

Minutes
HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
Monday, February 23, 2015
4:00 P.M.

Members Present: Dea Brokesh, Chair; Betty Mattingly-Ebert; Tyler Holloman; Cameron Tross.

Members Absent: Angie Danner, Vice-Chair; Michael Krysko; Tim Weiser

Others Present: Mayor Wynn Butler; Kathy Dzewaltowski; Calvin Emig; Linda Glasgow; Linda Morse; Lana Oleen; Mel Borst; Jim Roberts

Staff Present: Benjamin Chmiel, Planner; Lance Evans, Senior Planner; Wyatt Thompson, Park Planner

Meeting began at: 4:07 pm.

1. Consider the minutes from January 26, 2015 meeting

Minutes could not be approved for lack of a quorum.

2. City Park Master Plan

Thompson briefly explained the process of updating the City Park Master Plan by July, 2015.

Tross asked how the 2006 master plan had been implemented since its adoption. Thompson explained what elements of the park incorporated since 2006 did and did not align with the current adopted master plan.

Mattingly-Ebert asked Thompson to clarify the plans for parking lot pavement on the north side of the park. Thompson confirmed that there is a project in the design phase to pave the existing lot using city-university funds and how it would not be congruent with the current plan.

Brokesh asked if there was a proposed plan for the park at this time. Thompson explained that the master plan update was still in the community input phase, though he would be creating concepts in March and April for further community input throughout May and June.

Brokesh commented that the park plan for 2006 had a rectilinear plan unlike the organic English style which may have been more historically accurate. She also pointed out that there might be some historical aspects to the trees at City Park

that may have been brought in from all over the United States and should be preserved.

Borst commented on the safety of the parking lot south of the park adjacent to the playground, noting that it was safer than an expansive parking lot.

Mattingly-Ebert asked if historical markers on the trails of the park had been considered. Thompson said it was something to consider.

3. 2016-2021 Capital Improvements Program Request

Chmiel explained what the board had discussed at the last meeting for their CIP request and briefly explained the items they could request. He added that staff discussed the feasibility of requesting funding for a historic survey of the Landmark Water Tower and adjacent structures including the Sexton's House, the Cemetery Gates and Pavilion, the Girl Scout Little House, and the Paslay Tower. He explained that there might be some momentum and support for this item, given recent interest in the tower and interest in having more information about potentially historic city-owned structures. Brokesh suggested that the CIP item for the survey include the structures' potential listing on the local registry as well.

Tross noted the Landmark Water Tower used to have an accessible observation deck and asked if it would be worthwhile to research what it would take to recreate that access again. Chmiel explained that it would be something that might be more feasible as an HPF rehabilitation project if/when the tower was listed. Brokesh emphasized that nothing throughout any listing process should prevent such a project from happening. Tross suggested that such improvements would make the tower much more functional.

Brokesh asked about the amount estimated for the survey of the Landmark Water Tower and adjacent properties. Evans explained that he based the estimate off of past surveys. Brokesh again asked that local registration be included in the survey.

Glasgow stated she received some information from SHPO regarding other historic water towers in Kansas which could be used as a template for the Landmark Water Tower listing.

Butler noted the importance of having more detailed, catalogued information about properties historic in nature, but not necessarily listed on the local, state, or national register. Brokesh asked how best information of that kind could be gathered. Oleen agreed such information would be of great benefit and could supplement as a first step to getting a property listed on a register. Morse suggested interviewing senior citizens for getting information about local history or sites. Chmiel explained that KHRI acts as a more formal inventory for information on properties and structures, whether listed on a historic registry or not, which can be uploaded or edited by anyone who creates an account. Evans

explained how group interviews to gather anecdotal information would potentially be a part of a formal survey of the Landmark Water Tower and adjacent structures, as was in the process of the African American study.

Evans explained the cost of the CIP request item for Union Pacific Depot photo and artifacts/memorabilia showcase and interpretive signage was dependent on exactly how much would be displayed and the nature of the display elements (climate control options, size, etc.). Brokesh had a showcase of photographs in mind. Tross and Mattingly-Ebert commented favorably on the display of artifacts. Evans said staff would explore the costs of different options.

Evans asked the board if there was any specific priority to the CIP request items. Cameron moved to submit the CIP request with the items listed in the packet as prioritized (Union Pacific Depot interior and exterior building maintenance; Union Pacific Depot photo and artifacts/memorabilia showcase and interpretive signage; Community House, window replacement/repair; and Landmark Water Tower and Adjacent Landmark Historic Survey) with the amendment of the Landmark Water Tower and Adjacent Landmark Historic Survey to include nomination to the (local) Manhattan Register of Historic Places. Mattingly-Ebert seconded. Motion passed 4-0.

4. Major Review Applications

Chmiel gave a brief overview of the proposed remodeling of 313 Poyntz, known as the Briggs Block Building, a contributing structure. He explained there were proposed changes to the interior and exterior. Interior changes included the addition of an ADA compliant bathroom and a separate entrance to the staircase on the main floor. Changes to the exterior (façade of the building) included removal of the existing blonde brick on the main floor exterior to expose historic limestone columns, relocating the east entrance to be flush with the underlying party wall, and replacement of the existing single-pane glass with new insulated glass of similar tint and color. Chmiel then opened the floor for the applicant, Calvin Emig, for comment and question.

Emig thanked Glasgow for providing historic photos, aiding the design process. He explained further the purpose behind the design and how the prospective tenant expressed the need for the historic rehabilitation, and the elements of the current building limiting the space's marketability. Emig explained his belief that there is original limestone behind the existing brick, though he cannot be sure of its condition or existence until the removal of the brick. He said he would like to utilize the existing limestone if it is in good condition and repair it if possible. Brokesh asked what would happen if the limestone was damaged beyond repair. Emig explained that he could install a "thin brick" over the historic limestone, which would more or less mimic the historic limestone. Borst explained there is a method of repairing the original limestone that could be financially feasible.

Tross expressed his appreciation for Action Pact Design’s work in rehabilitating historic buildings in the past and if Emig did find the underlying limestone was damaged beyond repair, that it be replaced or mimicked as closely as possible. Otherwise he had no objections to the proposal. Mattingly-Ebert agreed that it fit well with the goals of the HRB.

Mattingly-Ebert moved that the proposal meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Tross seconded. The motion passed 4-0.

5. City Owned Structures

Brokesh prepared a PSIQ for the Sunset Cemetery gates and Paslay Tower. She had some questions about the description of the stone on the Sunset Cemetery Gates. She also asked about the Paslay Tower’s “rebuilding” in 2001. Glasgow said she believed the rebuilding was only associated with the internal sound system, and not the structure itself. Borst confirmed both the sound system and the grill of the tower were modern.

Brokesh said she would wait to proceed with registry of the tower or cemetery gates in lieu of the CIP request for funding to do so. Evans advised the HRB to put together a memo to the city commission saying the HRB is looking for more information on the identified properties and explaining the board’s plan for preserving the city-owned properties. Evans stated he would put together a memo explaining the HRBs status (what they had done to date) on analyzing the city owned structures over 50 years old and how the HRB would keep working on getting more information on the properties. Tross also explained assessing the condition of the structures throughout the research of city-owned structures. Borst noted the disrepair of the roof of the Sunset Cemetery Gates Pavilion.

Dzewaltowski commented that anyone can submit a PSIQ. Evans clarified that as an advisory board, members should go through the city commission first, though as individual citizens, yes, they could submit a PSIQ.

In absence of Weiser, Brokesh asked he be contacted and have his research of ‘B’ list properties included in the next meetings packet to be discussed.

6. Updates and Announcements

Chmiel explained how the city allocated excess CDBG funds toward an RFQ. The RFQ solicited contractors who would assess what the Community House could accommodate in being repurposed for some kind of social service office use. The deadline for submitting RFQs is March 9th. Butler emphasized the intent to repurpose the Community House as a historic building and the possible uses it could house. The RFQ is the first step in rehabilitating the structure. Chmiel explained the contractor would be consulting with SHPO so that they would be

aware of what could and could not be done to the building to maintain its historic character.

Chmiel updated the board explaining that the Young Buck site was listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Chmiel explained that the Grier's had removed all applications for proposals to redevelop their site adjacent to the Landmark Water Tower. Butler explained however that it was still possible for them to reapply with a new proposal. Borst mentioned that the Parks Advisory Board would be discussing designating the Landmark Water Tower Site as a park at their next meeting. He explained how this would possibly give it another layer of protection. Mattingly-Ebert thought the designation of the Landmark Water Tower Site as a park was a good idea, though the board could not make an official recommendation due to the lack of a quorum. Evans explained if there was a written proposal the HRB could have reviewed it, but it would have to follow due process and give the public proper notice, and therefore would have to be put on next month's agenda. Brokesh explained the Board's CIP request for a survey of the site might suffice in expressing support for any additional protection of the site through a park designation.

Glasgow recommended The Economics of Historic Preservation by Donovan Rypkema as a good read for the board.

7. Upcoming Meetings

Monday, March 23, 2015

Monday, April 27, 2015

8. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 5:53pm