This document is the staff’s comparison of the Secretary of the Interior’s 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:** 2020-COA-165

**Address:** 3295 Meade Street

**Historic Dist/DLM:** Packard’s Hill Historic District

**Year structure built:** c.1925 (Period of Significance: 1886-1940)

**Council District:** #1 Amanda Sandoval

**Applicant:** Steven Bass, Empire Drafting and Design LLC

**LPC Meeting:** June 16, 2020

**Staff:** Abigail Christman

---

**Project Scope Under Review:**

- Replace non-historic windows on original structure
- Add a second-story addition
- Add a two-story rear addition
- Expand/finish basement and add two egress windows
- Install iron fence
- Add a rear deck

**Demolition** (only historic features are included in these calculations):

Roof: 363.35 sf

**Materials:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation: concrete</th>
<th>Roofing: asphalt shingle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siding: brick and cedar shingle</td>
<td>Trim: smooth fiber cement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows: aluminum clad wood</td>
<td>Doors: aluminum folding door, wood door</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Staff Summary:**

This application proposes to substantially expand the square footage of the historic structure at Meade Street with a rooftop addition, a two-story rear addition, and basement expansion. The existing house is 774 sf. The proposed additions would add 252 sf on the first floor and 630 sf on the second floor, more than doubling the existing sf. The existing unfinished basement will be finished and expanded to match the footprint of the house. The proposal also includes the replacement of non-historic windows on the historic structure, the addition of a 4’ metal picket fence along the north of side of the house, the replacement of the rear 6’ wood privacy fence, and the construction of a rear deck (15'-1" x 16'-1").
The bungalow at 3295 Meade Street is contributing to the Packard’s Hill Historic District. According to the designation application, the brick bungalow was constructed in 1925. The single-story bungalow features a front-gable roof and buff brick walls with a red brick foundation. A front-gabled projecting porch with battered brick piers, a solid brick balustrade, and open truss work extends nearly the full width of the façade. According to the property inventory form accompanying the designation, a brick garage was added on the alley in 1931 and a rear sunroom was added in 1950. Sanborn maps and aerial images show that the sunroom replaced a small rear porch at the southwest corner of the house. Since the sunroom was added after the period of significance of the Packard’s Hill district (1886-1940), it is considered non-contributing and has not been included in the calculations of the sf of historic material proposed for demolition.

It is very challenging to make any rooftop addition subordinate to the original structure. The small scale and simple design of this bungalow combined with the location on a corner lot make it especially difficult. Due to the corner lot, the proposed additions will be highly visible. Staff find that the proposed additions overwhelm the original structure. The additions will more than double the existing square footage, significantly changing the mass, form, and proportions of the house, losing the original bungalow form. Due to the corner location, these changes will negatively impact not just the historic character of 3295 Meade Street, but also the surrounding historic district. 3295 Meade Street is adjacent to two similar single-story, front gabled bungalows, 3289 and 3283 Meade Street. The other corners of Meade Street and 33rd Ave are occupied by a 1 ½ story eclectic residence (northwest corner), single-story terrace style duplex (northeast corner), and a vacant lot (southeast corner). The height and mass of the proposed additions would have a negative impact on these adjacent historic residences as well as the overall character of the historic district. Staff recommend denial, finding that the scale of the additions overwhelms the original structure. The additions do not not adequately relate to the original structure or the historic district and, due to the location on a corner lot, they will be highly visible.

Registered Neighborhood Organization (RNO) comments
The Design and Preservation committee of the West Highland Neighborhood Association (WHNA) have reviewed several iterations of this project. They initially met with the owner and a previous architect on January 14, 2019 and June 10, 2019. Landmark Staff referred a subsequent version of the proposal completed by the current architect to the RNO on January 13, 2020. The RNO met with Stephen Tuck, representing the owner 8 Ball Capital Inc., along with Steven Bass and Michael Payne of Empire Drafting and Design on March 9, 2020. Following that meeting several additional designs were also submitted to the RNO for review. RNO comments are based on the most recent design submitted to them on April 7, 2020. This design is similar to the design currently under review, though some details have been modified. The overall mass and scale of the additions is the same as that reviewed by the RNO.

The RNO does not recommend approval of the design, citing intent statement 3f (“ensure that an addition is subordinate to the main structure, has minimal visibility from public vantage points, and is compatible with the surrounding historic context”) and guidelines 3.2, 3.7, 3.8, and 3.10. The RNO states that: “The corner location and the public vantage point from 33rd avenue presents an additional design challenge. The proposed design of the addition lacks compatibility with and is not subordinate to the scale, massing and forms of the historic house structure. We suggest considering only a one-story addition at the rear of the historic house rather than a roof top addition. If eliminating the roof top addition is not viable, then the impact of the roof top addition should be mitigated by reducing the height of roof ridge line.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline</th>
<th>Meets Guideline?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.14 Maintain the pattern and proportion of historic window and door</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Most of the windows on the original structure have been replaced. These will be removed and replaced with windows more characteristic of the bungalow type. On the façade, simple one-over-one windows will be replaced with three-over-one windows. On the south side, two openings filled with glass-block will be replaced by paired three-over-one windows. A small one-over-one window will be replaced with a three-over-one window. On the north side, a one-over-one window will be replaced with a three-over-one window. Windows will be aluminum clad wood with simulated divided lights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>openings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Preserve the position, number and arrangement of historic windows and doors in a building wall. Modifying a window or door on the rear of a contributing structure may be considered on a façade that is not visible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Maintain the original size and shape of window and door openings on primary façades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Restore altered window or door openings on primary façades to their original configuration, when feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24 Preserve the form, materials and features of an original historic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The simple front-gabled roof will be significantly altered with the addition of a second story addition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roof.</td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Maintain the perceived line and orientation of the roof as seen from the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Design an addition to a historic structure to respect the character-</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>The proposed additions are not compatible with the scale, massing, or rhythm of the historic structure and context. The proposed rooftop addition and rear two-story addition will overwhelm the simple bungalow design. A modest scale is a character-defining feature of the original structure. Bungalows historically feature one or 1 ½ stories using dormers to keep the overall height of the structure low. The second story proposed for 3295 Meade St. is too tall and incompatible with the bungalow character. The first floor of the addition will be clad in brick and the second story with paneled cedar shingle. Cedar shingle is a traditional building material that is commonly found on bungalows, though it is not a material used historically for bungalows in Packard’s Hill. The shingle panel will also have a larger exposure (7”) than typically allowed by Landmark (5”). Windows on the addition are three-over-one sash or three-light casements. These windows have the same configuration as the new windows proposed for the historic structure, though the proportions are different. Generally, simplified windows are recommended for additions. A Nanawall folding door is proposed for the rear wall. This is not compatible with the historic structure or district character and may be visible from public vantage points due to the corner location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defining features of the historic district, the surrounding historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Design an addition to be compatible with the scale, massing and rhythm of the historic structure and context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context, and the original primary structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Use materials that are of a similar color, texture, and scale to those in the historic structure and surrounding historic context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e. Design windows and doors to be compatible with the primary structure and surrounding historic context, particularly when visible from public vantage points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Design an addition to be recognized as current construction.
a. Differentiate an addition from the original structure with an offset of at least four inches.
b. Differentiate an addition from the original structure with a change in material or size.
c. Use simplified versions of building components and details found in the surrounding historic context.
e. Do not design an addition to contrast starkly with the original structure. At a minimum, an acceptable design should be neutral and not detract from the district’s or structure’s historic character.

Yes/No  The additions are inset from the walls of the original structure. The rooftop addition will be differentiated with a change of materials, but the first-floor rear addition will use the same materials (buff and red brick) as the original building, including replicating the decorative brick pattern at the foundation. The windows proposed for the addition use the same three-over-one configuration as the original structure, rather than a simplified configuration. The mass and scale of the new addition will starkly contrast with the original structure.

3.5 Do not damage historic building fabric or obscure key character-defining features of the primary structure when building an addition.
a. Minimize the removal of original building fabric when attaching an addition.
b. Design an addition so it can be removed without destroying original materials or features.
c. Avoid damaging historic façades, cornice lines or other details.

Yes/No  The historic façade will remain intact. The rooftop addition will require demolition of a significant amount of the original roof. Due to the nature of rooftop additions, it would be very difficult to remove/reverse these alterations.

3.6 Design windows, doors and other features on a new addition to be compatible with the original structure and surrounding historic context.
a. Incorporate windows, doors and other openings at a ratio similar to those found on nearby historic structures. For additions with public visibility, doors and windows should have similar proportions and rhythms as windows on historic façades.

Yes/No  Windows will be aluminum clad wood with simulated divided lights. Windows on the addition are three-over-one sash or three-light casements. These windows have the same configuration as the new windows proposed for the historic structure, though the proportions are different. Generally, windows with simplified configurations but the same proportions are recommended for additions. A Nanawall folding door is proposed for the rear wall. This is not compatible with the historic structure or district character and may be visible from public vantage points due to the corner location.

3.7 Design the roof of a new addition to be compatible with the original structure and surrounding historic context.
a. Use a roof form that is consistent with the original structure’s roof form and those of structures in the surrounding historic context in terms of pitch, orientation, and complexity. An addition with a pitched roof is usually inappropriate for a structure with a flat roof.

Yes/No  The gable roof form of the addition is compatible with the gable roof form of the original structure. However, the complexity of the roof, with a bump out on the south side, is not compatible. The roof does not reflect traditional bungalow patterns. Bungalows historically feature one or one-and-a-half stories with the half story tucked into the attic space and utilizing dormer windows to keep to the overall roof height low.
### 3.8 Locate an addition to a residential structure to be subordinate to the existing structure.

- **No**

  The proposed additions are not subordinate to the original structure and will have a significant visual impact. The additions will more than double the sf of the house. The mass and scale of the additions would negatively impact the character and historic integrity of the structure, threatening the property’s contributing status within the district.

- **a.** Design an addition to have minimal visual impact to the existing structure.
- **b.** Place a one-story addition to the rear of the existing structure, if possible.
- **c.** Consider a compatible side addition if a one-story rear addition is not possible.
- **d.** Consider a compatible rooftop addition for a one-story house if there are no other alternatives. A limited program rooftop addition on a one-story house may be appropriate when the house is located on a small lot and there are no opportunities for expansion elsewhere on the property.

### 3.10 Design a rooftop addition to minimize impacts on the residential structure and context of the historic district

- **Yes/No**

  The rooftop addition will be set back 20'-1 ½" from the façade, preserving the façade of the structure. The rooftop addition is inset from the side façades of the existing structure, though the exact dimensions of the setbacks is not clear in the plans. The original structure is 23' - 10 ¾" wide while the rooftop addition is 20'- 4 ½" so the rooftop addition does not appear to be inset quite the required 2’ on both sides. The height of the rooftop addition is not visually compatible with the original structure and will visually dominate.

  - **a.** Set back a rooftop addition a minimum of 15 feet from the highest point of the primary façade to reduce its visual impact, help preserve the historic roof form, differentiate it from the original façade, and remain subordinate to the existing structure.
  - **b.** Set back a rooftop addition at least two feet from the side façades of the existing structure to reduce potential visual impacts and help preserve the existing roof form and historic building materials.
  - **c.** Minimize the height of a rooftop addition to ensure the historic structure remains visually prominent. Utilize dormers and knee walls to keep heights low.

---

**Recommendation:** Denial

**Basis:**

Additions are not subordinate to the historic structure. The mass and scale of the additions overwhelm the original structure. The additions do not adequately relate to the original structure or the historic context and, due to the location on a corner lot, they will be highly visible (2.24, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5-3.8, 3.10).

**Suggested Motion:** I move to DENY application #2020-COA-165 for the additions at 3295 Meade Street, as per design guidelines 2.24, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5-3.8, 3.10, character-defining features for the Packard’s Hill historic district, presented testimony, submitted documentation and information provided in the staff report.
1929 Sanborn Map with 3295 Meade St. outlined in black
1933 aerial with 325 Meade St. outlined in black