

Minutes
HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
Monday, February 25, 2013
4:00 P.M.

Members Present: Patrick Schaub, Chair; Dixie West, Vice-Chair; Michael Dudek; Angie Danner; Michael Mecseri; Dea Brokesh; Michael Krysko (left after item 2).

Members Absent: None.

Others Present: Kathy Dzewaltowski; Linda Glasgow.

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

1. Consider the minutes for the January, 2013 Historic Resources Board meeting.

Brokesh and West noted several typographical errors and suggested that they be corrected. Brokesh then moved that the Board approve the minutes as amended. West seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 7-0.

2. Capital Improvement Program (CIP) & Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) Grant – 2014

- HPF Grant for Manhattan archeology study;
- Windows/repairs at the Community House;
- Feasibility study for the Community House;
- “Punch list” for repairs at the Union Pacific Depot;
- Downtown design guidelines.

The Board discussed the cost of several items that they had suggested for the CIP. Schaub said that he researched the cost of the Community House windows – 59 windows at an average price of \$1,300 - \$1,500 per unit for acceptable historical matches, plus installation cost yields a total of \$90,000 - \$100,000. Mecseri said that a rough estimate for the “punch list” of deferred maintenance repairs at the Union Pacific Depot was about \$40,000. He added that the list includes things like replacing the rotting fascia board under the gutter, replacing the doors on the south side of the building, cleaning soffits, touching up light fixtures, and removing insect accumulation.

Schaub then said that an update of the downtown design guidelines to reflect changes that have occurred in the area, such as the adjacent residential areas and new strip commercial, would cost somewhere between \$5,000 - \$8,000. West suggested that the windows at the Community House could be done in phases rather than all at once in order to reduce the cost per year. She added that it was frustrating to see the Depot deteriorating so quickly after being remodeled – since the building is bringing in money,

could some of it be used to address the deferred maintenance issues? The Board then discussed the idea of using some of the Depot's income for repairs. Dzewaltowski said that she had heard that the net income for the building at one time was about \$30,000 a year. Mecseri agreed, saying that the building gets a lot of use, and that the current maintenance seems very minimal.

Brokesh asked if the most pressing issue for the building was the floor, and the Board discussed the need to gather more research on the structure of the floor and the possibility of adding a new wood surface. Schaub said that the most important issue would be keeping water out of the building, and the Board discussed perhaps pulling those items out of the punch list and listing them as a less-expensive CIP request.

Danner then said that the feasibility study for the Community House might need to be a prerequisite to installing the windows – what if the study finds that the chosen windows are incompatible?

Evans mentioned that for many of the items the Board could apply for a Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) grant. The Board then discussed their final prioritization and ranking of CIP request items, settling on the following list: 1) Repair “punch list” for the Union Pacific Depot — \$8,000 (total project cost: \$45,000); 2) Community House feasibility study — \$65,000; 3) Downtown design guidelines — CIP request amount: \$2,000 (total project cost: \$10,000); 4) Archeology Study for Site 14P024 (Blue Earth Village) — CIP request amount: \$9,000 (total project cost: \$55,000); 5) Community House window replacement/repair — CIP request amount: \$16,000 (total project cost: \$100,000).

The Board discussed the Depot's needs and said that they could perhaps request the City to perform some of the general maintenance on the building as a part of normal operations. Evans then asked if the Board could allow staff some flexibility in researching the CIP items and preparing the final list, and then e-mail their findings to the Board and gather comments electronically so that the list could be submitted before it was due on March 1st.

West moved that the Board accept the discussed list of priorities for the CIP and HPF grant opportunities for 2014 with the potential for City staff to gather additional information and make minor adjustments. Brokesh seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 7-0.

3. City-Owned Property

- Updated list of structures owned by the City at least 50 years old.

Credit presented on the updated list of City-Owned property over 50 years old. West suggested that the Board take Curt Loupe up on his offer to use a Parks and Recreation vehicle to tour the properties on the list and perhaps even prioritize the list. She added that they should wait until the weather warms and take photos of the sites on the tour.

Brokesh asked if the goal was to nominate some of the properties for the local register. West said that was a possibility, but the list would also be for research purposes, to catalogue the properties. Danner suggested that perhaps staff could take photos of the properties and add the list to the website. Schaub said that the item should be put on a future meeting agenda for further discussion.

4. Discussion on State Law Review Major/Minor Project List.

Credit explained the proposed major/minor project review list that staff had presented at the previous month's meeting. The Board discussed some of the items on the list. Brokesh suggested that solar and wind energy equipment installation might always be considered a major project, and should be removed from the list.

Dudek said that the Board is going to have to trust staff's judgment. West moved that the Board approve the Project Review List for Historic Resources where staff will have authority to administratively review projects on properties listed on the State and National Registers and within 500 feet of listed properties, with the amendment that item 3E in both sections be stricken. Mecseri seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 6-0.

5. Administrative Review Summary:

- 420 S. Juliette Avenue: HOME Grant rehabilitation. *Within the environs of: Houston-Pierre Streets Residential Historic District, Hulse-Daughters House.*
- 121 S. 4th Street (Marshall Theater Building): Interior Remodel. *Contributing structure within the Downtown Manhattan Historic District.*

Credit reviewed decisions on 420 S. Juliette Avenue and 121 S. 4th Street. Both administratively-reviewed items had been approved by SHPO. There were no Board comments.

6. Announcements and Updates:

- Update on HB 2118 repealing the 500' Environs Review Law.

Credit explained the status of Kansas HB 2118, which proposes to eliminate the 500' Environs Review portion of the Kansas state preservation statute. Danner added that the legislation had been brought forward by the Kansas Association of Realtors, and said that it was expected to clear the House and be voted on in the Senate in the next few days. The Board discussed how other states deal with historic property environs, and what the impetus might be for removing the environs. Glasgow added that large investors in historic projects like the environs law because it affords them some security in knowing that the surrounding neighborhoods can be more easily preserved.

7. Upcoming Meetings:

- Monday, March 25, 2013.
- Monday, April 22, 2013.

Brokesh presented some information she had research on environs review and site planning for sustainability. She asked staff to e-mail the Board information about grant opportunities from the National Endowment for the Arts, which offered an opportunity to bring in some kind of artistic group perhaps as a fundraiser for the Community House.

8. Adjourn.