 10/03/06) **Addition**
Driving Park H.D.
Applicant – Michael Koch
Property owner – Tim Miller

Public Hearing opened at 1:15 p.m.

Staff Report by Christie Murata:

There are two options. The second is the more successful of the two. The bungalow form is easier to see.

Presentation by Michael Koch:

Sheet 3.5 is an elevation drawing showing both options. The roof looks tall in elevation. Option A represents what we brought in last time. Option B slopes back. We have model views for both. Option A has a clear relationship between old and new. The height of the roof and the brick are the main differences. The bungalow solution separates the old and new roofs and the brick differentiates old and new. We're happy with both but we prefer option A. We have a garage elevation and a model. After conversations with the next door neighbor we're flexible on the setback and amenable to a 3' setback

Questions:

E. Schlosser: The difference between A and B is cost?

M. Koch: Design.

J. Bershof: A is what you presented last time?

M. Koch: With minor changes.

R. Roybal: The east elevation, you did some gymnastics over the window.

M. Koch: Yes, for head room. The front is the most important façade.

E. Schlosser: Other changes to the garage?
M. Koch: I didn't have a drawing before.

Public Comment:

**Robert Restad
560 Humboldt Street**

I'm concerned with the distance from the garage to the property line. They should consider the mature trees in that area. A 3' setback would be OK. The new will blend with the neighborhood. 525 Franklin is similar but it doesn't blend as well.

Discussion:

J. Bershof: It's attractive. I prefer the smooth roofline; Option B.
C. McConnell: I appreciate the improvement in the plans. I also like Option B.
E. Schlosser: We're in agreement.
E. Shalkey: I support B as well. I appreciate the front porch and moving the garage.
C. McConnell: Motion?

**Motion by J. Bershof to approve option B for Project #202-06, 552 Humboldt Street, with the caveat that the garage be moved 3' from the property line
Second by E. Schlosser**

Discussion of the Motion:

S. Leonard: Windows?
E. Schlosser: Retaining the windows on the north façade?
M. Koch: We need two windows. We'll replace the aluminum with metal clad wood.
C. McConnell: Details to Staff?
J. Bershof: Yes.
E. Schlosser: French doors?
M. Koch: That's acceptable as well.
J. Bershof: Amend to include the north facing windows, the south facing doors to be French doors, no mullions is OK and it's acceptable to replace the metal windows with aluminum clad wood windows. The details can come back to Staff.
E. Schlosser: I'm OK with the amendment.

Amended Motion:

**Motion by J. Bershof to approve option B for Project #202-06, 552 Humboldt Street, with the caveat that the garage be moved 3' from the property line, north facing windows, south facing doors to be French Doors, no mullions OK, and that it is acceptable to replace metal windows with aluminum clad wood windows, details to come back to Staff
Second by E. Schlosser
Vote: Unanimous in favor, Motion carries.**

**Motion by E. Schlosser to close the Public Hearing
Second by S. Leonard
Vote: unanimous in favor, Motion carries, Public Hearing closed.**

III. Design Review

2. **Project #372-06 727 Detroit Street**

East Seventh Avenue H.D.

Applicant – Michael Koch

Property owner – Russ & Fara Bowler

Residence

Addition

Chair reviewed procedures for design review.

Staff Report by Christie Murata:

This is a noncontributing 1962 house. This is an interesting block with an internal carriage lot. They worked hard on this project. It's much more appropriate now.

Presentation by Michael Koch:

We originally considered demolition. This house has very small rooms. There's no room for a master bedroom. The kitchen is small, even by 1962 standards. Land values here are quite high. While this is an expensive addition it's done in a way that works on this house. The addition is in line with what's in back, with the exception of the porch and the 3-car garage. The front is most exciting. There were so many problems, the windows are off center and the doorway was added. We tried to give the house some character. We decided on the prairie style. The symmetry of the porch re-centers the house. The new brick is blond in color for a two-toned brick scheme. The porch has four posts and a wood handrail system, a wood door and eave brackets. Today's presentation is slightly different from your packets. The rear porch is behind the garage. We also extended the new configuration of the brick piers. We center the sidewalk on the house. We restudied the front dormer. The family really likes the house as a dream home rather than a tear down.

R. Bowler: The unique part is the little private park in the rear.

Questions:

E. Schlosser: This is Charlie Willies old property. Why so arts & crafts instead of International?

M. Koch: My clients asked for more character.

E. Schlosser: Is the front porch original?

M. Koch: No.

J. Bershof: This is interesting, most noncontributing structures are torn down. This is great. Will this be of its time though?

M. Koch: The brick color is key. Also it notches in. That's an important detail.

R. Roybal: Did Staff see a need to differentiate the brick?

C. Murata: You really don't have to do that.

R. Roybal: Would you have done this if you hadn't had too?

M. Koch: It's good to differentiate and brick's almost impossible to match.

E. Shalkey: Drainage?

M. Koch: Roof drains.

R. Roybal: Is there a parapet?

M. Koch: All you'll see is the mansard.

R. Roybal: How do you handle the brick and the window proportions?

M. Koch: Looking original is a delicate process.

Discussion:

C. McConnell: We've seen projects with long unbroken fascia lines. There is a break on this but it's too monolithic. The chimney breaks that line on the north.

M. Koch: The new eaves are smaller than the original.

C. McConnell: It's partially visible from the alley.
J. Bershof: It's well done.
E. Schlosser: I could do without the dormer.
E. Shalkey: It helps to center the house.
C. McConnell: You're proposing a different window configuration for the dormer?
M. Koch: Yes.
S. Leonard: I'm not bothered that this blends. It looks handsome.
J. Bershof: Staff's comment that a south addition would be inappropriate is right on target. This looks nice.

**Motion by S. Leonard to approve Project #372-06 as presented with details to come back to Staff
Second by J. Bershof
Vote: Unanimous in favor, Motion carries.**

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>3. Project #411-06 535 16th Street Downtown Denver H.D. Applicant – Josh Comfort, Comfort Development Services Property Owner – Bill Saslow, 16th & Welton Investors</p> | <p>Commercial Addition (Patio area)</p> |
|---|--|

Chair reviewed the procedure for design review.

Staff Report by Christie Murata:

I understand the financial concerns but this cuts into a significant entry and it will have great impact. There should be a different way to solve this.

Presentation by Josh Comfort:

We appreciate the opportunity to bring this forward. The Appaloosa Grill's business has thrived. This project expands the restaurant into the adjacent space. The parallel piece is to expand into a sidewalk café; patio seating for six to twelve people. The issue is the symmetry of the Masonic building. Technically this is an addition. We feel this is a mall issue rather than an historic preservation issue. It enlivens the mall and gives visibility to the restaurant. It's temporary in nature. While the façade is symmetrical to the corner, the whole building isn't. There was a plan for the building after the 1984 fire. That plan crafted the main entry. There were no doors on the storefronts. There really is a need to attract more tenants. There is now a variety of doors. We're trying to come to terms with outside activity on this building. The addition of a railing is incidental to the building. It seems the guidelines would allow this addition. It plays off the 1984 modifications. Activity is mall related, and the streetscape is very much a part of this proposal. Consider this positively. There's no impact to the historic building. The restaurant owner and Mr. Saslow are here to answer any questions.

Questions:

E. Schlosser: Is this related to the smoking ban
J. Comfort: No, just to summer dining.

C. McConnell: The railing's not attached?
J. Comfort: That's correct, per the Downtown Denver Partnership's standards.

J. Bershof: This change will require people who want to go into the restaurant will have to use the main building entrance?
J. Comfort: Yes.

J. Bershof: You can still enter the building from the left?
J. Comfort: Yes.

E. Shalkey: That's a congested spot. I don't object to this.
J. Comfort: The Partnership's standard distance to the curb is 10'. There's 13 feet here. We only come off the building 63".

E. Shalkey: You can't do this on the Welton Street side?
J. Comfort: No.

R. Roybal: Cutting of the main entry is my only concern but if the owner is OK with this I'll support it.
W. Saslow: We want to increase interaction with the mall

C. McConnell: The "Where the Buffalo Roam" sign?

W. Saslow: No, that sign was there from renovation. We'd like to see it removed.

**Motion by E. Schlosser to approve Project #411-06 as presented
Second by J. Bershof**

C. McConnell: Staff has asked that you stipulate removal in winter.

John: We intend year round use.

Vote: unanimous in favor, Motion carries.

- 4. Project #340-06 1001 East Bayaud Avenue**
(Continued from 10/17/06)
Country Club Gardens H.D.
Applicant – Rick Petersen, Oz Architecture
Property Owner – Graham Hatcher, The Broe Companies

**Residential
Addition, Alteration
and Preservation**

J. Bershof recused himself as his firm is the applicant in this matter.

Staff Report by Christie Murata:

There are four issues:

- The design guidelines,
- The maximum envelope,
- Moving the east-west wing to the north, and
- The shadow study.

I'm uncomfortable with redrawing the guidelines. This isn't developed enough. This may limit the LPC's actions. The maximum envelope; this is way too big. They've made efforts but the shadow study shows a huge impact on the courtyard.

K. Buckey: The first iteration of the Country Club Gardens Design Guidelines, and the development agreement, and the designation were all approved by City Council, so they have to approve guideline changes. Your role is to make a recommendation to Council. The applicant can go to Council with or without your approval.

Presentation by Rick Petersen:

Mr. Petersen recapped the previous submittal before proceeding;

.
This is two towers tucked behind the existing buildings. Last time you asked us to restudy the corner and its relationship to the Norman and to do a shadow study. What we're seeking today is specific approval for the envelope. We have precise dimensions for the envelope with step and set backs.

We want to mitigate the impact of the southeast corner, toward the Norman. We decided to move the mass to the north to reduce its impact. We moved the base back 3 feet. A more effective way was to move the building back into alignment with the Norman, to allow for much more open space.

We looked at June through December for the shadow study, to evaluate the impact. The two courtyards are in shadow in all cases. We weren't concerned because when we looked at current conditions much of both courtyards were in shadow anyway.

There is a third item, the modern language; we found that a complimentary building may be more effective. Looking at the current guidelines they may not be the best way to go. We suggest detailed guideline language to be complimentary motifs.

Questions:

E. Schlosser: The height has increased?

R. Petersen: No, 300' is the limit.

C. McConnell: On page 5, the red outlined area is where you pull back?

R. Petersen: Yes.

C. McConnell: To what does item 1 refer?

T. Bishop: There are a number of non-historic items. We'd like it made clear that we could remove these if appropriate; volunteer trees for example. We've talked about the pattern of the landscape.

C. McConnell: I understand but it seems so general.

J. Bershof: Compatibility?

C. McConnell: More specific site features.

R. Petersen: The current guidelines don't allow changes to the landscaping. Removing volunteers would be a benefit of the guideline changes.

C. McConnell: On sheet C3A, outbound extended?

P. Petersen: Facades that aren't curved into the building, the inset balconies for example. It's a good place to start looking at the design of the building.

C. McConnell: Could you use that to reduce the amount of brick?

R. Petersen: No.

C. McConnell: The guidelines are pretty well written on balconies.

R. Petersen: We don't suggest striking that. It's matching versus complimentary.

C. McConnell: The façade details that relate to a specific building should be specific.

R. Petersen: The existing details talk about incorporating details similar to existing.

C. McConnell: You're trying to eliminate the horizontal banding?

R. Petersen: No, complimentary not similar.

C. McConnell: Parking?

R. Petersen: We simply go from similar to complimentary.

Public Comment:

Dianne Stallos

Against

99 South Downing Street

I represent the Norman Homeowners Association. Are you committed to moving back to the east side of the Norman?

R. Petersen: Yes.

D. Stallos: To reducing the mass?

R. Petersen: Yes, in relation to the Norman.

D. Stallos: On the Sun study; a potentially 300' building will have no more impact than existing landscaping?

R. Petersen: If the building went to 300' but that's not our intent.

D. Stallos: This building negates the integrity of the neighborhood. Honor the 2001 commitment to leave the Norman open. Move this further west. That's what we fought to obtain.

Suellen White

For

1322 east Bayaud Street

I'm in favor of the new design. It's aesthetically better. The impact on Ogden is less. Off-street parking is a concern. The Bro Tower doesn't have sufficient parking. 600 more units will have a huge impact.

Nancy Enyart

Against

99 South Downing Street

As this building moves toward Downing it impacts the historic avenue. Contemporary; looking at the existing tower, Mr. Bro's idea of contemporary is unacceptable. I'm glad you're looking at the guidelines.

Stewart Hiatt

Against

99 South Downing Street

Traffic is the biggest problem in the area. A massive structure is destructive of the historic character of the area. It's a 300' prison wall. 900 plus cars will significantly impact traffic. I'd like to see a traffic study. There are 49 homeowners in the Norman and one person can destroy our home.

Ruth Ridick

Against

99 South Downing Street

There's already a lot of traffic on Bayaud. Our hope was your concern for landmarks. Help us preserve our neighborhood.

Marc Halpern

Against

99 South Downing Street

Our biggest concern is the viability of the Norman. If it's destroyed what will happen next? Some owners will sell and property values will go down. The Norman is beautiful but it will be destroyed if this goes up. We'll sell.

Ron Mason

Against

99 South Downing Street

Country Club Gardens is beautiful and worth preserving. The scale of this project is overwhelming and will destroy the neighborhood. This overbuilds the site. I call upon the developer to do something that will benefit our community. I urge the LPC to use critical assessment, protecting the neighborhood.

Michael Levy

Against

99 South Downing Street

Where will the egress be?

R. Petersen: Same as today.

M. Levy: North on Downing?

R. Petersen: A traffic study will be done.

M. Levy: Anyone going north will have to make a U-turn. The streets here are very narrow. The Traffic department is very concerned with traffic in this area. You should provide free parking to residents and guests. Where will construction staging take place?

R. Petersen: You'd have to ask the contractor.

M. Levy: The bottom line is that in trying to preserve Country Club Gardens the scale impacts the neighborhood, ruining the quality of life. Don't ruin a neighborhood to save a few buildings.

Discussion:

D. Humphries: You said you'd give us details on the guideline changes.

C. Murata: It's amorphous. It's not clear what the impact would be.

C. McConnell: On the envelope, they have the right to go up?

E. Schlosser: We thought this was an improvement.

C. McConnell: Do you feel the modifications were what you asked for?

D. Humphries: Did you study other alternatives?

R. Petersen: We understood height as paramount.

D. Humphries: Slice the lower step off.

R. Petersen: We looked at that. We thought it better to step down and relate to the Norman. That's in fact more sympathetic to the neighborhood.

C. McConnell: The owners have the right to fill the envelope.

K. Buckey: You have the flexibility within the guidelines

R. Petersen: If it doesn't need to be 300' it won't be. We want it as low as possible.

C. McConnell: I'm not sure that's greater impact than pulling back.

R. Petersen: Our attempt...

- D. Humphries: Lowest?
- R. Petersen: It raises the garage 5 feet. Drive alignment drives this.
- C. McConnell: We're looking at two things:
- Recommending changes to the guidelines and
 - Recommending changes to the massing.
- R. Petersen: Would the LPC consider removing the tower?
- C. McConnell: I don't know that we could. This was from a desire to preserve as much of Country Club Gardens as possible.
- D. Humphries: This is much better than the existing, proper separation between the buildings and the Norman is still an issue. The neighbors want the project to go away; that's not going to happen. This is better. We shouldn't recommend changes to the guidelines until they're clarified. The important issue is the impact on the Norman.
- E. Schlosser: We're moving in the right direction, though?
- D. Humphries: Yes.
- S. Leonard: A motion to allow something better?
- D. Humphries: Push the first floor back to the 12' setback.
- E. Schlosser: But that would go 5' higher.
- C. McConnell: The symmetry is nice in the model but you could still pull back from the Norman.
- D. Humphries: We can't design this. Ask for a restudy.
- C. McConnell: Recommendation to Council?
- S. Leonard: Retain the guideline language or ask them to come back. Council will have to change it. You can ask them to come back or recommend it to Council with our modifications. The applicant doesn't gain a lot.
- D. Humphries: They'd have to use the current guidelines.
- E. Schlosser: Complimentary isn't what the neighborhood wants. They want similar.
- R. Petersen: Similar could be more massive.

Motion by D. Humphries to recommend forwarding Project 340-06, 1001 Bayaud Street to City Council with the current guidelines in place and the applicant to restudy to reduce the impact on the Norman
Second by E. Schlosser

Discussion of the Motion:

- R. Roybal: What distance are we looking for? Plus 40' or plus 80'? If you remove 40' on the edge you could pick up parking space without impact. You'd gain 20'. Is that acceptable? It's doable.
- R. Petersen: Pulling parking over to Ogden?
- R. Roybal: You'd create more mass to the south.
- G Hatcher: We can't because we're landlocked on both sides. Parking would have to go deeper
- D. Humphries: Strike the proposed changes to the guidelines on page 5 and ask for a restudy of the massing to further reduce the impact on the Norman.
- E. Schlosser: I'd accept that amendment.
- E. Shalkey: I'm still concerned with the shadow study. Amend to study massing to increase the amount of Sun light.
- E. Schlosser: Is that driving height?
- D. Humphries: I'd accept that but using December 21st as the existing condition it won't get much better. I'm concerned with going taller so I won't accept that amendment.

Amended Motion:

Motion by D. Humphries to recommend forwarding Project 340-06, 1001 Bayaud Street to City Council, striking the proposed guideline changes on page 5, asking for a restudy of the massing to further reduce the impact on the Norman

C. McConnell: Call the question.

Vote: D. Humphries, A. Jenison, R. Roybal, B. Gibson, C. McConnell, E. Schlosser, J. Bershof, and S. Leonard in favor, E. Shalkey: opposed, Motion carries.

III. Other Business

A. **Historic Urban Edge District, (HUED,) LPC Decision**

Introduction by Kerry Buckey:

Only one item is within your authority; to approve the design guidelines approved by the Lower Downtown Board, (LDDRB,) and forwarded to you. You can approve them or deny them, sending them back to the LDDRB with your recommendations, but you can't change them.

Two other issues; the changes to chapter 30 and the PUD, both of these are under the authority of City Council. The LDDRB has made their recommendations and you can do the same but it's just a recommendation, you have no authority in either matter. Both will go forward. The PUD will go to Planning Board for a recommendation.

E. Schlosser: The PUD goes forward whether we approve or not?

K. Buckey: Yes. Council can wait for guidelines or approve them as they did with Country Club Gardens. Changes to Chapter 30 are theirs as well.

C. McConnell: We're considering the final draft as approved by the LDDRB. We will entertain public comment.

Presentation by Tyler Gibbs:

This process began 18 months ago with David Tryba exploring what could be done on the Bell park site. The planning Department became aware of the need to address the entire edge of the district where it meets Speer Boulevard and the Auraria Campus. There are six sub-areas. Sub-areas 1 and 2 have two options under these guidelines;

1. A 400' and a 55' building, or
2. A building at 85' and one at 55'

Both options anchor the corner.

Sub-area 3 has two sites, because of the view corridor, one at 85' and the other at 64'. Sub-area 5 matches the Volker and Acme Lofts. Sub-area 6 is the Children's Park.

The LDDRB added more specific language- calling attention to the area's unique character. Visual access and pedestrian scale were reinforced with forms and rhythms that are complimentary to the historic district, relating to the building types in the district. The LDDRB approved the guidelines at their December 7, 2006 meeting, support their work and that of the stakeholders group.

Questions:

C. McConnell: In sub-area 1 option 1, the limit of the parking is 7,500 square feet?

T. Gibbs: The parking is below grade. 7,500 square feet is the tower.

C. McConnell: So, parking could cover much of the area.

T. Gibbs: True, but you wouldn't see it. Look at page 18. there's a limit on the height of guard rails the best way to address this is to talk about the objective- a low wall or fence to provide security, insuring clear visibility, there's language that addresses that on page 9.

C. McConnell: Sub-area 3 could be a parking structure?

T. Gibbs: That view corridor has to be at grade.

C. McConnell: Why is the Bell Park site different?

T. Gibbs: you can't have structures in a view corridor. Fences and walls are OK as long as they don't obstruct.

R. Roybal: page 26 says that parking may be surface is that your intent?

T. Gibbs: Only limited guest and service parking. We haven't written anything for sub-areas 3 and 5.

E. Schlosser: Why two options? Why not one or the other?

T. Gibbs: We knew the existing guidelines don't address this site and we can't predict what the market will ask for. So the options address the site without being narrowly drawn. We can look at both of those. It's important to be able to respond to the market.

D. Humphries: Shouldn't the PUD say something about guest and service parking?

T. Gibbs: I thought it did.

E. Shalkey: The last paragraph on page 26?

R. Roybal: Parking needs to be enclosed.

C. McConnell: The criticism is that these will still be parking lots.

T. Gibbs: That's not the intent.

D. Humphries: There should be language in the guidelines about how vertical walls are treated.

T. Gibbs: There's no great detail on that. It's subject to LDDRB review.

D. Humphries: I thought that was the purpose of guidelines.

R. Roybal: The current guidelines are very specific regarding parking structures.

T. Gibbs: All those guidelines apply.

D. Humphries: Would the guidelines apply to a garage wall on the creek?

B. Gibson: The LoDo guidelines apply.

D. Humphries: This is a unique parking situation.

R. Roybal: The LoDo guidelines talk about new buildings having a maximum height of 130' in Special Review Districts, (SRD.) How do you deal with a new type of structure?

T. Gibbs: That's why there are specific guidelines for each unique site. Where these are silent the LoDo guidelines apply.

E. Shigeta: We have first floor parking in LoDo. It's treated as structure. The LDDRB felt they had enough to control. They were comfortable.

C. McConnell: I'm concerned this is based on the assumption of a certain development team. Who owns it today won't necessarily be the developer.

P. Park: This is shaping the public realm, recognizing unique conditions.

T. Gibbs: The guidelines must serve any proposal.

R. Roybal: in the other SRD's we have specific guidelines. This new SRD treats individual parcels. There's no guideline specific to the whole district.

B. Gibson: When you put in SRD's there are specific areas.

R. Roybal: True but this is treated like six separate SRD's. Why not just do that or have guidelines for the whole SRD?

T. Gibbs: That's what we're doing.

P. Park: Look at page 6, the design principles, one formal characteristic is the shaping of the blocks by Speer and the creek. Each block has its own unique conditions, the notion of a tower on Speer as a gateway, a signature element, from either direction. This document is organized around principles and general guidelines. Each block is unique so there's more detail than in other SRD's.

E. Schlosser: What about the affect of a 400' tower on the historic district?

P. Park: Understand, the historic character of this site has been altered. We have high-rises on the edge of many districts. This is within the historic district. The value of Bell Park is open space. What was there historically was city hall, and a tower but now it's open space. The reality is that the historic pattern has changed. This recognizes the dynamic character of the city. That's why there are two options. We change history all the time. We need balance.

E. Schlosser: With that thinking you could have the tallest building in the world here. This wouldn't pass Federal review. You're creating new rules for historic preservation.

T. Gibbs: What we value is openness.

E. Schlosser: I don't agree with your values. This is politically driven.

T. Gibbs: The importance of the creek has been talked about for decades.

R. Roybal: The creek is clearly an amenity but you're talking about a gateway to LoDo. Why does a gate way have to be 400' tall? Gate ways are pedestrian oriented. This is a private structure, gate ways are public. To create a gate way is an incorrect response to LoDo.

T. Gibbs: A gate way doesn't have to be pedestrian oriented.

P. Park: Parking lots don't make a gateway.

C. McConnell: Let's hear from the public.

Public Comment:

Jeff Shoemaker

For

Greenway Foundation

966 South York Street

There's an opportunity here. This is challenging. I believe the proposal is a good one; to create a bold entry to LoDo. This is the last opportunity to expand open space on the Cherry Creek, a rare opportunity. We will partner with the City and the developer to take Bell Park back to a place of honor.

Deborah Wicks

Against

1551 Larimer Street

I'm new to the area. I'm there because I love LoDo, maybe in response to the building I live in. It sticks up in the middle of an historic district. I'd not like that to happen again. We have to treasure our historic districts. Have the courage to show us what a tower would look like.

Tom Young

Against

1551 Larimer Street

This sets an extreme precedent. This will be the "Darth Vader" of downtown. Look at Washington and Cheesman parks. This should be one or two story buildings.

John Anderson

For

1615 17th Street

My position has been as a representative for Historic Denver, Inc. I was on the LoDo Board. We were always afraid of a bad proposal in this area. This is a unique transitional zone, encompassing the creek and Speer. This addresses that. This is the way we need to go. The tower is a marker.

John Fuller

Against

1551 Larimer Street

I've been a developer in Denver for 50 years. There's nothing wrong with the present guidelines. This is architectural gobbledy-gook. If you allow a high-rise in LoDo you destroy the work of decades. This will destroy the integrity of the district. Study this carefully when you make your recommendations.

James Kurtz-Phalen

For

370 17th Street Suite 4800

This proposal respects the historic district with two options. We believe that opening up these parcels is a valid way to serve the district. This area lacks the characteristics of LoDo. Keep in mind that the tower is a trade-off for open space.

Fabby Hillyard

For

LoDo, Inc.

1616 - 17th Street #468

I support Mr. Kurtz-Phalen. This area has been neglected for years. This proposal was an opportunity to look at this district. The stakeholders group reflects that. This gave us an opportunity to apply historic values to the area. Vertical density gives open space and enhances Bell Park.

Cathy S. Krendl

Against

1551 Larimer Street

You were told you were useless. When a court looks at this they'll recognize your authority. If they can't change Broadway, how can they do this? They argue facts. There have been changes, but not a tower. As a member of the stakeholders group; there was no discussion of a tower. They're asking you to obliterate the

historic district. Take a moral stand against end runs around the historic district. I quit the stakeholders group.

Jack Houser

Against

1551 Larimer Street

I was on the neighborhood planning committees. When the guidelines were established there were exceptions; three special review districts, but at no time were we asked to consider a tower. You're being asked to choose between a tall, spectacular, 400' tower and a short fat ugly building. I support maintaining the current design guidelines.

Kathleen Brooker

For

Historic Denver, Inc.

1536 Wynkoop Street

I object to Ms. Krendl's statement that a tower was not discussed at the stakeholders meetings. Historic Denver supports the HUED guidelines..

Jack Ton

For

Larimer Place

1590 Little Raven Street

Mr. Shigeta shared my letter with you. Our Board supports the HUED. We participated in the stakeholders meetings. We also support the tower option which provides an important connection to the creek and to the Auraria Campus. This proposal and the design guidelines support Larimer Square, the Tivoli, as well as the Volker and Acme buildings. We are opposed to a second tower.

Lester Ward

Against

1551 Larimer Street

This is a preservation commission, I moved here before Denver's historic urban edge was established. This proposal disestablishes what was established years ago; the Auraria Parkway with vistas of grassy areas along the Cherry Creek, Larimer Square, and Speer Boulevard, then the high-rise commercial buildings of downtown. Entering from Speer all of the structures gave an exciting vista of Downtown Denver. Building a tower destroys any meaningful edge. Observe the present height limitations. A 400' tower destroys the downtown experience.

Z. L. Pearson, Jr.

Against

1551 Larimer Street

Thank you for being gatekeepers. Ordinance 109 and Chapter 30 provide guidelines for preserving the historic district. A 400' tower as a transition is ridiculous. We support the fourth Special Review District but not the tower option. Option 2 provides access to the creek. Approve option 2 and deny option 1.

Fred A. Deering

Against

1551 Larimer Street

We moved here because of the charm of a great city. Look at Los Angeles and San Francisco. LA is a big city that isn't pleasant. San Francisco is also big but with beautiful buildings. Be San Francisco, not LA. One thing about Denver; it's not Chicago or New York. Keep it at today's level.

Jessica Parker

For

Downtown Denver Partnership

511 16th Street, Suite 200

The Partnership supports and we participated in the stakeholders group. We'd like to acknowledge everyone's work on this. The objectives were to:

- Acknowledge the importance of the site,
- Improve Speer Boulevard,
- Enhance the connection to Auraria and the creek,
- Protect the view plane.

We need to resolve the connection between Auraria and the city. This is a key gateway.

David Tryba
1620 Logan Street

For

The question before you is part of the urban edge district. Of the 15 parties in the stakeholders group 13 voted to support the HUED. Those in the district accepted our QUID PRO QUO. This was a diverse group. Jack Ton represents a 16 member board. We've been asking for this for 5 over two years.

J. Ton: Larimer Place doesn't oppose the fourth special review district.

Discussion:

C. McConnell: I'd like to poll the Commission. I'll start; I applaud everyone's efforts. These are good guidelines. But, in looking at the current LoDo guidelines I'm struck by how they discuss height and what an important issue height is. The currently guidelines are very appropriate. A 400' tower violates the spirit of the historic district. Option 2 is good.

E. Schlosser: I agree. We could suggest the removal of option 1.

E. Shalkey: The height doesn't bother me. It's an imperfect compromise but it is possible politically.

J. Bershof: I also support this. I appreciate the neighbors' interest but many of them live in a pretty tall building themselves. I'm for it.

B. Gibson: Knowing what's gone into this I'm in favor of it. I agree that height and the tower are controversial issues. The LDDRБ needs our trust. This is an area we've struggled with. I'm in favor of it.

D. Humphries: I think we've done some great things Unique guidelines are required, and we have them. The tower is the only issue. We should applaud the effort. The reference to San Francisco was interesting. The Transamerica Tower became a signature building. There hasn't been any great justification for a 400' tower but we shouldn't ignore the LDDRБ's unanimous approval. The issues have been addressed. I'll support this. I think the city gains much by this.

A. Jennison: I agree with Mr. Humphries. It'll come down to design review. I'm inclined to trust the LDDRБ's decision. If I were given the opportunity to choose; I'd choose Option 2, but this is a worthy trade-off.

S. Leonard: I'm perplexed by guidelines that allow two distinctly opposed options. I'd be more comfortable with just option 1. Have you come up with justification for option 2?

R. Roybal: In reviewing the HUED guidelines, the current LoDo guidelines and the neighborhood plan; these guidelines are good. The only thing I disagree with is the tower. Context and massing are important. Development shouldn't move beyond the established height restrictions. LoDo was historic for a purpose. I'm opposed.

C. McConnell: We have options. We can turn this down and recommend changes but the PUD and the ordinance changes will go through anyway.

E. Schlosser: What's the height at Union Station?

E. Shigeta: 250 feet.

S. Leonard: It all comes down to principles and politics. It will go forward but we can stand on principle. We can't stop this so we haven't gained anything. These are nice guidelines, but powerless.

C. McConnell: Your comment on option 2 is good.

E. Schlosser: Option 2 is like London or Paris while Option 1 is different, a novelty

J. Bershof: I disagree. You have more visibility.

R. Roybal: Bell Park will be open either way.

P. Park: Part of the trade-off is an increase in open space; more exposure of the authentic historic district.

R. Roybal: In your proposal you talked about the view plane. You have to deal with that but it's preserved in both options.

P. Park: Seeing the authentic edge of the historic district was part of the discussion. Height is a trade-off acknowledging the value of the land and the needs of the developer. The two options are different in form but the volumes are close.

T. Gibbs: View and open space; you get more exposure with option 1.

C. McConnell: More open space at the expense of the pedestrian experience. A building under option 2 can have public spaces. The tower is a private space. Option 2 is closer to what we're trying to preserve.

S. Leonard: At 85' the site could be built from sidewalk to sidewalk.

K. Buckey: The PUD would limit that.

P. Park: It's a 375' tower plus 25'.

**Motion by D. Humphries to approve the Fourth Special Review District as presented in the December 12th design guidelines
Second by E. Shalkey**

Discussion of the Motion:

E. Schlosser: Mr. Leonard put it very well; we should vote our hearts. This is a land swap and it's not a good precedent. Vote right and let Council decide.

D. Humphries: I agree it's a land swap but this is about the right approach to the special review district.

C. McConnell: Call the question.

Vote: D. Humphries, J. Bershof, B. Gibson, E. Shalkey, and A. Jennison in favor, R. Roybal, C. McConnell, S. Leonard, and E. Schlosser opposed, Motion carries.

**Motion by S. Leonard to recommend the proposed changes to Chapter 30 of the Revised Municipal Code be made
Second by J. Bershof**

Vote: S. Leonard, J. Bershof, B. Gibson, E. Shalkey, A. Jennison, and DS. Humphries in favor, R. Roybal, C. McConnell, and E. Schlosser opposed, Motion carries.

Vote: S. Leonard, J. Bershof, B. Gibson, E. Shalkey, A. Jennison, and DS. Humphries in favor, R. Roybal, C. McConnell, and E. Schlosser opposed, Motion carries.

C. McConnell: The PUD?

D. Humphries: I'm still concerned with parking.

**Motion by D. Humphries recommending approval of the PUD with the exception of allowing surface parking
Second by E. Shalkey**

Vote: J. Bershof, B. Gibson, E. Schlosser, E. Shalkey, A. Jennison, and DS. Humphries in favor, S. Leonard, R. Roybal and C. McConnell opposed, Motion carries.

Vote: J. Bershof, B. Gibson, E. Schlosser, E. Shalkey, A. Jennison, and DS. Humphries in favor, S. Leonard, R. Roybal and C. McConnell opposed, Motion carries.

V. Administrative Approvals

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. Project #386-06 2536 West 34th Avenue Potter Highlands H.D. Property Owner/Applicant – Chad & Jennifer Gentry</p> | <p>Residence Addition, Alteration, Preservation, Maintenance & Rehabilitation (House & Carriage house)</p> |
| <p>2. Project #388-06 1427 Larimer Street Larimer Square H.D. Applicant – Patricia Mueller, Larimer Square Management Property Owner –Hermanson Family Trust & Downtown Denver Investors</p> | <p>Commercial Alteration (Storefront)</p> |
| <p>3. Project #389-06 444 17th Street Downtown Denver H.D. Applicant – Jeff Skowmal, Colorado Signworks Property Owner – 444 17th Street Associates, LLC</p> | <p>Commercial Signage “US Bank”</p> |
| <p>4. Project #401-06 1646 Vine Street Driving Park H.D. Applicant – Ken Maner, Reardon Enterprises Pools & Spas Property Owner – Joshua & Melissa Pace</p> | <p>Residence New Construction (Spa and Pool)</p> |
| <p>5. Project #413-06 485 Williams Street Wyman H.D. Property Owner/Applicant – David Kempf, Urban Vision, LLC</p> | <p>Residence Adaptive use, New Construction (town home conversion)</p> |
| <p>6. Project #417-06 2041 Larimer Street</p> | <p>Commercial</p> |

Ballpark Neighborhood H.D.
Applicant – Tony Newsome and Jonathan Weaver
Property Owner – Tony Romano, Romano Family Trust

Rehabilitation
(Storefront)

7. Project #418-06 1120 East 6th Avenue
Alamo Placita H.D.
Applicant – Jane P. Master
Property Owner – LHL Partnership

Commercial
Signage
“Montecito”

8. Project #420-06 820 16th Street
Downtown Denver H.D.
Symes Building
Applicant – Perry White, Rusch Signs
Property Owner – Sterling & Associates

Commercial
Signage
“Edible Arrangements”

9. Project #421-06 3124 West 21st Avenue
Witter-Cofield H.D.
Applicant – Dave Knowlton, Budget Garages, Inc.
Property Owner – David Wesoloskie

Residence
Detached Garage

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

A. Applications for Preliminary Approval

- 1. Leonard Residence
646 Franklin St.
7th Ave. H.D. Interior and exterior renovations
Qualified Costs: \$98,800
Total Costs: \$98,800
- 2. Wichern Residence
745 Lafayette St. Interior and exterior renovations
7th Ave. H.D.
Qualified Costs: \$100,000
Total Costs: \$147,900
- 3. Gentry Residence
2536 W. 34th Ave. Interior and exterior renovations
Potter Highlands H.D.
Qualified Costs: \$220,000
Total Costs: \$220,000
- 4. Schlosser Jordan Residence
777 Williams St. Exterior rehabilitation
7th Ave. H.D.
Qualified Costs: \$27,000
Total Costs: \$27,000

B. Applications for Final Approval

- 1. Howard Residence 32-05
3405 Alcott St Interior renovations
Potter Highlands
Qualified costs: \$94,169
Total Costs: \$176,902

2. Yates Residence 16-06
2525 W 34th Ave. Interior renovations
Potter Highlands
Qualified Costs: \$80,301.26
Total Costs: \$80,301.26
3. Rockmount Buildings 55-06
1626 Wazee St. Interior renovations
LoDo
Qualified Costs: \$380,375
Total Costs: \$587,172
4. Niederloh-Van Heuvelen Residence 54-06
300 Marion St. Interior renovations
Country Club H.D.
Qualified Costs: \$240,092
Total Costs: \$312,236
5. Ervolina/Atkins Residence 23-06
345 Lafayette St. Interior renovations, HVAC
Country Club H.D.
Qualified Costs: \$135,688
Total Costs: \$155,000
6. Wightman Residence
727 Elizabeth Roof
7th Ave. H.D.
Qualified Costs: \$17,221.00
Total Costs: \$17,221.00

Motion by S. Leonard to approve both preliminary and final applications for Colorado State Income Tax Credits as presented

Second by J. Bershof

Vote: Unanimous in favor, Motion carries.

VII. National Register of Historic Places and State Register of Historic Properties - None

VIII. Committee Reports - None

IX. Designations - None

X. Information Items - None

XI. Chair's Time

A. Civic Center Issue

S. Leonard drafted a letter expressing the thoughts and recommendations of the LPC concerning Civic Center Park,

E. Schlosser: Should this letter go to every Council person?

S. Leonard: Yes, with copies to the Conservancy and the Parks & Recreation Department as well.

Motion by E. Schlosser to move forward with the letter expressing the thoughts and recommendations of the LPC concerning Civic Center Park to the Mayor, with copies to every Council person, the Conservancy and the Parks & Recreation Department

Second by S. Leonard

Vote: Unanimous in favor, Motion carries.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert L. Atkinson