

# Minutes

## HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD

City Commission Room, City Hall  
1101 Poyntz Avenue  
Monday, August 27, 2012  
4:00 P.M.

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

**Members Absent:** Michael Mecseri.

**Others Present:** Kathy Dzewaltowski, Linda Glasgow, Loren Reiswig.

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

1. Consider the minutes for the July 23, 2012 Historic Resources Board meeting

Brokesh suggested several corrections to the minutes. West moved that the minutes be approved as amended. Brokesh seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 6-0.

2. Historic Review – Listed Historic Property

401 Yuma Street, Bethel AME Church, ADA-Compliant Wheelchair Ramp (*within the environs of: Bethel AME Church*).

Credit presented the staff review for 401 Yuma Street. Brokesh said that she could appreciate that they are trying to provide ADA access, because that is important, but she wished they would have come before the Board before installing the ramp. West asked about rear access to the church, and whether or not the ramp could have been positioned at the rear of the building rather than the front. She said she has never been inside the church.

Brokesh said that the intent of the ADA law is to not separate the disabled from the able-bodied. She added that she did not know if there is another way for wheelchairs to enter the building, and that the ramp was very noticeable. West said that yes, it is kind of the elephant in the room. Brokesh replied that it doesn't seem to destroy the building, but as you drive by it does seem very massive. She then said that she wondered if the church had considered a chair lift, which would have less mass and could be attached to a hand rail.

Schaub opened the meeting for public comment. Glasgow said that it was a real dilemma, and that it caused her to think about all of the historic buildings that get re-tasked into another purpose. She added that it seems that it could come off of the building fairly easily, and said that she wondered about the expense of a chair lift. Schaub added that a lift could potentially be more invasive to install than the ramp.

Schaub closed the meeting to public comment. West said that the ramp could be removed without damaging the building if money were raised for some kind of a chair lift. Brokesh said that, without looking at specific pricing options for chair lifts, it just seems that the church may not have explored all of the feasible alternatives. She added that the potential

invasiveness of a chair lift comes down to design. The Board then discussed the apparent safety and structural integrity of the ramp, and whether it seemed to meet ADA guidelines.

West then said that, from the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, the only thing that they are looking at is Standard 9, which deals with new additions, exterior alterations, the differentiation of new work from old, compatibility with historic materials, size, shape, and massing. She said that the ramp is not compatible, but it is certainly differentiated from the old, and it probably cost a lot of money. The Board then discussed the various price differences between ramps and chair lifts. Brokesh said that this has been a major issue for historic properties across the country and that it takes a lot of thought to develop solutions that are compatible with historic properties. She then said that she would be curious to know how much thought went into the decision to install the ramp.

West replied that she thought it probably didn't even cross their minds – all they wanted to do was to get handicapped people into the building. Dudek asked about the feasibility of putting the ramp at another entrance. West asked if it were possible to table the item and ask representatives from the church to come answer some of the questions the Board had about the ramp, and whether it could be placed at another entrance.

West then moved to table the item and request a representative from the Bethel AME Church to come to the next Board meeting and discuss the placement of the ramp in order to answer the Board's questions. Brokesh seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 6-0.

3. Historic Review – Environs

1744 Leavenworth Street, Construction of New Garage & Studio Space (*within the environs of: McFarlane-Wareham Residence and Grimes House*).

Credit presented the staff review for 1774 Leavenworth. Brokesh asked about the materials shown on the site plan – she could not read the text. Credit provided a blown-up copy of the site plan which showed that the exterior would be made mostly of fiber cement panels and polycarbonate panels. Dudek said that the property is so far from the two historic properties and tucked away behind trees, down a hill, he could not see how it would affect the two properties at all.

Schaub opened the meeting for public comment. Glasgow asked if it would make a difference in winter when the trees do not have leaves. Dudek said that it is better than the garage that is there now, but that he was not sure if it is within the Traditional Neighborhood Overlay guidelines. West replied that the TNO will catch some things, but according to the *Standards*, demolition should be avoided. She said that she was torn again – it is so far away from the historic properties, but she never likes to take into account trees or that vegetation will hide something. She asked if it could even be visible over housetops if there were no trees, and then added, on the other hand, compatible reconstruction should occur, and no like materials are being used, although it would be astronomically expensive to use historical materials. Glasgow asked about the potential for using mason board or hardy board as siding, and said that once it is painted it looks pretty much like the historic materials.

Brokesh said that the proposal seems out of character with the neighborhood. West replied that it will look nothing like the current garage of the house. The Board then discussed clapboard-style fiber exterior cement. Schaub mentioned that the kind of material being

proposed looks like the old asbestos siding. Brokesh asked if she was correct in understanding that the tallest part of the structure would be along the alley, and whether or not the scale was appropriate with the neighborhood. West said that she didn't think scale was the issue. Danner said that the style of the garage does not match the house at all. Dudek added that it does seem to compromise the character-defining features of the area. The Board then discussed the viability of different types of historic materials and siding.

West said that she did not think it was going to be compatible, but it does look cute. Dudek expressed his opinion that it was too contemporary in style. Brokesh added that the roof line and materials seem to be out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. Krysko said that Standard 6 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effect of Projects on Environs* mentions materials and character-defining features.

West then moved that the Board find that the proposal does not meet the *Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effect of Projects on Environs* and will encroach upon, damage or destroy listed historic properties and their environs, based on Standards 4 and 6. Danner seconded the motion. Dudek said that he was still wrapping his head around the distance from the historic properties, as the proposal is right at the boundary of the 500 foot environs, but that it was incrementally affecting the environs, and that if they let this go, the next proposal may be a little bit further in. He added that he thought they could easily redesign it to be compatible with the neighborhood –the roof and siding could be changed to make it work. The motion passed on a vote of 6-0.

4. Historic Review – Environs

801 Leavenworth Street, First Presbyterian Church, New Park Landscaping & Walls (*within the environs of: Women's Club House, Ulrich House, and the First Congregational Church*).

Credit presented the staff review for 801 Leavenworth. Reiswig explained that church donors were contributing money for outdoor landscaping, classrooms, and other amenities, and that they needed an Exception from the front yard setback for the planned freestanding walls. He said that the tallest of the walls was only 30 inches tall, and that they were planned to give the park area a sense of enclosure and space. He also said that in the past they have had issues with people walking their dogs in that area, and that they anticipated having more outdoor activities and weddings, and also wanted the walls to create a sense of separation for children between the park and the street.

West asked if they planned to change the brick sidewalks. Reiswig said no, and added that they were proposing all of the walks in the parks to be paved with red clay bricks in order to compliment the brick sidewalks. Brokesh asked about the height of the walls in relation to the existing sign in the southeast corner of the property that the Board had previously approved – would the sign be covered up? Reiswig replied that he did not think so, and that right now where the sign is placed is pretty much worthless. Brokesh asked if the materials proposed for the walls were some kind of concrete, and if they had considered using limestone instead. Reiswig replied that the blocks would have a smoky hill tan color that will very closely match the color of the sanctuary itself, being weathered limestone. Brokesh then asked if the block size proposed would match the limestone of the sanctuary, which is more characteristic of the surrounding historic properties in the area.

Reiswig said that the cost of a limestone mortared wall and 30 inches of footing beneath it was prohibitive. West asked about the need for a footing for the wall. Reiswig explained that the wall they proposed could be put on a crushed limestone base rather than a footing, which would allow for some movement with freezing and thawing. Brokesh then said that the character of the proposed wall seemed different to her than that of the surrounding neighborhood, and provided pictures to the Board of similar walls in the area. The Board discussed existing walls at the Kansas State University campus, the size of stone blocks, and rough-cut texturing. Brokesh said that the proposed material seems more modern than historic. West asked about the total length of wall in linear feet that was being proposed. Reiswig replied that he did not know, but each individual wall was kept to fairly short lengths, such as 30-40 feet long.

Schaub asked if there were any other questions for the applicant and then opened the meeting to public comment. Reiswig said that if the church could not use this type of less expensive material, the wall would not be able to happen. The Board then discussed some more cost-effective alternatives. Schaub said that an issue of possibly greater importance to him was whether or not walls or fences are appropriate at all in this part of town. He added that this is not a residence, but a quasi-civic space. Brokesh mentioned the open lawns along Leavenworth and large setbacks on the block west of the church.

West then said that the primary issue is the fact that the wall is not made out of limestone, and added the suggestion that if there is not enough money for limestone walls, perhaps the church could do more fundraising. Reiswig reiterated that the material is colored in such a way that it will match the church as it appears today, whereas new limestone will be white for many years until it can age, meaning that the proposed color will be less offensive immediately. Brokesh said that she can appreciate the color, but to her the limestone would more closely match existing materials used in the neighborhood. Dudek then suggested that some of the extensive brick paving shown on the plans could perhaps be reduced in order to dedicate more money to the walls. He added that the walls do not match the historic character of the neighborhood.

West then moved that the Board find that the proposal does not meet the *Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effect of Projects on Environs* and will encroach upon, damage or destroy listed historic properties and their environs, based on the incompatibility of the proposal's materials with the historic neighborhood according to Standard 6, in terms of the cement not matching the existing stone, with the suggestions that the applicant should try to use limestone if at all possible. Dudek seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 6-0.

5. Historic Review – Contributing Structure Within Downtown Manhattan Historic District 331 Poyntz Avenue, Ulrich Building, Sign Permit for Decal Sign (*within the environs of: Downtown Manhattan Historic District, Manhattan Carnegie Library, Manhattan State Bank, Community House, and the Riley County Courthouse*).

Credit presented the staff review for 331 Poyntz. West asked for clarification of the images showing the proposed decals.

Schaub opened the meeting to public comment. No one spoke.

Schaub closed the meeting to public comment. Danner said that it seems odd to have a decal right below the other approved. Schaub said that he did not see any negative impact. West agreed, saying that it will not damage anything if the business shuts down.

Dudek then moved that the Board find that the proposal meets the *Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effect of Projects on Environs* and will not encroach upon, damage or destroy any listed historic properties or their environs. Danner seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 6-0.

6. Code Violation Report

Evans discussed the situation for the property at 210 S. 10<sup>th</sup>, explaining that there has been some work done and progress made. West agreed, saying that they have made an honest effort to get the building weather-proofed.

7. Administrative Review Summary

Credit provided an overview of the administrative reviews conducted by staff for the month of August.

- A. 210 N. 4<sup>th</sup> Street Suite B, State Farm, Sign Permit (*within the environs of: Downtown Manhattan Historic District, Manhattan State Bank, Riley County Courthouse, and the Community House*).
- B. 901 Poyntz Avenue, Manhattan High School East Campus, Sign Permit (*within the environs of: Houston & Pierre Streets Residential Historic District, Fitz House, and the Women's Club House*).

8. Announcements and Updates

West asked for an update on the CivicPlus sign. Evans explained that the situation was somewhat complicated. It was an old box sign that was existing when CivicPlus moved into the building, and they had simply put new sign copy on top of it. West said that she wanted to make a list of signs in the downtown and when they were approved by looking at old minutes and sign permits, in order to see which were made before the onset of the Historic Resources Board in 1998. She said that such a list would give the Board a clue towards what signs were good precedents to reference in decisions. Brokesh then reported on the LEED training that she and Evans attended in Topeka.

9. Upcoming Meetings:

- Monday, September 24, 2012
- Monday, October 22, 2012

10. Adjourn.

11. SHPO Training for CLGs: 5:40 – 7

Kim Gant and Katrina Ringle from the Kansas State Historic Preservation Office conducted a training session on Certified Local Governments, environs law, and historic review process from 5:40 to 7.