

**Minutes**  
**HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD**  
**City Commission Room, City Hall**  
**1101 Poyntz Avenue**  
**Monday, November 26, 2012**  
**4:00 P.M.**

**Members Present:** Patrick Schaub, Chair; Dea Brokesh; Michael Mecseri; Angie Danner; Michael Krysko (arrived after the vote on item #1).

**Members Absent:** Dixie West, Vice-Chair; Michael Dudek.

**Others Present:** Scott Kulp, Schurle Signs; Brent Bowman, Bowman Bowman Novick; Daniel Crouch, Bowman Bowman Novick; John Pecoraro, Manhattan Public Library; Nathan Bergman, Bartlett & West; Kathy Dzewaltowski; Linda Glasgow.

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

1. Consider the minutes for the October 22, 2012 Historic Resources Board meeting.

Brokesh noted a typographic error on the minutes. Brokesh then moved that the minutes be approved as amended. Mecseri seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 4-0.

2. Review of a Contributing Structure Within the Downtown Manhattan Historic District: 230 Poyntz Avenue, Limbocker Building (Bartlett & West): Sign Permit. *Within the Downtown Manhattan Historic District.*

Credit presented the staff review for 230 Poyntz Avenue. Brokesh asked whether the signs would be ADA-compliant at 80 inches above the right-of-way. Bergman said that he did not know, but that it was an issue that would be covered in Zoning or Building Code review. Mecseri asked what material the sign will be mounted on. Bergman replied the window frames are made of wood, so he would assume that the signs will be attached to wood. He added that their intention was to do something nicer than the decal signs that they currently have. Mecseri said that the only way that he could think of to attach the sign, other than to the wood frame of the window, would be to perhaps fasten it to mortar joints on the wall. Schaub said that the mortar joint method would probably be more damaging than attaching the sign to the wood. Mecseri then asked if the applicant planned to remove the decals once the proposed signs were constructed. Bergman said yes.

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

Danner then 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. Krysko seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 5-0.

3. Review of a Contributing Structure Within the Downtown Manhattan Historic District: 318 Poyntz Avenue, Higinbotham Store (Rockstar & Rodgers): Sign Permit. *Within the Downtown Manhattan Historic District.*

Credit presented the staff review for 318 Poyntz Avenue. Schaub asked if the sign was going to be illuminated. Kulp said that it would not be illuminated, and would be made out of sheet aluminum. He then added that the original plan for the sign was to fasten it to the existing sign and paint the edges of the frame to match the building; however, they were informed by the Zoning Inspectors that they would not be able to do that. The Board discussed the difference between the painted sign proposal and the stand-alone sign. Credit indicated that the proposal on the table was the stand-alone sign. Kulp said that if the existing sign were removed, it would probably leave some damage to the building. Brokesh asked whether that damage could be repaired. Kulp replied that they would probably use caulking that matches the color and material of the building façade to patch the holes.

Brokesh said that she preferred the scenario with the smaller sixteen-foot sign. Evans added that the Board could possibly approve both configurations, in case the applicant decided to modify the proposal and prepare an application to the Board of Zoning Appeals. Brokesh said that proportionally, the sixteen-foot sign looks more appropriate.

Danner moved that the Board find that the proposal for the sixteen-foot sign 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. Brokesh seconded the motion with an amendment that the façade of the building be repaired with the removal of the existing sign. Mecseri said that he would be amenable to the amendment, as long as the Board stipulates that the repair involve mortar rather than caulking.

Schaub then 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, with the requirement that when the existing sign is removed, the holes shall be repaired according to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. Brokesh seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 5-0.

4. Environs Review: 302 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street (CivicPlus): Demolition Permit & Building Permit. *Within the environs of: the Downtown Manhattan Historic District, Houston-Pierre Streets Residential Historic District, Lyda-Jean Apartment House.*

Schaub recused himself and did not participate in the discussion. Brokesh stood in as meeting chair. Credit presented the staff review for 302 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street. Bowman then gave a general overview of the project, explaining that he had been working with CivicPlus on

the building for over a year, and that it was an important part of the City's economic development efforts. He said that the company felt that they needed to be able to compete for the highly-qualified employees in the professional realm of computer programming/website design, and so they had partnered with McCullough Development and the Manhattan Area Chamber of Commerce to put this building into place. Bowman further explained that the building is planned to be five stories of mixed uses, with a restaurant and retail commercial space on the ground floor, and the top four floors devoted to CivicPlus offices.

Brokesh asked about the footprint of the building and the amount of space provided for parking. Bowman said that the footprint of the building was slightly irregular due to a desire to provide sidewalk dining at the restaurant, and that they were working with the City on the parking issue – they have conducted a study that shows that there is usually unused parking in the Manhattan Town Center Mall parking lot, relatively close by. He added that the project would likely provide for 200 additional people working in this area of the downtown. Brokesh asked for more detail on the first floor retail. Bowman replied that the intent was to lease the majority of the first floor to one major restaurant tenant, with enough leftover room for 1-2 additional retail spaces. He added that there would be enough room for 5,000 total square feet of retail.

Danner then asked what the total size of the building is. Bowman said that each floor was approximately 10,000 ft.<sup>2</sup> of useable space, for a total of around 55,000 ft.<sup>2</sup>. Mecseri asked about the height of the building, whether it would be allowed under the Zoning Regulations. Bowman said that there was no height limit in this area, but that escalating costs had limited the height. They had originally planned for a winter garden and meeting space on the roof, but that it would have thrown the building into the category of a “high rise” for Building Code purposes, so, in the concern of fiscal interests, they eliminated that plan. They had also discussed having residential units, but the cost of creating sufficient separation between units discourage them. Bowman added that if the client experiences the growth that they have projected, they may plan to build a companion building in the future. He also said that environmental considerations were very important to the client, and that the building will be LEED-certifiable, even if they do not decide to go through the process of actually obtaining certification.

Brokesh discussed the landscaping plan for the parking lot, and then said she would make a friendly comment to the zoning board to review the landscape plan in order to maximize the life of the trees. Brokesh then asked if any of the Board members had any comments on the proportion of the building to the surrounding neighborhood. Mecseri said that he sees the downtown as getting larger and larger buildings over time, and that this project is a part of that progression.

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

Danner 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 property or its environs. Krysko seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 4-0.

5. Environs Review:

629 Poyntz Avenue (Manhattan Library): Municipal Facilities Review & Building Permit for Children's Library Expansion. *Within the environs of: the Houston-Pierre Streets Residential Historic District, Seven Dolors Church, Wharton House, Elliot House, First Congregational Church.*

Schaub continued his recusal and did not participate in the discussion. Credit presented the staff review for 629 Poyntz. Bowman described the project, beginning with the history of the library building itself. He said that the building had been designed in 1967, inspired by an I.M. Pei library in Iowa. He discussed the addition of the second story, the rerouting of the sewer line to the south of the building, the removal of a house in the southeast corner of the existing parking lot that generated some controversy, and issues with blocking the light coming into St. Paul's Episcopal Church to the immediate east, all of which had been dealt with in the past. Brokesh asked if the new one-story addition would block light coming into the Episcopal Church. Bowman said that it would not. Danner asked about the additions possibly affecting the size of the parking lot or increasing the number of required parking spaces. Bowman said that they had discussed the possibility of adding angled parking along Poyntz to help accommodate some of the increased demand. The Board then discussed the service entrance to the rear of the building and security lighting on the north side of the building.

Brokesh opened the meeting to public comment. Glasgow asked about the importance of preserving sight lines along Poyntz to the Episcopal Church, which has been accomplished when the Library had expanded last time by not building in the front yard area along Poyntz. She also asked about the future plans for the Library, and whether or not the building could be used for other purposes if a brand –new facility where eventually built, perhaps in 20 years. Bowman said that Manhattan had traditionally resisted creating branch libraries, and added that some space in the basement that had previously been used for storage of cassette players and other technologically-obsolete materials could be re-assigned to accommodate some future growth. Glasgow asked what the Library might be re-tasked into if the City decided to move on to a larger facility in the future. Bowman said that he could see the building being re-purposed, but he would hate to see it happen, since it is strategically located in the downtown to maximize its walkability and centrality. Pecoraro said that, while they can't predict what will happen in 20 years, indications are that public libraries are becoming increasingly important as places where people meet.

Glasgow then asked if the Episcopal Church was on the Register of Historic Places. Evans said that it was not. The Board then discussed the potential loss of sightlines to the Church as a result of the proposed addition. Danner asked if anyone from the Church had been contacted. Pecoraro said that they had not specifically contacted the Church, but that a neighborhood meeting had been held at the Library. The Board discussed the distance

between the addition and the Church rectory. Danner asked if there will be windows on the east side of the addition. Bowman said there will not be.

Krysko 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 property or its environs. Mecseri seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 4-0.

6. Discussion on the Community House.

Schaub returned and proposed that, due to the absence of some Board members and the length of the current meeting, the discussion on the Community House be postponed until next month.

7. Administrative Review Summary:

- A. 100 Manhattan Town Center (Applebee's): Sign Permit. *Within the environs of: Downtown Manhattan Historic District, Riley County Courthouse, Manhattan State Bank, Damon Runyon House, Community House.*
- B. 305 Fort Riley Boulevard (Rockhill Chiropractic): Sign Permit. *Within the environs of: Bethel AME Church.*

Credit presented a summary of the Administrative reviews conducted in the month of November. Credit then presented on an additional environs review for a demolition at 701 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street, and asked the Board if it would be possible to conduct the review administratively since the applicant had concerns about being issued a demolition permit before the first of the year. The Board discussed the location of the building proposed to be demolished in relation to the Union Pacific Railroad Depot.

Danner moved that the Board give staff approval to conduct an administrative review for a demolition permit at 701 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street. Krysko seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 5-0.

8. Announcements and Updates:

- A. Wareham Hotel minor repair method update
- B. Recommendation from Board on CLG state law review issue at the December meeting.

Credit described the month's announcements and updates. The Board discussed the method of cleaning being used on the Wareham Hotel. Mecseri moved that staff forward the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* to the Code Department and ensure that those guidelines are followed during the repair and cleaning of the Wareham Hotel. Brokesh seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 5-0.

9. Upcoming Meetings:

- Monday, December 17, 2012 (Third Monday).
- Monday, January 28, 2012.

10. Adjourn.