

**Minutes**  
**HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD**  
City Commission Room, City Hall  
1101 Poyntz Avenue  
Monday, September 22, 2014  
4:00 P.M.

**Members Present:** Dea Brokesh, Chair; Angie Danner, Vice-Chair; Betty Mattingly-Ebert; Tyler Holloman; Michael Krysko; Cameron Tross; Tim Weiser.

**Members Absent:** None

**Others Present:** Mimi Balderson; Jan Borst; Mel Borst; Brent Bowman; Kathy Dzewaltowski; Sara Fisher; Chuck Jackson; Bruce McMillan; Barbara Poresky; Debbie Saroff; Steve Saroff; Donna Schenck-Hamlin; Dixie West; Ray Weisenburger.

**Staff Present:** Jason Hilgers, Deputy City Manager, Benjamin Chmiel, Planner; Chris Curtis, Recreation Superintendent; Eddie Eastes, Park Director; Lance Evans, Senior Planner; Kiel Mangus, Assistant City Manager.

Meeting began at: 4:00 pm

1. Consider the Minutes

Brokesh requested a correction to item #4: Change “Unadoptable” to “Unadopted”.

Dzewaltowski informed the Board that “Glasgow” said she would prepare slides for a later meeting, not “Dzewaltowski,” as stated in item #4.

Mattingly-Ebert requested her name changed from “Mattingly” to “Mattingly-Ebert” as stated in the list of Members Present.

Minutes passed as amended 6-0 (Weiser absent at previous meeting)

2. City Hall Addition

McMillan, representing Bruce McMillan AIA, Architects, P.A. discussed and presented the site plans of the Parks and Recreation office addition to City Hall. He went on to explain the floor plans of the new Parks and Recreation office space addition as well as renderings of the building, its future landscaping, and changes to parking configurations.

West raised concern about the rear AC units noise as a nuisance. McMillan explained that he would work toward mitigating for noise through possible noise insulation techniques and/or relocation of additional mechanics.

The design will go before the Planning Board on Oct 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014. McMillan expects to begin making bids for construction in November 2014 and start construction in January of 2015.

Mattingly-Ebert opinioned that the proposed plan was a good solution. The Board had no further comments on the City Hall expansion design.

### 3. Landmark Water Tower

Mangus discussed and presented the design, created by Bowman Bowman Novick Inc., of the desired expansion of the Grier's residence and the subsequent need to acquire the city-owned property adjacent to the Grier's, on which Landmark Water Tower stands. Mangus explained that various city staff expressed concern for utility and maintenance access, which would require specific setbacks from the water tower to the property line and proposed structure. He specifically noted that while the water tower is not operational, a water main the city would need access to, as well as a gas line (not city owned) runs through the city property.

Brent Bowman, of Bowman Bowman Novick, presented a site plan of the Grier house expansion depicting the expansion of property and structure toward the water tower. Bowman explained that the design would have to go before the city commission for final approval regardless.

Brokesh inquired about the distance between the tower and the proposed property line. Bowman noted there was a planned 14 feet between the tower and the proposed property line and 20 feet between the tower and the proposed structure, suggesting it was enough to allow access to the tower for city maintenance.

Mattingly-Ebert inquired about the proposed structure's setback from the street. Bowman had no figure, but explained that the right of way for the street was 25 feet, which would abut the proposed structure.

Weiser raised interest in the water tower's draw as a tourist attraction or as a destination for local visitors. He alluded that the tower had relatively little draw as such, but if there was any, it should be considered in the design of the house and land acquisition negotiation.

Tross expressed concern on differentiating the abutting private and public properties, which arises from the close proximity between the proposed structure and the existing water tower. Bowman noted that the visibility of the water tower is of high priority, and was considered in the design.

Brokesh articulated there should be at least 20 feet between the proposed property line and the tower for issues of maintenance access outside of a potential fence line if existing landscaping is to remain. Mangus explained how private structures are often located on or in easements, though often at the risk of the property owner. Mangus also elaborated on

how the city would not lose any landscaping in the expansion, though the Griers would lose some trees on their own property with the proposed design.

D. Saroff requested another rendering of the house's expansion, which didn't display any trees, so that the proposed design would be made clearer. No such rendering was available.

Weisenburger posed Bowman on his point of view of encroaching upon a potentially historic landmark. Bowman explained how there were issues of scaling that were carefully analyzed to give the design a better dialogue with the tower, though in general, he stated that the expansion does not feel to encroach upon the water tower.

J. Borst questioned if the TNO (Traditional Neighborhood Overlay) allowed for the lot coverage the design proposed. Assistant City Manager explained how if it didn't, the Griers would have to ask for an exception to the current zoning. M. Borst stated that the TNO does not in fact encompass the property in question. J. Borst also expressed concern about the spatial relationship between the tower, the house, and the neighborhood. As well, she was concerned about the setbacks the design encroached upon.

S. Saroff explained that the Griers are proposing to purchase roughly 25% of the public Landmark Water Tower property.

Schenck-Hawlin questioned why the residence couldn't expand south- away from the water tower, instead of north- towards it. Bowman explained that the property is too narrow on the south side to allow for expansion.

J. Borst expressed concern about the surrounding neighbors' view of the tower from their properties affected by the proposed two-story expansion.

West expressed concern about diminishing the open-space, park-feel of the Landmark Water Tower property. Weiser responded with again posing if there was a large demand for use of the land as a park destination.

Schenck-Hawlin explained how the area is very popular for walkers and joggers in the area, using the tower as a destination between the abutting cemetery and historic area as a whole.

D. Saroff explained how at the west end of Leavenworth, there were two stairways installed to create public access to the cemetery and the water tower, so that people could at one time promenade to the top of the water tower and observe the view it provided.

M. Borst further explained the historic park function of the tower and how it could be eligible for the national historic register.

J. Borst also raised concern about being able to differentiate between the park area and property.

At 5:10 pm, Bowman withdrew himself from the meeting after expressing his client's desire to avoid a controversy.

Brokesh stated for the record that her impression of the majority of the public comments was that the encroachment of the proposed structure on the water tower is "significant."

Amy Balderson expressed that the expansion could be much worse than what is being proposed, but that the visual appeal will be affected nonetheless. She also stated her appreciation for Bowman Bowman Novick's and the Grier's willingness to listen to the board and to seek public input.

S. Saroff expressed that he didn't want the addition to the Grier's house to occur.

Jackson noted that he rarely sees people using the land as a park.

Tross stated that he didn't have a "huge issue" with the expansion, though there should be a greater demarcation between the private and public property. Further stating that nothing would be degraded if there were more mitigation.

Mattingly-Ebert raised concerns about the city being able to maintain the structure and the property with the proposed building distance from the tower.

Weiser furthered that there is a long process before the City Commission can approve the final design.

Brokesh expressed that the view driving from Evergreen to the tower is one of the most significant aspects of the tower and its site. Krysko agreed. Tross explained that view obstruction is important, but that there are many pre-existing issues degrading said view and measures should be taken to preserve the view as is.

Danner opinioned that the water tower preservation is priority one and that the least the HRB could do is move forward with pursuing its national registry.

J. Borst raised concern about the property possibly expanding or intensifying an existing non-conforming use.

Brokesh made a motion that if the Griers chose to pursue the proposed design, HRB would request more information regarding separation between the water tower and the proposed structure including additional viewpoints of the relationships between the two structures. Seconded by Tross. Motion passed 7-0.

#### 4. City-Owned Structures

Brokesh discussed the items listed in local ordinance that characterize historic properties and using them as criteria for prioritizing historic structures, since they largely mirror the state and national criteria.

Brokesh suggested that the City Owned Structures discussion be moved to a later meeting. Seconded by Weiser. Discussion postponed.

5. Announcements and Updates

Evans updated the board on the status of the York Property on Wildcat Creek being eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Brokesh described her visit to the Kansas Preservation Conference and mentioned that the Alliance was looking for a city to host next year's conference. She asked if the board would be interested in hosting, though a date has not been set for the conference.

The board discussed potential Manhattan facilities fit for hosting the conference and how it would be preferable if it were in an historic building or district to showcase the city's preservation efforts. Weiser requested that more information be presented at a later date so that the board could gather the exact responsibilities and roles that the board would have in such an endeavor.

6. Ucoming Meetings

Monday, October 27<sup>th</sup>

7. Meeting Adjourned at 5:45 pm