Dec 28th, 2023

Krystal Marquez, City Planner

Via email: krystal.marquez@denvergov.org

Re: 2914 California St

Dear Krystal and Land Mark Commission,

The Curtis Park Neighbors Design Review Committee reviewed this project via Zoom on Dec 27th 2023. We met at 6:00 pm and had five people in attendance along with the owners of the property as the applicant team.

The CPN Design Committee had several concerns with the ADU.

The majority of the attendees felt that the overall placement and the mass and scale of the ADU was appropriate for the district and was consistent with previously approved ADUs in the district. Guidelines 4.18 a, b, c and 4.19 a, b and d. One attendee disagreed.

The majority of the attendees felt that the flat roof form was found in the district and was appropriate for the ADU as the commission has previously approved flat roof ADUs with a pitch roof primary structure. There have been numerous examples of ADUs in the district that the commission has previously approved with roof forms that do not match the primary structure. Guidelines 4.19 a. One attendee disagreed.

The majority felt the ADU to be subordinate to the primary structure, mainly in its size. Guideline 4.19 b One attendee disagreed.

If the ADU where to have a hipped roof form found on the primary structure, the ADU would be taller in height than that of the primary structure. The current design with the flat roof allows the ADU to not exceed the height of the primary structure which meets design guideline 4.19 b.

The majority of the attendees felt that the front elevation of the ADU should be clad in brick, guideline 4.19 c. This ADU will be visible from the street given the width of the lot and the placement of the ADU. Curtis Park Neighbors have consistently stated that an ADU needs to maintain the same material as the primary structure on the façade visible from the street on the ADU. There was discussion of it being one story of brick and the second story to be 4-inch horizontal lap siding or standing seam metal, all are quality materials and are found in the district. One attendee felt given how far back the ADU would be it was not necessary to have brick on the front façade. All attendees agreed that the vertical wood siding and stucco was not found in the district and not compatible with the district, guideline 4.19 c. We encouraged the applicant to look at metal, brick or horizontal lap siding.
The committee all agreed on the windows needing to be taller and narrower and asked the applicants to look at one over one vs. casement. The commission has approved casements and it is a secondary structure but we felt having one over one windows would help tie in the ADU to the primary structure, guideline 4.19 c. The side elevation windows that were rectangular need to be split to be square. No slider windows are in the district.

The stair railing and rear balcony railing need to read vertical rather than horizontal. The horizontal is more modern and is not reflective of what is found metal-wise in the district.

The sliding door on the alley elevation needs further study. The door could remain a slider but have mullions to give the appearance of French doors or the applicant can investigate smaller double doors.

In conclusion, mass, scale, and form fit the district. The height is in line with the primary structure and is in the rear of the property. We feel there does need to be additional modifications and restudy of design and materials to better relate to the primary structure and the historic district.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Keith Pryor, Curtis Park Neighbors Design Review Committee Chair
I am submitting my objections as a CPN Resident who also is a member of the CPN Design Review Committee. All of these concerns/potential violations were presented in the DRC meeting to the owners and DRC. To me:

A. The Specific ADU Overarching Requirements are:

4.19: Design a new garage or accessory structure to be compatible with, and subordinate to, the primary structure and surrounding historic context.

a. Design the mass, form and roof shape of a new garage or accessory structure to be compatible with the primary structure and other historic accessory structures in the surrounding historic context.

b. Design the height of a new garage or accessory structure to be within the range seen in the surrounding historic context.

Violation: the boxy ADU is not compatible with, and subordinate, to the primary historic structure AND the surrounding historic context, which historic context in prior sections of Part 4 is defined as “block” and “adjacent structures” numerous times. The proposed ADU has no connection to the primary structure whatsoever. The height of the ADU was estimated by Owners (architect not in attendance) at somewhere between 21.8-24’ with the height of the historic primary structure unknown and unstated on the plans; and,

4.20: Use materials that appear similar in scale, color, texture and finish to materials of the primary structure and to those seen historically in the district for detached garages or accessory structures: the primary structure is brick, with one tiny dormer being wood.

Violation: The material usage does not comply. Wood siding is proposed for the top half and stucco on the bottom half, neither of which conforms to the primary structure. Some suggested that brick on the bottom half of the street facing side and either stucco or horizontal metal siding could be used on the other sides. Stucco is not compatible with and subordinate to the primary historic structure, and splitting the first story and the second story materials on the street facing side will call further attention to the nonconformity as it will be seen on the street on at least one side. Note: there is a stucco house two doors down which is For Sale and which may have had some recent exterior work. This has not been on LPC’s docket to my knowledge in the last year, and I have no knowledge as to the stucco application versus the date of entry into the CP Historic District.
B. General Part 4 violations:

4.1: Respect established building location, lot coverage and open space patterns when locating a new building.

a. Design the site footprint of a new building to be compatible with the existing historic lot coverage pattern on the surrounding context/block.

Violation: The ADU, the design of which is not compatible with and subordinate to the primary structure, sticks out past the side of the primary structure by an owner estimated 6-7 feet; and the exterior staircase, which is not a feature of Curtis Park and which has been objected to previously and vociferously may, as well. The over-extension of the ADU will be seen from the street so the non-compliance in form will be even more prominent.

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:

b. Floor-to-floor heights and overall building height

Violation: the height of the ADU as compared to the primary structure is unknown and not specified on the plans. A line is drawn between the ADU and the primary residence but it is unknown if that is precise or a guess. If the ADU is taller, the lack of conformity and subordination to the primary structure will be emphasized and visible from the street.

4.4: Design the height, mass and form of a new building to be compatible with the historic context:

a. Design a new building to be within the typical range of building forms, heights and sizes in the surrounding context/block.

Violation: the ADU is not within the typical range of building forms (no reference to the primary structure so not compatible with and subordinate to it and the adjacent structures and the exterior stair is not a feature of CP); heights (the ADU if taller than the primary structure will emphasize the lack of compatibility and subordination to it); and sizes (the ADU extends beyond the side boundary of the primary structure, which emphasizes the non-conformance and bulk).

4.5: Design a new building to be recognized as current construction, while respecting key features of the historic district as well as the surrounding historic context/block.

a. Use a simplified interpretation of historic designs found in the historic district, or use a contemporary design that is compatible with historic siting, massing, and forms found in the historic district. At a minimum, an acceptable design should be neutral and not detract from the district’s historic character.
**Violation:** While the ADU is contemporary in construction, neither the form, placement nor materials used are compatible with and subordinate to the primary structure AND the historic residences in the block, and particularly not the adjacent structures, either in form, mass or usage of materials. My assumption is the Guidelines in Part 4 are referring to other historic residences and not commercial buildings like the large apartment complex next door or the school across the street as the form and roof line of commercial buildings has always been different from most residences and are regulated by other sections of the Guidelines. The primary structure is brick, with a tiny dormer built of wood. The ADU is wood siding on the top half, which does not age well, and stucco on the bottom half. Wood is not primary on the primary structure; there is no stucco on the primary structure; and stucco is more aligned with Spanish architecture. The ADU is not neutral in design and detracts from the historic primary structure and the adjacent structures.

4.6: Use a roof form that is compatible with the historic context.

a. Use a roof form that is consistent with typical roof forms of existing structures in the district in terms of pitch, orientation, and complexity.

b. Avoid using a flat roof unless it is a typical feature of the surrounding historic context.

**Violation:** Neither the primary historic residence nor the adjacent residences have a flat roof so the roof is not compatible with and subordinate to the primary structure AND the historic context/block/adjacent structures. My premise is that commercial buildings are not analogous as their design is typically different and they are regulated by other Guidelines.

4.8: Design windows, doors and other features to be compatible with the historic contributing primary structure and the historic context:

**Violation:** The ADU has an exterior upper door and staircase which is not a feature of Curtis Park. Such a staircase has been vociferously objected to numerous times by our Design Review Committee in the last year yet, for some reason, only I object to that here. Exterior stairs infer an apartment building – not a structure in conformity with the historic residence.

4.9: Locate a new building to fit within the established setback (front and side) and yard patterns seen in the historic district.

a. Locate a structure to maintain the side yard spacing pattern on the block as seen from the street.

**Violation:** the ADU encroaches considerably into the side yard on one side, causing the non-conforming structure to be visible from the street.

4.10: Design a new duplex, town house, or other small-scale residential building to incorporate heights and proportions that reference those on historic buildings in the surrounding historic context.
a. Design a new residential structure to be within the range of historic heights in the surrounding context/block.

**Violation:** The ADU height may be higher than that of the primary structure; it is not identified on the plans which would render its non-compatibility and lack of subordination to the primary structure and adjacent structures to be visible from the street and glaring.

**4.11:** Use building forms that are compatible with the mass and scale of surrounding residential structures.

e. Avoid using boxy building forms when they are not typical of the surrounding historic context.

**Violation:** This ADU is a boxy building form and is not compatible with and subordinate to the primary historic residences and the surrounding historic context/block/adjacent residences.

The violative ADU proposal does not comply with the Landmark Preservation Regulations, nor the stated Intent of 4 a, b, c or d. For these reasons, respectfully, please Deny this application.
January 14, 2024

Subject: 2914 California ADU letter of support

Dear Landmark Committee,

I would like to express support for my neighbors Tom Richardson and Claire Thomas, who live at 2914 California Street, in their endeavor to build an ADU in their backyard. I have seen the plans for the building and have no objections to its form, size, placement, or material.

Thank you,

Natalie Finn
3114 Champa St
Denver CO 80205
January 14, 2024

Subject: support for Neighbor's ADU Construction

Dear Members of the Landmark Committee,

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my support for my neighbors Claire Thomas and Tom Richardson in their plans to construct an ADU in their backyard at 2914 California Street.

Having had the opportunity to review the proposed plans, I believe that my neighbors have taken care in ensuring that the design does not clash with the neighborhood architecture.

I kindly request that the Landmark Committee considers this proposal favorably.

Signed, [Your Name]
3148 CHAMPA ST.
Dear Landmark Committee Members,

I am a neighbor of Tom Richardson and Claire Thomas, and I support their plans to build an ADU in their backyard at 2914 California Street. I have seen the design plans for the structure and I have no objections.

Signed,

[Signature]

Keith Regensburger

3101 Stout St
January 15, 2024

Subject: 2914 California ADU letter of support

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to convey support for my neighbors Tom Richardson and Claire Thomas, who live at 2914 California Street, in their endeavor to build an ADU in their backyard. After reviewing the building plans I have no objections to its design, dimensions, or material.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Brandon Kuehne
2650 Arapahoe St.
Denver, CO 80205
240-916-0580
Brandon.kuehne@gmail.com
Dear Landmark Committee Members,

I am a neighbor of Tom Richardson and Claire Thomas, and I support their plans to build an ADU in their backyard at 2914 California Street. I have seen the design plans for the structure and I have no objections.

Signed,

Shannon Smith, Attorney

agent

2914 California Street

Denver, CO. 80205
Dear Landmark Committee Members,

I am a neighbor of Tom Richardson and Claire Thomas, and I support their plans to build an ADU in their backyard at 2914 California Street. I have seen the design plans for the structure and I have no objections.

Signed,

[Signature]

Stephen Bennett
676 29th Street
Denver, CO 80205
ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT & GARAGE

DENVER LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION
APPLICATION SUBMITTAL
JAN. 9, 2024

OWNER CLIENT: CLAIRE THOMAS/TOM RICHARDSON
ARCHITECT OF RECORD: ZACHARY JOHNSON
e: zachjohnson62@gmail.com
7th January 2024

Claire Thomas + Thomas Richardson
2914 California Street
Denver, CO 80205

To: Landmark Commission and Zoning Reviewer

Re: ADU proposal - 2914 California Street

Dear Commission,

We met with the Curtis Park Neighbors Design Review Committee and have revised our initial design following their recommendations in order to be more cohesive with the historic context – you’ll see this reflected in window proportions, elimination of sliding glass windows, use of vertical railings.

There are a few details we wanted to expand on, and we are grateful for the opportunity to do so in this letter.

**MATERIAL**

We recognize that material is likely a large sticking point with this project, and wanted to explain our reasoning. We are referencing stucco and wood, both common materials in Curtis Park. In terms of the vertical siding, we wanted to use an old material but use it in a new way while at the same time referencing the *verticality* common in the district - vertical railings, tall vertical windows, tall vertical door+transom frames, vertical forms (tall Italianate and Victorians). The vertical siding is a nod to that historic context. In addition, it would only be on one story of the structure (which is at the very rear of the lot and not highly visible).

**FLAT ROOF**

The [Character Defining Features of Curtis Park packet](#) states “Curtis Park includes an unusual mix of high style and vernacular homes, with large two-story residences for Denver’s business elite located next door to quaint one-story Queen Anne cottages, duplexes and rowhouses...” We think the juxtaposition of the flat roof ADU against the existing Victorian structure presents no disrespect for the rich history of the neighborhood.

In addition, the property is overshadowed by a three floor flat roof structure directly next to it; there is also a flat roof school across the street. We of course understand those are not structures contributing to the historic context, but we thought it made sense here and fits with the character of existing structures. In addition you’ll find in our provided neighborhood context photos that flat roofed ADU’s with non-flat roofed primary structures have been approved in the district.
The ADU proposed is at the very rear of the lot, with a smaller footprint than the maximum allowed. If we were to do any type of pitched roof - the building footprint would expand (to get similar usable floor area) - and roof height would surpass existing home roof height.

It is a small technicality, but the primary house roof has both pitch and flat - it is a hip roof with a flat top.

**BALCONY DOOR**

We know that the zoning allowance for ADU balconies is still new to the district, so design guidelines are difficult to come by here. After reviewing Curtis Park Neighbors’ feedback with Landmark staff, we opted to leave the sliding glass as-is. Especially with the new Welton building being built, access to light will be limited and a sliding glass provides the most light entrance for the inhabitants. The balcony itself is too shallow for outswing doors, and inswing doors aren’t feasible with such a small living room space.

**NEW BUILDING REPERCUSSIONS ON STREETSCAPE**

Finally, a massive 6-story flat-roof building (29th and Welton Affordable Housing by Shanahan Development) is in plans to be constructed directly behind our house which, though technically outside of Curtis Park Historic District, will nevertheless greatly change streetscape view, tremendously overshadowing both structures on our property.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration. Warmly,

Tom Richardson
2914.5 CALIFORNIA ST

PROJECT DESCRIPTION/DESIGN INTENT:

- BUILD NEW 784 SF ADU (1 BED, 1 BATH) / 784 SF 2-CAR GARAGE IN REAR 35% OF LOT
- CONSIDER MATERIAL AND FORM THAT COMPLIMENT HISTORIC CONTEXT
- REFERENCE PROPORTIONALITY OF WINDOWS FOUND IN HISTORIC DISTRICT
- INCORPORATE A MINIMALIST QUALITY INHERENT OF MODERN ARCHITECTURE AND TO THE CLIENTS PREFERENCE [NOTE: THIS PROPOSED BLDG. IS SET FAR FROM STREET VIEW AND IS OVERSHADOWED BY LARGE MULTI-UNIT DEVELOPMENTS TO SOUTH AND EAST]

OWNERS: CLAIRE THOMAS / TOM RICHARDSON
ARCHITECT: ZACHARY JOHNSON, R.A.
NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT
Examples of ADUs with different roof styles and different materials than the primary house exist throughout Curtis Park historic district.

**note that this ADU has stucco and vertical siding**
Examples of stucco are prevalent in Curtis Park.
PROPERTY PHOTOS

YARD PHOTO (LOOKING WEST)

YARD PHOTO (LOOKING EAST)

AERIAL

YARD PHOTO (LOOKING EAST)

PRIMARY RES. FRONT (NORTH- WEST ELEV.)

YARD AT ALLEY (NO EXIST. GARAGE)
WINDOWS SHOWN HERE REFLECT PROPORTION AND SPACING COMMON TO HISTORIC AREA (>2H:1W)

3-COAT STUCCO FINISH
ALL SIDES (1ST FL ONLY)

VERT. WOOD SIDING

3-COAT STUCCO FINISH

WOOD SILL (TYP. 2ND FL)

STONE SILL (TYP. 1ST FL)

VERT. WOOD SIDING

ALUM. CAP FLASHING AT T.O. PARAPET

"FIBREX" CASEMENT WINDOWS/
ANDERSON 100 (THROUGHOUT)

FACING CALIFORNIA ST

WEST ELEV.
3/16" = 1'-0"

SOUTH ELEV.
3/16" = 1'-0"

*CURTIS PARK HOMES (WINDOW TYPE EXAMPLES)
PITCH ROOF TO GUTTER, 1/4":12" MIN.

*SOLAR PANELS
(TILT/ ORIENT TO SOUTH)
300 SF

3" VENT FOR
BATH/WASH. MACH.

ELEC METER/
PANEL LOC.

EPDM FLAT ROOFING
MEMBRANE

PNT ALUM. PARAPET CAP
FLASHING SEE DET.

GUTTER AT EAST ELEV.

BATH FAN TO ROOF

3" VENT FOR
BATH/WASH. MACH.

"ELBOW/EXTEND DMSPOUT -AWAY
FROM HOUSE AT GRADE (BOTH
SIDES OF GARAGE)

2" KITCHEN SINK VENT

RANGE HOOD WALL
VENT
ROOF MAX
23'-6"
LEVEL 2 (ADU)
10'-7 1/4"
LEVEL 1 (GARAGE)
0"
ROOF (ADU)
21'-8"
FIN. CLG
9'-6"
FIN. CLG
9'-0"
BASE PLANE (ADU)
-6"
LEVEL 1 (GARAGE)
10'-1 1/4"
LEVEL 2 (ADU)
21'-8"
7'-0" AFF EXT. DOOR AND WINDOW HEAD HEIGHT
* PER ZONING
PROPOSED ADU ROOF HEIGHT APPROX. IN LINE WITH EXISTING PRIMARY HOUSE ROOF

3'-0" 5'-0"
4'-0"
3’-0"
9'-6" CLG
9'-0" CLG
7'-0" AFF EXT. DOOR AND WINDOW HEAD HEIGHT

N-S SECTION
3/16" = 1'-0"
SITE SECTION E-W
1/8" = 1'-0"

"SEE "BLDG. DETAILS" SHEET FOR CALL OUTS HERE"
EXTERIOR

10’-7 1/4”

LEVEL 2 (ADU)

3 COAT CEMENT STUCCO W/ DRAINAGE MAT/CAPILLARY BREAK

ZIP R-6 SHEATHING/INSL @ 2ND FL ONLY - TAPE ALL SEAM (DRAINAGE PLANE)

2X6 STUD (24” O.C.) R-21 BATT

2X4 R.O. IN 2X6 R.O. TO MOUNT NAIL FIN/CREATE RECESS (BOTH FLOORS)

WOOD RETURN

WOOD SILL OR SIM.

1”X6” T+G VERT. CEDAR (OR SIM) ON FURRING OR MESH STRIPS TO PROVIDE AIR CAVITY/BACK VENTING (EVERY 2’ MAX VERTICAL). PROVIDE BUG SCREEN TOP AND BOTTOM

STUCCO RETURN AT WINDOW HEAD/SIDES

INSTALL WINDOW PER MANF. (ANDERSON 100 SERIES: CASEMENT)

MTL DRIP / TRANSITION AT 2ND FL

R- 30 MIN. BATT INSL PER IRC 2021

3 COAT CEMENT STUCCO W/ DRAINAGE MAT/CAPILLARY BREAK

2X6 STUD (24” O.C.) R-21 BATT

SITE SECTION E-W - Callout 2

ALUM PARAPET CAP FLASHING

T+G VERT. SIDING

PITCH ROOF RAFTERS TO GUTTER AT ALLEY (R-60 BLOWN IN CELLOSULOSE)

DROOP CEILING BELOW PITCHED FLAT ROOF (9’-0” AFF)

SITE SECTION E-W - Callout 1

BUILDING DETAILS

*AT WALLS / WINDOWS / PARAPET
PERSPECTIVE FROM STREET (NORTH P.L.) TREES ARE HIDDEN

PERSPECTIVE FROM STREET (SOUTH P.L.) *2907 WELTON (PROPOSED MULTI UNIT) BEYOND

PERSPECTIVE FROM STREET (GOOGLE STREET VIEW-EXISTING CONDITION)
ADU PERSPECTIVE VIEWS

ALLEY / NORTH-EAST (675 29TH ST BEYOND - SIMILAR FORM)

WEST / PRIMARY ST FACING (NOTE: PROPOSED 2907 WELTON BEYOND)

ALLEY / SOUTH-EAST
2ND STORY FINISH:
1X6 "NICKEL GAP" VERTICAL T+G CEDAR SIDING STAIN OR PNT PER CLIENT

1ST STORY FINISH
3-COAT TRADITIONAL SMOOTH STUCCO FINISH TEXTURE

EXTERIOR WALL LIGHT (L1)

VERTICAL RAIL AT DECK/STAIR GUARDRAIL
DECK DOORS: ANDERSON 100 SERIES GLIDING PATIO DOORS (APPROX. 7’H X 7’W)
CASEMENT & AWNING WINDOWS

Casement windows are hinged on the side and open outward to the left or right, while awning windows are hinged at the top and open outward, both are also available as non-operating stationary windows.

WINDOWS: ANDERSON 100 SERIES CASEMENTS (SEE ELEV. FOR DIMS)
CREATE AN ENTRY DOOR WITH CHARACTER

Andersen® Entry Doors are handcrafted, built with solid fine grain wood and available with a variety of style options so you can create a one of a kind entryway, suited to fit you, and your home, perfectly.

- Select from a variety of richly-grained woods or make a bold first impression with color
- Choose from 50 commercial-grade, aluminum clad exterior colors
- Offered in 11 of the finest grades of wood species for both the interior and exterior
- Customize your door with a variety of decorative glass options and grille patterns
- Available as single-door or double-door configurations and either inswing or outswing operation
- Low-profile sill option available
- Many door styles are available, see andersenwindows.com/entrydoors for options

POPULAR DOOR STYLES
**Actual wood species is either Sapele or Sipo, both non-endangered species grown in Africa, with color and characteristics similar to Central American mahoganies.**

**Hardware is sold separately.**

†FSB style 1 102 is not available in black anodized aluminum.

Distressed bronze and oil rubbed bronze are “living” finishes that will change with time and use.

Bright brass and satin nickel finishes on patio door hardware feature a 10-year limited warranty.

Printing limitations prevent exact replication of colors and finishes. See your Andersen supplier for actual color and finish samples.

**All trademarks where denoted are marks of their respective owners. ©2022 Andersen Corporation. All rights reserved. 03/22**
SMOOTH-PRO™ FIBERGLASS

SMOOTH-PRO™ FULL VIEW FRAMELESS CLEAR GLASS WITH 6-LITE SDL IN BLACK

SMOOTH-PRO™ 1-PANEL 3/4 VIEW FRAMELESS SARDIS GLASS IN MARINE

SMOOTH-PRO™ 1-PANEL 3/4 VIEW FRAMELESS CLEAR GLASS WITH 9-LITE PRAIRIE SDL IN COLONY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Door Width (ft)</th>
<th>2'8&quot;</th>
<th>2'10&quot;</th>
<th>3'0&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP7-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP8-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP8-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP8-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP8-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP7-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP8-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP7-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP8-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP7-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP8-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SP = 6'8"  SP7 = 7'0"  SP8 = 8'0"

Actual colors may vary from samples shown due to printing process and/or differing monitor calibrations.
### DESIGN-PRO™ FIBERGLASS

#### Design-Pro™ Fir Fiberglass 6'8" Door

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Bottom Rail Height for 79&quot; Door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DF-100</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF7-21</td>
<td>10.125&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Design-Pro™ Fir Fiberglass 7'0" Door

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Bottom Rail Height for 83&quot; Door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DF7-100</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF7-20</td>
<td>11.000&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF7-24</td>
<td>11.000&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF7-60</td>
<td>11.000&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF7-21</td>
<td>11.000&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF7-686DG</td>
<td>12.874&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF7-684DG</td>
<td>11.000&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF7-607DG-1P</td>
<td>11.065&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFC7-866DG</td>
<td>11.050&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Design-Pro™ Fir Fiberglass 8'0" Door

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Bottom Rail Height for 95&quot; Door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DF8-100</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF8-20</td>
<td>10.125&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF8-24</td>
<td>10.125&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF8-60</td>
<td>10.125&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF8-686DG</td>
<td>10.374&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Design-Pro™ Mahogany Fiberglass 7'0" Door

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Bottom Rail Height for 83&quot; Door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM7-20</td>
<td>10.000&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM7-60</td>
<td>11.000&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMC7-866DG</td>
<td>11.050&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Design-Pro™ Oak Fiberglass 7'0" Door

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Bottom Rail Height for 83&quot; Door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO7-100</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Textured White Panel Fiberglass 7'0" Door

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Bottom Rail Height for 83&quot; Door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TW7-100</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SMOOTH-PRO™ FIBERGLASS

#### Smooth-Pro™ Fiberglass 6'8" Door

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Bottom Rail Height for 79&quot; Door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP-100</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP7-21</td>
<td>10.125&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Smooth-Pro™ Fiberglass 7'0" Door

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Bottom Rail Height for 83&quot; Door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP7-100</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP7-20</td>
<td>11.000&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP7-24</td>
<td>11.000&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP7-60</td>
<td>11.000&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP7-21</td>
<td>11.000&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP7-686DG</td>
<td>12.874&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP7-684DG</td>
<td>11.000&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP7-607DG-1P</td>
<td>11.065&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GARAGE DOORS: CLOPAY "MODERN STEEL" FLUSH (4) PANEL: 9' W X 7' H

*DOOR COLOR TO BE SELECTED BY OWNER
ROOFING: JOHNS MANSVILLE 60 MIL (MIN.) EPDM
ORIENT SOLAR PANEL ARRAY TO SOUTH
28000 BTU Tri-Zone Mini Split Air Conditioner
- Heat Pump - SENA/30HF/T

Senville

MSRP $USD: $2,699.99
$2,599.99
(You save $100.00)

Starting at $39/mo or 0% APR with affirm. See if you qualify.

SKU: SENA-30HF-T6912
UPC: 893088001133

Availability: Ships in 2 to 3 Days

Indoor Combination: *
- 9000 BTU / 9000 BTU / 12000 BTU

Installation Kit: *
- 16 Ft. (incl. 3 kits)

Quantity:

ADD TO CART

MECH. SYSTEM: SENVILLE 2,8000 BTU MINI SPLIT/HEAT PUMP (3 HEADS- SEE PLANS)