LORETTO HEIGHTS AREA PLAN
Steering Committee Meeting #7

April 23rd, 2019
6 PM – 8 PM
Loretto Heights Library
Loretto Heights Steering Committee Meeting #7

AGENDA

Loretto Heights Library; 6-8 pm

Welcome

Historic Preservation Discussion

Parks & Open Space Discussion

Closing
WELCOME
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
GOAL: Identify the future of the Loretto Heights historic resources in the campus redevelopment
WHAT WE’VE HEARD: Historic Preservation
# Loretto Heights Kick-Off Survey: Feedback on Historic Preservation

- **Total Survey Respondents:** 380
- **Total Comments Provided:** 1,800
- **Comments on Hist. Pres.:** 738
  - “Likes and Assets”: 475
  - “Worries and Concerns:” 123
  - “Hopes and Opportunities”: 140
How do residents generally feel about the need for historic preservation in Loretto Heights?

Historic Preservation Comments by Sentiment (% of Total Historic Preservation-Related Comments)

- Likes and Assets: 64%
- Hopes and Opportunities: 19%
- Worries and Concerns: 17%
What do residents like about the area’s historic character?

Question: “What do you like about the Loretto Heights area?”
Most frequent comments related to historic preservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>No. of “likes and assets” comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration building</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iconic views of and from the campus</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic open spaces on the grounds</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General history, spirit and character</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater building</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Loretto Heights Online Kick-Off Survey
N = 475; Many comments included multiple sentiments
What concerns do residents have regarding historic preservation?

Question: “What concerns you about the Loretto Heights area?”

Most frequent comments related to historic preservation

- Maintain and preserve historic buildings: 35
- Potential loss of history and character: 20
- Need design review to ensure high quality development: 16
- Historic buildings need maintenance and updating: 16
- Potential loss of grounds/open space: 14

No. of “worries and concerns” comments

Source: Loretto Heights Online Kick-Off Survey
N = 123; Many comments included multiple sentiments
What are residents’ hopes for historic preservation?

Question: “What hopes do you have for the Loretto Heights area?”

Most frequent comments related to historic preservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History and buildings stay intact</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open/green spaces are preserved in new plan</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New uses serve the community and spirit of the campus (education, culture, arts, service, etc.)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration building is preserved</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel building is preserved</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of “hopes and opportunities” comments

Source: Loretto Heights Online Kick-Off Survey
N = 140; Many comments included multiple sentiments
Preservation Priorities: Which buildings are most important to nearby residents?

"I love the tower and being able to see it from a distance. It is a marker ‘home.’"
- Survey Respondent

"I would love to see an inclusive, intergenerational community....The theater would be an incredible community theater hub."
- Survey Respondent

"I'm concerned [the chapel] will be torn down. I was married here, as were many other couples. The stained glass and pipe organ was imported from Europe when the chapel was renovated. There's a lot of sentiment with the chapel, but the art and history should be preserved."
- Survey Respondent

**Preservation Requests by Building/Site (No. of Comments)**

- Admin Building: 192
- Theater: 86
- Chapel: 53
- Cemetery: 38
- Pancratia Hall: 27
- Pool Building: 21
- Library: 11
- Machebeuf Hall: 10
- Irrigation Ditch: 5
- Amphitheater: 4
- Walsh Hall: 2

Source: Loretto Heights Online Kick-Off Survey
Feedback by key word: Historic Buildings

**Admin Building: 192 Comments**
A powerful visual foundation and the emotional heart of nostalgia surrounding the campus. Residents feel very strongly that it should remain and its architectural character preserved, potentially to be reused to serve the community in the spirit of the original campus.

**Tower: 69 Comments**
Residents view the “iconic tower” as a “community beacon” and a “marker of home”. Many reference being able to see the tower from many areas of the city, and feel strongly those views should remain.

**Theater: 86 Comments**
The second-most frequently cited historical building, the theater is much-loved. Residents appreciate this cultural institution being nearby in their neighborhood, and would like to see it used more often to promote local arts.

**Chapel: 53 Comments**
Residents feel an emotional tie to the chapel, particularly those who were married—or who have had relatives married—inside. They especially appreciate its history, architecture, stained glass window, and organ.
Feedback by key word: Historic Buildings

Cemetery: 38 Comments
Residents would like to preserve the cemetery out of respect for those buried there. Many specifically requested that allowances be made for continuous maintenance of the site.

Pancratia Hall: 27 Comments
Residents appreciate the building’s role as a core campus building, and would like to see it preserved and adaptively reused. Multiple comments suggested reuse as affordable housing for seniors or other groups.

Pool: 21 Comments
Residents love the historic pool and its “beautiful roof”. Many would like to see it refurbished and opened to the public as a community resource.

Library: 11 Comments
Residents would also like to see the library re-opened and leveraged as a community resource and gathering space.
Feedback by key word: Historic Preservation

**Machebeuf: 10 Comments**
Residents fondly recall eating meals at Machebeuf during their time on campus. They would like to see the building maintained and adaptively reused.

**Heating Plant: 0 Comments**
No comments were submitted regarding the Heating Plant.

**Walsh Hall: 2 Comments**
Walsh Hall was mentioned less often than other campus buildings; however, one resident recalled memories of living in the dorm. Another requested it not be used for affordable housing.

**Amphitheater: 4 Comments**
Residents would like to see the amphitheater used for community events and outdoor gatherings.
Feedback by key word: Historic Preservation

Marian Hall: 0 Comments
No comments were submitted that referenced Marian Hall by name.

Art Studio: 0 Comments
No comments were submitted that referenced the Arts Studio by name.

“Save”: 38 Comments
Many comments referenced “saving” various campus buildings, as well as the historic cemetery. There is a lot of concern about whether core buildings will remain.

“Preservation/Preserve”: 135 Comments
Overall, residents feel strongly about the need to preserve both the area’s historic buildings, as well as its traditional spirit of community, education, arts and service.
Feedback by key word: Historic Preservation

“Reuse”: 10 Comments
Residents would like to see historic buildings reused to serve the community, and to help transform the campus into a more active, accessible, and inclusive neighborhood center.

“Views”: 123 Comments
Views are also considered integral to the site’s identity and character. Many residents cited views of the tower from elsewhere in the city, as well as views from the campus they feel are unparalleled in Denver.

“Landscape”: 6 Comments
While “landscape” was not frequently mentioned, many comments cited a love for the campus’ grounds, open spaces, views, and topography.

“History/Historic”: 246 Comments
Overall, residents love the history of Loretto Heights, its buildings, and its character. They feel strongly that this history stay central to the identity and use of the site.
LORETTO HEIGHTS HISTORIC RESOURCES SURVEY REPORT & INVENTORY
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND & TIMELINE

- 1812: Colorado attains statehood
- 1876: Sisters of Loretto founded
- 1888: Frank E. Edbrooke designed Administration Building constructed and opens
- 1891: Cemetery developed
- 1911-1912: Chapel constructed
- 1915: Rectory constructed
- 1916: Loretto Heights College opens
- 1918: Pancratia Hall constructed
- 1930: Loretto Heights Academy closes
- 1941: Art Studio constructed
- 1947: Landscape architect S.R. DeBoer develops campus master plan
- 1950: Machebeuf Hall constructed
- 1951: Amphitheater constructed
- 1955: Mother Pancratia Bonfils dies
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND & TIMELINE

- **1957**: Marian Hall and Swimming Pool constructed
- **1958**: City of Denver annexes Loretto Heights
- **1962**: Walsh Hall, Library and Theater constructed
- **1967**: Independent and secular board of trustees created
- **1968**: Sister Patricia Jean Manton becomes president and first nun to appear in secular dress
- **1969**: Loretto Heights College admits first male students
- **1970**: Musick & Musick Architects develop campus master plan
- **1988**: Telko University purchases campus
- **1989**: Loretto Heights College closes due to declining enrollment, coursework, and facilities move to Regis College
- **2017**: Westside Investment Partners, LLC purchases campus
- **2018**: Telko University closes
Historic Significance and Integrity

Period of Significance: 1891 – 1969

Areas of Significance:
➢ Education
➢ Religion
➢ Architecture
➢ Social History

Integrity: High
Evaluation of Historic Resources

TABLE 2: NATIONAL REGISTER AND DENVER LANDMARK EVALUATIONS FOR INDIVIDUAL PROPERTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>NATIONAL REGISTER</th>
<th>DENVER LANDMARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administration Building / Ad. Buildinga</td>
<td>Yes – already listed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sr. Lady of Loretto Chapel / Chapelb</td>
<td>Yes – already listed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>No – State Register only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Priest’s House / Bungalowc</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pancratia Hall</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Art Studio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Amphitheater</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Machebeuf Hall</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Central Heating Plant / Boiler Room</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Marian Hall</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Walsh Hall</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>May Bonfils Stanton Library / Libraryf</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>May Bonfils Stanton Center for Performing Arts / Theaterf</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Caretaker’s House</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a These two buildings were already National Register listed in 1975 as “Loretto Heights Academy,” although this designation only includes the building footprints. The boundary should be expanded to include viewsheds/landscape extending east to Federal Blvd. A similar boundary would apply to a potential Denver Landmark designation for this grouping.

*b The current “Loretto Heights Academy” National Register listing could be amended to include the Priest’s House.

c The Amphitheater was evaluated in conjunction with Machebeuf Hall since they were built at the same time and attributed to the same architect, John K. Monroe. Machebeuf Hall could be designated on its own.

d The 1988 Swimming Pool Enclosure does not meet the National Register “exceptional significance” consideration required for properties less than 50 years old.

e Marian Hall is attached to Pancratia Hall. For National Register evaluation, they are one building. For Denver Landmark evaluation, they could be designated separately.

f The Library and Theater were designed together, with their connecting Arcade, by local architects Musick and Musick. The two buildings, with arcade, would need to be listed in the National Register as an ensemble. While an ensemble listing is preferred for a Denver Landmark designation, one building could potentially qualify for local designation without the other, and if that happened, the arcade or appropriate portion of the Arcade should be designated, along with the Green Court.

g The c. 1970 Caretaker’s House west of the Library does not meet the National Register “exceptional significance” consideration, and no information was found in Loretto records to inform its origin, architect, or occupants.
Evaluation of Historic Resources – Historic Districts

The Swimming Pool would be contributing to a Denver Landmark Historic District, providing the period of significance extends from 1891-1988, but would not contribute to a National Register District.

Note: Protection of the extended viewshed boundary could be achieved by adding this area to the Denver landmark historic district boundary delineated in Option B, or through design standards and guidelines of the Area Plan.
Common Historic Preservation Tools
Common Historic Preservation Tools Matrix

This table indicates what each tool can achieve when applied on its own. Tools can also be combined to achieve multiple goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Register of Historic Places</th>
<th>Denver Landmark Preservation Easement</th>
<th>Historic Covenant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevents demolition</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires design review</td>
<td>No*</td>
<td>Yes (exterior only)</td>
<td>Yes (specific to agreement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No (though eligible for one time deduction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for State Rehabilitation Tax Credit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity in charge</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>City and County of Denver</td>
<td>Easement holder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If a National Register-listed property receives federal and/or state rehabilitation tax credits, the project must follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation—a set of design standards and guidelines that provide the foundation for the Design Guidelines for Denver Landmark Structures & Districts.
Individual vs Group
HISTORIC PRESERVATION DISCUSSION
Questions

1. What does historic preservation of the Loretto Heights campus mean to you?

2. Which of the Loretto Heights historic buildings and features should be a part of the campus redevelopment?

3. What level of change to the historic buildings and features are you comfortable with in the redevelopment?
PARKS & OPEN SPACE
WHAT WE’VE HEARD: Parks & Open Space
Loretto Heights Kick-Off Survey: Feedback on Parks and Open Spaces

- Total Survey Respondents: 380
- Total Comments Provided: 1,800
- Parks/Open Spaces Comments: 524
  - “Likes and Assets”: 296
  - “Worries and Concerns”: 88
  - “Hopes and Opportunities”: 140
How do residents generally feel about parks and open spaces in Loretto Heights?

Parks and Open Spaces Comments by Sentiment (% of Total Parks and Open Spaces-Related Comments)

- Likes and Assets: 56%
- Hopes and Opportunities: 27%
- Worries and Concerns: 17%
What do residents like about the area’s parks and open spaces?

Question: “What do you like about the Loretto Heights area?”

Most frequent comments related to parks and open spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open green spaces</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretto Heights Park</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature trees</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's a natural area/oasis within the city</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkable paths and trails</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Loretto Heights Online Kick-Off Survey  
N = 296; Many comments included multiple sentiments
What concerns do residents have regarding the area’s parks and open spaces?

**Question:** “What concerns you about the Loretto Heights area?”

Most frequent comments related to parks and open spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>No. of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of open spaces/low density</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of pedestrian and bike access and connections</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No publically accessible and welcoming open spaces</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and amenities in Loretto Heights Park</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of &quot;natural&quot; spaces/corridors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Loretto Heights Online Kick-Off Survey

N = 88; Many comments included multiple sentiments
What are residents’ hopes for the area’s parks and open spaces?

Question: “What hopes do you have for the Loretto Heights area?”
Most frequent comments related to parks and open spaces

- Open space is maintained: 55
- Loretto Heights Park is maintained and improved: 42
- Additional recreational amenities (sports fields, rec center, etc.): 35
- Area will be accessible, inviting and open to the community: 22
- Walkable paths and trails: 19

Source: Loretto Heights Online Kick-Off Survey
N = 140; Many comments included multiple sentiments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback by key word: Parks and Open Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Loretto Heights Park Connection”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents care deeply for their neighborhood park, and would like to see it maintained, expanded, and improved. Many residents also requested improved pedestrian connections and accessibility among the campus, the park, and nearby neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Trails/Paths”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents love the winding, walkways and “natural” and would like to see this system maintained and expanded for recreation opportunities and overall community wellness. They enjoy the elevation gain for exercise, the natural environment, and the beautiful views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Recreation”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents would like to see some of the open spaces on campus activated. It is important these amenities feel welcoming, inclusive, and accessible to everyone in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Ped/Bike/Sidewalks”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents would like to see accessibility improved for pedestrians and bikers. Many mentioned the lack of connections makes the campus seem uninviting, resulting in a lack of use for many nearby neighbors. There is a strong desire for wider, complete sidewalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback by key word: Parks and Open Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Playground”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents appreciate the playground at Loretto Heights Park but expressed concern about the lack of maintenance and amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Lawn”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents appreciate the open space and sightlines to the Administration Building provided by the front lawn. Many mentioned that it was a welcome respite from the bustle of Federal Boulevard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Water”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some residents expressed concern for proper stormwater drainage with the new development. Some also mentioned a desire to maintain a natural corridor around the irrigation ditch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GAME PLAN FOR A HEALTHY CITY
The Game Plan provides a roadmap for our parks, recreation programs, and urban forest to serve the needs of all Denverites in the face of population growth and climate change.

**EVERY DROP**
- Adapt to the changing climate and limited resources.

**EVERY PERSON**
- Diversify parks and recreation services.
- Grow the park system and recreation access.

**EVERY DOLLAR**
- Invest in Denver's parks and recreation resources and people.

**UNIQUELY DENVER**
- Connect to Denver's nature and culture.

---

**healthy CITY**
- Climate change adaptation
- Enhance biodiversity
- Resource stewardship

**healthy PEOPLE**
- Park/open space accessibility
- Improve & enhance parks
- Improve & enhance outdoor recreation opportunities
5 – 10 minute walk gaps
## Public vs. Private Open Space and Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larger</td>
<td>Smaller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More flexible spaces</td>
<td>Plaza like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of activity and uses</td>
<td>Designed to serve adjacent uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public master planning process following DPR public engagement</td>
<td>Small gathering spaces and play features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements</td>
<td>Privately owned and maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public parks following rules and regulations</td>
<td>Different rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Public access by an easement and or covenant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pocket Parks

Stout Street Childrens’ Park

1 inch = 40 feet at 11x17

Map Scale in Feet

DENVER PARKS & RECREATION
FEEDBACK FROM PUBLIC MEETING

Top Amenities

Community Gathering Spaces 55
Bicycle Friendly Trails 50
Parks/Open Spaces 51
Loretto Heights Park

We’ve heard concerns about the maintenance and programming of Loretto Heights Park. What improvements can be made to improve the experience?
Loretto Heights Park

Loretto Heights Park is a public park that includes the following amenities: picnic shelter, picnic tables, benches, playground, natural areas and a bike/ped path. What additional park and/or recreation amenities would you like to see accommodated as part of this redevelopment project that would complement this existing, adjacent community park?
Open Space

We’ve heard that it is important to have both passive open space (seating, trails, picnic areas) and active open space (athletic fields, courts, playgrounds). What proportion of the redeveloped campus should be passive or active?

a) All active space
b) Majority active space, some passive space
c) Equal mix
d) Majority passive space, some active space
e) All passive space
Open Space

Which types of private open space should be incorporated as part of the redeveloped campus (select up to two)?

a) Flexible grass lawn for recreation  
b) Formal sports field for league play  
c) Plaza space with outdoor seating  
d) Small pocket parks  
e) Retail space with outdoor seating  
f) Festival space for events (farmers market, etc.)
Open Space Amenities

Which amenities are most important to include in private open spaces within the redeveloped campus (select up to three)?

a) Nature Play (playground)
b) Public Art
c) Water Feature(s)
d) Seating
e) Hardscape (plaza with seating)
f) Amphitheatre
g) Dog Park
h) Fitness Equipment
i) Swimming Pool
SCHEDULE

• Three Steering Committee Meetings Remain
  • May – Implementation Strategies
  • June – Review of Final Concepts
  • July – Review Draft of Plan
UPCOMING ITEMS

May Steering Committee Meeting
Tuesday, May 28th
6pm-8pm
Loretto Library (3001 S. Federal Blvd.)

June Steering Committee Meeting
Tuesday, June 25th
6pm-8pm
Loretto Library (3001 S. Federal Blvd.)
Project Website

www.denvergov.org/lorettoheights