

Minutes
HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
Monday, January 26, 2015
4:00 P.M.

Members Present: Dea Brokesh, Chair; Angie Danner, Vice-Chair; Betty Mattingly-Ebert; Tyler Holloman; Tim Weiser,

Members Absent: Cameron Tross; Michael Krysko.

Others Present: Mel Borst; Kathy Dzewaltowski; Linda Glasgow; Gina Scroggs, Downtown Manhattan, Inc. (DMI); Dixie West.

Staff Present: Benjamin Chmiel, Planner; Lance Evans, Senior Planner.

Meeting began at: 4:02 pm.

1. Consider the minutes from December 15, 2014 meeting.

Brokesh requested it be noted in the previous minutes that Danner made the motion to approve the November 17, 2014 minutes and Mattingly-Ebert seconded.

Angie made a motion to approve the December 15, 2014 minutes as amended, Mattingly-Ebert seconded. Motion passed 4-0.

2. Downtown Design Guidelines

Evans noted that matching funds for Downtown Design Guidelines were part of the previous year's CIP request from HRB.

Brokesh noted that, based on the Chronology of Downtown Design Guidelines (included in the packet), previous guidelines were never formally adopted. She asked if those previous guidelines ever went before the City Commission. Evans was not sure since it would have been before he was on city staff. The board speculated that previous adoptions may have been unapproved due to a lack of support or funding. Scroggs explained that DMI has generally been uninvolved throughout the process of creating guidelines and that more conversation with the stakeholders might spur support. She went on to explain that DMI's support would more likely lead to Commission support of a CIP request for Downtown Design Guidelines.

Evans explained that HRB and DMI had some conversation over guidelines in the past. In 2010 DMI met with the Board and agreed to at least pursue funding.

Weiser suggested that the boundary for “Downtown” would need to be clarified to establish the jurisdiction of such guidelines.

Scroggs suggested that perhaps it would be a good time to revisit guidelines, though she questioned if DMI should talk about it first before pursuing funding. Evans explained that DMI has been on board with the previous CIP requests. Despite this, funding was not awarded through CIP. Scroggs explained that it would need to be something that a good cross-section of the DMI would have to discuss and be supportive of, perhaps putting a committee together for such. Evans suggested presenting previously unadopted guidelines before DMI to see if it’s something they would be supportive of.

Evans noted that CIP requests for the upcoming year were due on March 16th. Scroggs said it was unlikely that DMI would be prepared to support guidelines before then. Danner asked if 6 months would be a realistic timeline for DMI to come back to the board with suggestions. Evans stated that staff would have to put together some ideas for DMI to look at and discuss. The soonest HRB could put together a CIP request for guidelines again would be next year- to be used in 2017 and matched with a Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) Grant in 2018. Brokesh questioned if HRB could go ahead and request 2016 CIP funding for guidelines to hasten the process, but Evans noted that it would unlikely be approved without DMI support. Evans explained that the HRB would need matching funds to even qualify for an HPF grant.

Glasgow mentioned that she brought some historic photos, but the Board felt it would be more appropriate to view them when the specific details of the guidelines were being discussed.

Scroggs said that she would discuss guidelines with DMI near the end of February or the beginning of March.

3. City Owned Structures

Brokesh described the background of the process the Board used to prioritize the examination of city-owned structures. She had conducted research of the Sunset Cemetery Gates and Paslay Tower, which was previously sent to the HRB members.

Weiser raised concern about the process that the HRB used to prioritize the historic significance of city-owned structures in terms of its scale of applicability (local, state, national). He wanted to ensure that the list become a document that could be adjusted as historic criteria are evaluated in order to produce a quality product that could eventually be backed up with all information available. Chmiel explained that the list and prioritization of historic significance was a living document which could be updated as new information came to light and that it was a simple way for the board to focus its resources and start taking action.

Brokesh explained the research she conducted on the Sunset Cemetery Gates and Paslay Tower. The Sunset Cemetery Gates were erected as a memorial to Civil War soldiers and constructed by the Women's Relief Corp, which she noted could classify as associations with a historic event and person(s). The stone wall was also constructed as a WPA project.

Evans clarified that the list of city-owned structures was a list to prioritize the sequence of further research. Brokesh asked how the Board would like to proceed with the list and if they would like to pursue local registration with them.

Weiser suggested that any information gathered through the research of the structures be assembled in a repository which the board would have access to so that any future questions concerning a city-owned structure's background could be readily answerable. Evans and Chmiel confirmed that KHRI (Kansas Historic Resources Inventory) acts as such, and could be utilized by the HRB.

The board agreed the Sunset Cemetery and Paslay Tower could be of historic significance. Brokesh went on to explain that the tower was a WPA project and had an architect of local significance.

Evans noted that a PSIQ (Preliminary Site Information Questionnaire) might be the next step for the board to advance on the two structures. Glasgow explained that SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office) serves as a helpful resources to those submitting PSIQs, aiding them throughout the nomination process with examples to follow.

Brokesh stated that a local listing should be first priority, though Chmiel noted it would not be much work to submit a nomination for a state or national listing after having gathered the materials required for local listing, since there is much overlap. Evans further explained the additional elements of a local listing, including site design standards and notification of neighbors. Brokesh stated she would be willing to file the paperwork necessary for a PSIQ and a local listing.

Borst reinforced the importance of having historic information readily available for when situations like the Landmark Water Tower arise and noted that the board was on track.

Brokesh clarified the board's intention on submitting PSIQs for the Sunset Cemetery Gates and Paslay Tower, though they would wait until after hearing back from SHPO before pursuing local registry. Dzewaltowski suggested pursuing a register of the whole cemetery in order to save time and resources. Weiser cautioned there might be undesired complications associated with its nature, as there might be stipulations on where people could be buried, what tombstones could be used, landscaping, etc.

Brokesh stated that the board would be discussing the “B” list properties at the next meeting. In the meantime she would submit the PSIQs for the Sunset Cemetery Gates and the Paslay Tower.

The board began discussing who would research what structures from the “B” list and what information was already available. Glasgow mentioned that Donna Schenck-Hamlin had been conducting research on the Landmark Water Tower area and that she would be willing to share her research. She also mentioned that Wyatt Thompson has been conducting his own research specifically on the historic elements of Manhattan parks. Weiser said he would contact Wyatt. Weiser discussed the scope of the board and what they should be able to accomplish between board meetings. He then volunteered to research all of the “B” structures to discuss for the next meeting.

4. 2014 HRB Action Plan Review

Brokesh reviewed the previous update to the HRB Action Plan. She suggested changing the action of “Identification of potential historic districts, prioritized by community interest as well as level of engagement” to a level “high” priority. Evans explained that the Action Plan Goals matrix was just a simplification of the HRB Action Plan.

Brokesh addressed the action item of preventing demolition by neglect. Evans explained that Code Services does not report on demolition by neglect, but any structures that the Board has concern on can be reported to Code Services. While Code Services reported to the HRB on their initial demolitions, they were only going to report on a case by case basis from then on. Brokesh raised concern that the board didn’t have the time or resources to be scouting for potential demolition by neglect properties. Evans stated that he would talk to Brad Clausen about a potential report on their recent code violations, though it might be a bit out of the scope of the HRB’s responsibility. Evans also explained that such code violations are posted in the City Manager’s Monthly Report. Brokesh suggested that such violations could just be included in the HRB packet. Holloman stated that the Board doesn’t have any jurisdiction over non-historic properties. Weiser suggested that there would be plenty of time throughout the demolition by neglect process for the board to be aware and to act if necessary. Brokesh suggested that there needs to be some sort of process between a first violation and the issuing of a demolition permit, in which the HRB would be informed. Danner noted that unless the property is in a historic district, or is listed in a register, the HRB would have no jurisdiction over the matter. Evans confirmed.

Borst asked if the 2014 Action Plan was the superseding action plan. The Board confirmed. He asked if there were a way for the public to view the Action Plan and current focuses. Brokesh asked if the 2014 Action Plan could be put on the city website. Evans said that the city could, but to consider that it is more of a working document for the HRB. Brokesh suggested that Chmiel update the Action Plan Goal status on a regular basis. Chmiel noted that such publication might be good for at

least informing the public on the HRB's mission and progress. Evans expressed concern for unnecessary redundancy of the minutes, or any appearance of lacking progress, since many HRB Action Plan items have not been addressed. Mattingly-Ebert suggested just maintaining the active items on the website.

5. 2016-2021 Capital Improvements Program Request

The board reviewed the inner-office memorandum, written by Wyatt Thompson, describing the condition of historic city-owned structures, as included in the Board's packet. Given the previous discussion, Brokesh noted that a CIP request for Downtown Design Guidelines would not be an appropriate request for the 2016 CIP. Thompson's memo encouraged the Board to submit a CIP request to support repairs needed to the Union Pacific Railroad Depot, including repairs to the exterior trim, crown molding, and fascia; new rain gutters; exterior painting; restoration of historic doors; stabilization of the structural sub-floor; and installation of carpet tiles to protect the existing wood floor.

Danner mentioned the ongoing need for repairs to the Community House, as requested for CIP funding in 2012. Danner moved that the Board move forward with the CIP Request for: the Union Pacific Depot repairs as described in Wyatt Thompson's memo; a photo and artifacts/memorabilia showcase and interpretive signage associated with the Depot (cost undetermined); and window replacement/repair to the Community House (an \$18,000 CIP request with a total project cost of \$100,000 in 2013). Weiser seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

6. Administrative Review Summary:

Chmiel briefly presented the administrative review of the 121 S. 4th Street Sign Permit for the Unwind Yarn Store. The board had no questions.

7. Updates and Announcements

Chmiel updated the board on the progress of the solicitation for the Bluemont Youth Cabin. The solicitation would be issued soon, estimated to go public in early February. There will be a non-mandatory pre-proposal meeting held on-site 30 days after solicitation. Final proposals would be due 90 days later in early June.

8. Upcoming Meetings.

- Monday, February 23, 2015
- Monday, March 23, 2015

9. Adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm