

# Minutes

## HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD

City Commission Room, City Hall  
1101 Poyntz Avenue  
Monday, July 23, 2012  
4:00 P.M.

**Members Present:** Patrick Schaub, Chair; Dixie West, Vice-Chair, Dea Brokesh, Michael Krysko, Michael Dudek, Michael Mecseri, and Angie Danner.

**Members Absent:** None

**Others Present:** Kathy Dzewaltowski, Linda Glasgow, Andy Thomason.

**Staff Present:** Lance Evans, Senior Planner; Kevin Credit, Planner.

1. Consider the minutes for the June 25, 2012 Historic Resources Board meeting

West moved that the minutes be approved as amended. Brokesh seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 7-0.

2. Historic Review – Contributing Structure Within the Downtown Manhattan Historic District & Environs Review

317 Poyntz Avenue, Knostman/Stevenson Building (Finn's Pub), Sign Permit (*within the environs of: Downtown Manhattan Historic District, Manhattan State Bank, Riley County Courthouse, and the Community House*)

Evans presented the Staff review for 317 Poyntz Avenue. The Board discussed similar signs in the district, as well as the white panel covering a portion of the top row of windows shown in one of the photographs of the building. Evans mentioned that this might have qualified for an administrative review if it had only been in the environs and not on a contributing structure, and suggested that they discuss the administrative review standards at the end of the meeting. West said that it doesn't overwhelm the building, and could be easily removed if the business went out of business. Brokesh added that she thought it looked to be of an appropriate scale.

Brokesh moved that Board find that the proposal meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and will not encroach upon, damage or destroy any listed historic property or its environs. Mecseri seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7-0.

3. Historic Review – Contributing Structure Within the Downtown Manhattan Historic District & Environs Review

331 Poyntz Avenue, Ulrich Building (Fortuity), Sign Permit (*within the environs of: Downtown Manhattan Historic District, Manhattan Carnegie Library, Manhattan State Bank, Riley County Courthouse, and the Community House*)

Evans presented the Staff review for 331 Poyntz Avenue. Brokesh asked about the detail of aluminum tubing supporting the sign - would it be visible underneath where it says "Fortuity?" She also asked about the color of the tubing, if it was anything other than aluminum. West added that she had question about the blue glass, and where the sign would be attached to the building. Dudek responded that it looked like it was going to be anchored to a wood frame. West said that, for her, as long as it's not hurting that glass material, which looks pretty good, it's OK.

The Board then discussed the proposed colors of the sign and its method of attachment further. West said that the way that they're doing it seems like they're not doing significant harm to the property, and that if something were to happen to the business, it could be easily removed. Mecseri replied that the only thing he could see as a potential problem would be possible damage from the bottom two holes.

Dudek moved that the Board find that the proposal meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and will not encroach upon, damage or destroy any listed historic property or its environs. West seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7-0.

4. Historic Review –Environs Review (Non- Contributing Structure Within the Downtown Manhattan Historic District)

409 Poyntz Avenue, Ballard/Penney's Building (Salon Brands), Sign Permit (*within the environs of: Downtown Manhattan Historic District, Houston & Pierre Streets Residential Historic District, Manhattan Carnegie Library, Manhattan State Bank, Community House, Lyda-Jean Apartment House, and the Riley County Courthouse*).

Evans presented the Staff review for 409 Poyntz Avenue. Dudek asked whether or not the bar sign below the channel letters was internally illuminated, and a discussion about the lighting characteristics of the sign followed. West said that it's better than what they have now. Mecseri added that the proposal is similar to fabrics store on Poyntz. Brokesh said that she was wondering about the scale of the sign - proportionally, design-wise, she thought it looked good. Mecseri commented that it doesn't relate to notch in top of the building, but that he does not have a strong reaction against it.

Mecseri then moved that the Board find that the proposal meets the Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effects of Projects on Environs and will not encroach upon, damage, or destroy any listed historic property or its environs. West seconded the motion, on the condition that the old sign is removed. Mecseri explained that in the "before" image that was presented, the existing awning sign is shown, and in the "after" image, it is removed. Dudek then explained that, referring to the Kansas Historical Society's "Guidelines for Signs in Historic Districts and on Individually Listed Properties," internally-illuminated box signs are listed as "not compatible." Schaub then said that there is a clear motion on the table, and a second. He added that he thinks sign ordinance would prohibit them from having two signs on the same building facade.

Dzewaltowski then asked what year the Environs Law went into effect. Evans replied, 1998. Dzewaltowski continued by asking whether the Board was using a sign as an example that existed before the Environs Law went into effect. She added that, if she were on the Board, she would be hesitant to use examples that were present before Environs Law was passed.

Evans then described the State Historic Preservation Office's explanation of a similar item from the previous month, a sign at the Pathfinder, which was approved because the historic environs were deemed to be destroyed due to the presence of a large parking lot. Krysko said that it seems that the bottom part of the sign is incompatible. West then read from the "Guidelines for Signs in Historic Districts and on Individually Listed Properties" and said, if we follow the guidelines, we cannot approve of the bottom part of the sign. Schaub indicated that the Board could vote to defeat the current motion and create a new motion. The motion failed on a count of 0-7.

Schaub then asked if there was another motion. The Board then discussed the scale of the sign, the size of its letters, and its position on the façade of the building. West asked if the Board could wait and ask for more information, saying that it would be nice if the applicants would come to the meeting. Brokesh then asked about the presence of historical large-lettered sign on Poyntz, and the Board discussed the possibility of tabling the item until the applicants could be present. Dudek then moved that the Board find that the proposal does not meet the Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effects of Projects on Environs and will encroach upon, damage, or destroy listed historic properties and their environs. Danner seconded the motion. West explained that the interior illumination of the bottom portion of the sign, the size, and the sign's location in the center of the building were all reasons for finding the proposal incompatible. Dudek suggested that the sign should be centered, and "Salon Brands" should be placed on a single line. Schaub mentioned that the sign should be aligned in the center of the building based on building features rather than trees.

Dudek then amended the motion, stating that the Board finds that the proposal does not meet the Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effects of Projects on Environs and will encroach upon, damage, or destroy listed historic properties and their environs, due to concerns about the location of the sign on the face, the scale of the sign, and the internally-illuminated portion of the sign that does not meet the standards laid out in the Kansas Historical Society's "Guidelines for Signs in Historic Districts and on Individually Listed Properties." Danner indicated that she was friendly to the motion. Mecseri asked if the Board should give specific direction on the scale of the sign, saying that while he is not offended by the current scale of the sign, if it were him, he would want more specific direction. Danner said that it was not letters that she objected to, but rather the composition. Dudek added that maybe scale is appropriate, but the proportion is wrong. Schaub cautioned that perhaps the Board was treading the line between making determinations and giving design advice, which they should try to avoid. Danner said that it was time for the Board to call the question. The Board voted, and the motion passed, 7-0.

5. Historic Review – Contributing Structure Within the Downtown Manhattan Historic District & Environs Review  
330 Poyntz Avenue, Eames Building (Capstone 3D), Sign Permit (*within the environs of: Downtown Manhattan Historic District, Manhattan Carnegie Library, Manhattan State Bank, Riley County Courthouse, and the Community House*)

Evans presented the Staff review for 330 Poyntz Avenue. Mecseri indicated that he was involved with this project, and explained the lighting characteristics of the sign, which will have a light that is internal to the frame that would wash the sign. He added that it would be

constructed of pin letters, with the small text below laser-cut. Danner asked how Mecseri was involved in the project. Mecseri responded that he was part of the design team, and has worked with the owner on signage. West then asked, how is the sign affixed to the building? Mecseri replied that it will be attached with little metal studs pinned to the stone.

Brokesh noted the location of sign, on the top of building above the window line, and said that she would suggest that the sign be located below the windows in order to be more consistent with the existing character of the downtown. The Board then discussed the location of the entrance to building, the location of the applicant within the building, and the difficulty of providing signage that relates to second-floor tenants. Brokesh said that on the north façade, locating the sign at the top of the building seems to be appropriate, but on the east and west facades it seems to be setting a precedent. She then asked if Mecseri would vote on the item. Mecseri replied that he cannot vote on this. Dudek added that his wife works for Capstone 3D, the applicant, and indicated that he would also recuse himself.

Glasgow then asked whether the purpose of the sign was to advertise the business or indicate where in the building the office is located. She then said that it strikes her as a billboard - the concept of the sign is nice, but it doesn't look right on the building. Schaub added that the district is about maintaining a pedestrian-friendly, walkable scale, and the location of the sign above the trees at the top of the building is geared towards the automobile. West asked if it would be possible to drop the sign down below the windows on the second floor, somewhere along the west façade. Mecseri said yes, but the sign would be very small.

Schaub then said that the realm above the windows has historically been reserved for the date and name of building, the date stone. Mecseri said that the owner knew about this issue, but his question was about the Old Chicago sign. The Board then discussed the compatibility of existing signs in the district and their similarity to the proposal. Glasgow said that the sign would be great on the corrugated north facade, but if it were located on the Poyntz Avenue or 4<sup>th</sup> Street facades of the building, she would disapprove of it every time she saw it. She added that she would not see the sign detracting from the Community House on the north facade, and that a sign telling people where to enter the building would be appropriate on the west facade. The Board then further discussed the viability of the sign on the north façade. Schaub said that it is a beautiful sign, but in the nature of how the buildings were signed historically, this does not necessarily fit.

Brokesh then moved that the Board find that the proposal for the sign on the north facade meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and will not encroach upon, damage or destroy any listed historic property or its environs; however, the Board also finds that the proposal for the signs on the west and south facades do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and will encroach upon, damage or destroy listed historic properties and their environs. Krysko seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 5-0-2, with Dudek and Mecseri abstaining.

## 6. Code Violation Report

Evans discussed the situation at 1446 Laramie; property owner Calvin Emig was denied in his demolition request by the Board and SHPO, and has submitted his official appeal to the City Commission. The item will be on the September 18th City Commission agenda. He added that notices will be going out to all interested parties.

7. Administrative Review Summary

Staff announced the following administrative reviews conducted in July:

- A. 404 Humboldt Street, Tsubo Solutions, Sign Permit (*within the environs of: Downtown Manhattan Historic District, Manhattan State Bank, Riley County Courthouse, Community House, and the Manhattan Carnegie Library*).
- B. 100 Manhattan Town Center, Carlos O'Kelly's, Sign Permit (*within the environs of: Downtown Manhattan Historic District, Manhattan State Bank, Community House, Damon Runyon House, and the Riley County Courthouse*).
- C. 100 Manhattan Town Center, Applebee's, Sign Permit (*within the environs of: Downtown Manhattan Historic District, Manhattan State Bank, Community House, Damon Runyon House, and the Riley County Courthouse*).

8. Announcements and Updates

Evans explained that the City had received an official letter from SHPO for the Daniel and Maude Walters House historic property nomination meeting, and that a letter of support signed by Schaub was included in the submission to SHPO. The Board then discussed possible SHPO training session dates, and settled on a time at the end of meeting on August 27th.

9. Upcoming Meetings:

- Monday, August 27, 2012
- Monday, September 24, 2012

10. Adjourn.