

Minutes
HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
Monday, December 17, 2012
4:00 P.M.

Members Present: Patrick Schaub, Chair; Dixie West, Vice-Chair; Michael Dudek; Dea Brokesh; Angie Danner; Michael Krysko; Michael Mecseri (left after the vote on item #3).

Members Absent: None.

Others Present: Debbie Saroff, McFarlene-Wareham Residence; Heather Peterson, Anderson Knight Architects; Dan Knight, Anderson Knight Architects; Kail Katzenmeier, Captstone 3D; Kathy Dzewaltowski; Linda Glasgow.

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

1. Consider the minutes for the November 26, 2012 Historic Resources Board meeting.

West and Brokesh noted typographic errors in the minutes. Mecseri noted a line that he did not remember saying and wished to strike. West then moved that the minutes be approved as amended. Brokesh seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 7-0.

2. Conceptual Environs Review:

720 Poyntz Avenue. *Within the environs of: Houston & Pierre Streets Residential Historic District, Ulrich House, First Congregational Church.*

Credit presented the conceptual staff review for 720 Poyntz. Mecseri said that he would not participate in the discussion due to a potential conflict of interest with the applicant. Katzenmeier explained the project and the fact that the applicant wanted to completely restore and rehabilitate the entire property with period-sensitive detail. He added that the intent of coming before the Board at this time was to get feedback, particularly on the prospect of raising the roof of the building in the northeast corner of the lot in a sensitive way that can allow for the second story to be used as a residence. Brokesh asked about the entrance from the alleyway to the building in the northwest corner of the lot. Katzenmeier replied that the site plan only shows one potential layout, but that right now the entrance is from the alleyway.

Brokesh asked about the height of the northeast building, is it one or two stories?

Katzenmeier explained that the building is two stories tall, but not tall enough for a full residential story on the second floor. The Board discussed the potential for increased green space on the lot and the parking angle from the alleyway into the spaces shown underneath the residential use on the northwest building. West asked what material they would plan on using if they raised the roof of the northeast building – would it be stone?

Katzenmeier said that they had talked about doing a band of windows, taking the existing roof off, lifting it, and placing it on top of windows. He added that his inclination tends to be to let the historic be historic and add compatible new construction that does not completely replicate the historic look. The Board then discussed the feasibility of listing the property with such a modification, and the potential use of tax credits for the project.

Katzenmeier then said that at this point it is probably most effective to think of this as an environs property rather than on the Register. Schaub asked how far they would plan to raise the roof. Knight said that it would probably be around three feet and that they would take the roof off and most likely rebuild and replace it. Brokesh said that she was not seeing that the proposed project would affect the environs of the surrounding historic properties, but if they were to raise the roof, she is not sure that it could be listed. The Board then further discussed the possibility of getting the property registered with minor modifications, and whether the changes should be similar to the existing materials and windows, or if that structure could be listed as non-contributing. West said that if it is done sensitively, she did not think that raising the roof would have an adverse impact. Katzenmeier said that the goal is probably not to continue with stone, but to build a window system that is consistent with the structure.

3. Recommendation on Manhattan Assuming State Law Review Responsibilities.

Credit presented on the possible changes to the historic state law review process and research conducted by staff. West asked about the potential change in the process, that if the City took over state law review, any potential administrative denial would be brought before the Board rather than being denied administratively. Credit responded that her clarification was correct. West then asked whether or not the other surveyed cities had full time preservation planners who might be better able to facilitate the administrative review process. Credit explained that most Kansas cities have a ½ full time equivalent position for preservation, with Lawrence having a dedicated staff person. The Board then discussed various details of the presentation, noting some inconsistencies and potential visual changes that would make things easier to understand. West asked about the difference between major and minor reviews. Credit explained that staff currently refers to minor reviews as administrative reviews. He added that the point of mentioning the difference between major and minor reviews in the presentation was to express that Manhattan has a much higher ratio of major reviews to minor reviews than other Kansas CLGs, and that if the City were to take over state law review responsibility, the list of minor review project types would need to be expanded, perhaps to include all signs.

Krysko asked about the comment made in the presentation that the Board would have less time to work on its other missions – the work load is not increasing from what the Board currently has, so how would it have less time to focus on its other missions? Credit responded that the conclusions made in the presentation are based on a choice between having the City take all responsibility for state law review, or leaving all of the responsibility to SHPO – maintaining the current process is not an option. Credit added, with that in mind, taking over state law review would decrease the Board's time to focus

on other missions and increase staff time spent on preservation relative to the amount of time available if SHPO were to take over all review responsibility.

Glasgow said that in her opinion taking over state law review responsibility would allow the review decisions to be made closer to the people, which is a positive, and that the local Board might have a better understanding of local projects and be able to make decisions on them that better fit the needs of the community. The Board then discussed a previous item that had been denied by the HRB but then approved by SHPO. Evans said that he wanted to make it clear that if Manhattan assumed state law responsibilities, the legal liability would rest on the City for any denial on historic projects, so the Board would have to be very clear in evaluating the criteria for each project and judicious in its judgment. Credit added that ideally both SHPO and the HRB would come to the same conclusion on any given project, as they are both bound by the same legal standards, but having a local perspective on the Board could certainly be a positive. Credit added that the best avenue for instituting more design-related controls was through local designation of properties on the local register, not through the environs law.

The Board then discussed the possibility of nominating additional properties to the local register. West expressed her desire to be able to streamline the local historic nomination process to allow currently-registered properties on the State and National Registers to easily transfer to the Manhattan Register of Historic Places. Brokesh added that staff should bring a copy of the current local historic nomination form to the January meeting for the Board to review. Schaub then said that the decision that the Board has to make on this item is whether or not they are willing to take on responsibility of making the final decision on state law reviews, or whether that responsibility would be better left to the State.

Krysko moved that the HRB recommend to the City Commission that Manhattan take over historic review responsibilities under the state statute according to the draft agreement with SHPO. The Board discussed the need to have further evaluation of the major/minor review list. Danner seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 7-0.

West commented on the time currently consumed by the Board on reviewing projects, and said that perhaps the Board could take an active role in determining the status or use of City-owned historic properties. She added that the HRB could review the condition of these properties and make recommendations to the City Commission on how best to rehabilitate or utilize them, investigating, for instance, what is happening with the Jarbeaux House.

4. Discussion on the Community House.

West said that with more people living downtown, it would be interesting to turn the Community House into some kind of public use, for example for yoga or dance classes. The Board reviewed the previous discussion on the Community House and Schaub read the recommendations provided by Bonnie Lynn-Sherow at the October meeting. West then said that the thing to figure out for the property is probably the use - the use will

then determine what has to be fixed, on the building and other issues. Brokesh brought up the possibility of potentially applying for a National Endowment for the Arts grant. Schaub explained that the local chapter of the American Institute of Architects previously did a charrette for the use of a historic school building. He said that he could approach the AIA Chapter about looking at doing that same kind of a charrette for the Community House. The Board discussed the possibility of researching grants for design work at the Community House. West said that the Board should also contact the Chamber of Commerce to let them know about plans for the future of the building and to generate some excitement. She added that she would look into contacting Downtown Manhattan Incorporated. Brokesh mentioned that Sherow had also suggested contacting the Rotary, due to the Rotary's history with the building. Schaub said that he would talk to the Rotary. He added a request that staff report back to the Board at the January meeting on the condition of the Jarbeaux House and other historic structures owned by the City.

5. Administrative Review Summary:

- A. 512 Poyntz Avenue (Marinello School of Beauty): Sign Permit. *Within the environs of: Downtown Manhattan Historic District, Houston-Pierre Streets Residential Historic District, Riley County Courthouse, Manhattan Carnegie Library, E.A. & Ura Wharton House, Mattie M. Elliot House, Lyda-Jean Apartment House.*
- B. 701 S. 4th Street (Midwest Concrete Materials): Demolition Permit. *Within the environs of: Union Pacific Railroad Depot.*
- C. 1920 Sunset Lane: Building Permit. *Within the environs of: Grimes House, McFarlene-Wareham Residence.*

Credit presented a summary of the Administrative reviews conducted in the month of December.

6. Announcements and Updates.

Dzewaltowski mentioned that the Preservation Alliance would be touring the Jarbeaux House on Thursday at 4:00PM. West added that once the Board gathered sufficient information on the Community House, Curt Loupe should be invited back to the HRB to come and hear the findings.

7. Upcoming Meetings:

- Monday, January 28, 2012.
- Monday, February 25, 2012.

8. Adjourn.