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:** 2018-COA-502*

**Address:** 2500 Arapahoe Street

**Historic District:** Curtis Park ‘H’ Historic District

**Year structure built:** Empty portion of lot

**Council District:** #9 Candi CdeBaca

**Applicant:** Root Architecture & Development

**Past LPC Actions:**

Landmark Preservation Commission Meeting – April 16, 2019
2018-COA-502* 2500 Arapahoe Street – Curtis Park
Description: Recommendation for BOA Variances.
Motion by E. Hummel: I move to recommend to the Board of Adjustment a variance for the primary street setback, the side street setback, the primary street transparency, the roof deck in the rear 35% of the zone lot, and the orientation of the dwelling units at 2500 Arapahoe Street as per design guidelines 4.2a and b, 4.8, 4.3c, 4.17b, and Section 12.4.7.5.C of the Denver Zoning Code.
Second: K. Corbett
Vote: Unanimous in favor (9-0-0), motion carries

Landmark Preservation Commission Meeting – December 18, 2018
2018-COA-502 2500 Arapahoe Street – Curtis Park
Description: Infill – Design Details
Motion by K. Wemple: I move to approve application #2018-COA-502 for the design details of the infill construction at 2500 Arapahoe Street, as per design guidelines 4.3c and e, 4.4e, 4.6, 4.8, f.19, 4.21b, 5.21 and 5.23, character-defining features for the Curtis Park historic district, presented testimony, submitted documentation and information provided in the staff report with the following conditions:
1. A brick soldier course header be provided at the windows on the south side of the west elevation to match that shown on the south elevation, Guideline 4.20.
2. Doors and windows located along walls clad with lap-siding to have a minimum 4” trim surrounding the opening, Guideline 4.20.
3. Full depth brick is used throughout.
Second: K. Corbett
Vote: Unanimous in favor (8-0-0), motion carries.

Landmark Preservation Commission Meeting - June 5, 2018
2018-COA-173 2500 Arapahoe Street
Description: Infill – Mass, Form and Context Review
Motion by: K. Wemple: I move to approve application 2018-COA-173 for the mass, form and context review for continued
the infill building at 2500 Arapahoe Street with the conditions that the sunken basement patios on 25th Street are omitted and the three square windows on the north façade have a more vertical orientation, as per design guidelines 4.1, 4.2, 4.9, 4.3a and 4.4b, presented testimony, submitted documentation and information provided in the staff report.
Second by: K. Corbett
Vote: Unanimous in favor (6-0), motion carries

**Project Scope Under Review:**
Revision to the design detail submission specifically associated with rooftop access for units 1 through 4. This entails removal of the roof hatch at these units and construction of a projecting 2nd-floor balcony and spiral stair at the north elevation of these four units. The proposal also entails the addition of a door and transom at the 2nd floor north elevation of these units for access to the balconies.

**Materials:**
Railings and spiral stair: painted metal

**Staff Summary:**
During the building permitting process, the building department determined that roof-hatch access is not compliant with the adopted building code due to the lack of a continuous handrail. The applicant proposed installing a rooftop stair bulkhead at the southwest corner of units 1 through 4 (the Board of Adjustment denied the previously-proposed variance for a roof deck on unit 5 toward the east side of the site); however, Landmark staff reviewed the proposed stair bulkheads and believed them to be too prominent and not compatible with the surrounding historic context. We encouraged the applicant to explore alternatives for roof access. The current proposal entails the addition of a projecting 2nd-floor balcony on the north elevation of units 1 through 4, and the installation of a spiral stair at the east end of each balcony leading from the 2nd floor to the roof. The stair and balcony will have a vertical-picket metal railing. The window configuration will be altered to accommodate a door from the 2nd floor to the balcony; this door will be capped by a transom to align the door and window openings.

Excerpted from Design Guidelines for Denver Landmark Structures and Districts, January 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline</th>
<th>Meets Guideline?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Design windows, doors and other features to be compatible</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>The proposed windows and doors on the north elevation of units 1 through 4 are compatible with the placement and configuration of windows in the surrounding historic context. A transom has been added above each door to allow the glazing height to be aligned with the adjacent window. On the units clad with lap siding, the windows have trim surrounding them, but the door and transom do not. We recommend more consistency in these elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Incorporate windows, doors and other openings and a ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similar to those found on nearby historic structures. New</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction with public visibility should incorporate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doors and windows with similar proportions to those in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surrounding historic context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Maintain the typical historic placement of window headers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and sills relative to cornices and belt courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Use door widths, heights and materials that are similar to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doors on historic buildings in the surrounding historic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Design a building to include the typical features and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhythms of historic buildings in the surrounding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
context/block, using similar proportions and dimensions. Features to reference include:
c. Window locations, proportions, and recess in the wall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.3 Design a building to include the typical features and rhythms of historic buildings in the surrounding context/block, using similar proportions and dimensions. Features to reference include: e. Scaling elements and articulation, such as belt courses, dormers, balconies, decorative roof cornices, etc.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>The 2nd-floor balconies at the north elevation on units 1 through 4 are visible from the street but are similar in scale to the inset patios at the 1st floor on units 2 through 5. 1st and 2nd floor patios and balconies are found in the historic district but they are typically found on non-visible rear elevations. The proposed 2nd-floor balconies are on the rear elevation of the building, but due to the corner lot, these balconies are readily visible from Arapahoe Street.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.17 Ensure that decks are compatible with the surrounding historic context. a. Locate decks to minimize visual impacts on the street when they are not a part of the historic context. b. Do not incorporate a roof deck unless it is not visible from the street, is oriented away from neighbors’ yards, and is screened to reduce privacy invasion…, and does not adversely affect the surrounding historic context.</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>The decks and spiral stairs on units 2, 3 and 4 will have minimal visual impacts on the street, but the balcony and stair on unit 1 are more visually prominent due to this unit’s proximity to the sidewalk and street. While safe, code-compliant stair access to the roof deck is required, the roof deck itself is an amenity rather than a required element on the building. Staff recommends the stair and balcony on unit 1 be eliminated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:** Approval with Conditions

**Conditions:**
That the balcony and spiral stair on unit 1 be eliminated, and the door and transom on units 2 through 4 include trim to match the adjacent window opening.

**Basis:**
The balcony and roof stair on unit 1 are highly visible from the street (Guideline 4.17). The lack of trim on around the 2nd-floor doors and transoms on the north elevation of units 2 through 4 does not maintain the typical features or rhythms found in the surrounding historic context (Guideline 4.8).

**Suggested Motion:** I move to approve application #2018-COA-502* for the revised design details of the infill construction at 2500 Arapahoe Street with the conditions that the balcony and spiral stair at unit 1 be eliminated, and the door and transom on units 2 through 4 include trim to match the adjacent window opening, as per design guidelines 5.8 and 4.17, character-defining features for the Curtis Park historic district, presented testimony, submitted documentation and information provided in the staff report.
Sanborn Map: 1904 with the south end of 2500 Arapahoe Street outlined