

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

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

**Members Absent:** None

**Others Present:** Kathy Dzewaltowski; Linda Glasgow; Mel Borst; Katrina Ringler, SHPO/KSHS; G.W. Clift.

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

Meeting began at: 4:04 pm.

1. Consider the minutes from January 26, 2015 meeting.

Danner moved to approve the minutes. Mattingly-Ebert seconded. Motion passed 4-0-1.

2. Consider the minutes from February 23, 2015 meeting.

Brokesh requested the addition of Tross's and Mattingly-Ebert's favorability of the display of artifacts at the Manhattan Union Pacific Depot.

Mattingly-Ebert moved to approve the minutes as amended. Tross seconded. Motion passed 4-0-1.

3. Public Hearing

Chmiel explained that staff had received a nomination for the Jesse Ingraham House at 1724 Fairchild Avenue to be listed in the Manhattan Register of Historic Places. He explained the procedure leading up to the public hearing and explained how staff would move forward with a recommendation from the HRB to the commission for the property's listing. Chmiel also explained the criteria used to evaluate the historic significance of local properties. He then presented a summary of the site's history, significance, and design criteria for the site set forth by the applicant in the nomination form.

Tross, noting that there were several additions on the site over time, asked if all additions of the structure were listed in the national register. Chmiel explained the whole site is listed and the latest additions are identified in the register. Tross

questioned if the national register points out what additions were deemed historically significant. Chmiel explained the local registry process deems acceptable alterations to the site in greater detail. He explained any changes to the site requiring a permit would have to be reviewed by the board and issued a Certificate of Appropriateness before commencing. Evans explained that the property being on the national register still has to adhere to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, but criteria beyond those standards are set by the local registry criteria.

Danner asked if the property was a single-family home. Chmiel confirmed, noting that it was in an R-1 zoning district.

Brokesh expressed concern about design guideline (A). As it was written, if any portion of the house becomes unstable, then it should be demolished. Chmiel explained as it is written, that would be the case. However, the board could put conditions on the guidelines with their recommendation if there were concerns.

Tross asked if the local and national registry included the whole site or just the house. Chmiel explained the local registry addresses the whole site. He assumed the national did also, but he was not completely sure. Brokesh noted that there were a few details about the site mentioned in the national register. Chmiel further explained the local nomination form listed about 10 design guidelines (8 after checking) which the applicant could specifically dictate, though the applicant only specified 3. He explained some of the guidelines would not necessarily be appropriate to the Ingraham House- such as sign and parking regulation.

Brokesh read through the formulation of the board's recommendation, outlined in the staff report. Brokesh opened for public comment on the nomination. Glasgow and Dzewaltowski expressed favor for the nomination. No one expressed disagreement to the nomination.

In terms of the integrity of the nominated property, as described in Article IV (F) of ordinance 6065, Brokesh pointed to the "Integrity of Association" section of the staff report. For the explanation of the significance of the nominated site as explained in Article IV (E) of ordinance 6065, Brokesh drew from the staff report, which noted the nominated site fulfills criteria (1) and (4).

Tross summarized the findings of the architectural significance of the property outlined in the national register, stating that there was no reason to deny a local registry based on the findings. Brokesh agreed.

Brokesh expressed concern for the language used in the local nomination's design guidelines, noting design guideline (A) stated "any part of the house *should* be demolished if it becomes unstable." Chmiel said the language could be changed by the board as a condition of recommendation. Tross also expressed concern for the language, saying it could allow for neglect or might not allow for repurposing or rebuilding after a demolition. Mattingly-Ebert suggested specifying that design

guideline (A) should specify that demolition should occur if any part of the house becomes “structurally unstable”. Holloman expressed he had no problem with the design guidelines, because any alteration requiring a permit would have to come before the board anyway. Chmiel reemphasized conditions with the language of the guidelines could be a part of the recommendation. Tross suggested the language of guideline (A) be written as “could be demolished” instead of “should be demolished”. Danner suggested changing the language in design guideline (B) from “*should* be maintained” “*must* be maintained”. Mattingly-Ebert explained if there was a situation when the structure needed to be demolished, the board would have to review it anyway. Brokesh agreed the language in guideline (A) should read “*could* be demolished” instead of “*should*”. Evans clarified that any demolition of the property would require a permit and would also, by ordinance, require a certificate of appropriateness from the board.

Brokesh explained the design guidelines could be very detailed, specifying guidelines for setbacks, signage, parking, etc. Chmiel clarified the property owner is not obligated to consent to such guidelines. Tross asked about the houses interior integrity. Brokesh also asked if the interior could be specifically maintained as dictated by the nomination. Tross and Mattingly-Ebert explained such interior regulations would not be appropriate since it is a private residence. Evans clarified what potential alterations would be reviewed by the board. Brokesh asked if the national registry should be referenced in the nomination. Chmiel stated the local nomination should be able to stand alone. He went on to explain interior regulations could be included in the design guidelines, but in this case, the property owner did not include such regulations, and no historic significance is yet associated with the interior. Tross proposed adding a general design guideline stating “The interior of the house be maintained.” Clift stated he would like to have the significant architectural details of the interior maintained. Brokesh said significant details could be those identified by the national register.

Danner motioned that the structure and associated site, known as the Jesse Ingraham House, located at 1724 Fairchild Avenue, Manhattan, Kansas, has sufficient integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, or association to make it worthy of preservation or restoration; and possesses significant historical, archeological and/or architectural qualities, and thus qualifies for designation to the Manhattan Register of Historic Places pursuant to criteria (1) and (4) listed in the Code of Ordinance, Ordinance No. 6065, Chapter 25, Article IV, Section E, of the City of Manhattan, Kansas, with the condition of the three amended guidelines: Guideline (A) reading as “If the front porch, the garage, or the house itself becomes structurally unstable, they could be demolished. The sub-units could be replaced with new construction of similar size, scale, material, quality, and design”; Guideline (B) reading as “The exterior features of the house’s west, south and east elevations must be maintained”; Guideline (C) reading as “The north elevation offers a few opportunities for modest change as it is already the meeting place for the original house and the three additions. The balcony and exterior stairway could be replaced or eliminated. The porch could be lowered or re-shaped. The ground floor frame addition could be

extended north, so long as the extension did not exceed a horizontal line eleven feet from the ground at the current north wall—this is the height of the balcony. But alterations would certainly need to be kept behind the current building so that they would not be visible from the south if their effect on the historic significance of the property is to be minimized. Other alterations are limited to what is permitted by the state and national registries”; and Guideline (F) reading as “The significant architectural details of the interior of the house must be maintained.” Mattingly-Ebert seconded. Motion passed 5-0.

4. Landmark Water Tower Park Designation

Borst explained Mayor Butler and the Parks Advisory Board’s recommendation to designate the Landmark Water Tower site as a park and how its designation might offer further protection from the property being sold in the future. He gave a brief history of the site and expressed his personal support for a park designation. Borst described potential improvements to the site as a park including a sidewalk extending from Leavenworth down to Poyntz.

Tross asked if there was a standing proposal for any purchase or development of the Landmark Water Tower site. Borst said that there was not. Evans confirmed that the application had been withdrawn.

Borst explained the significance of Samuel Kimble Jr.’s role in the development of the area. He expressed his support for naming the park in honor of the Kimble family. Glasgow noted that the tower was eligible for the national register. She gave a bio of Samuel Kimble Jr. and his family explaining their civic and personal contributions to the city of Manhattan. She also expressed her support for naming the park in honor of the Kimble family.

Chmiel explained though nothing on the site is currently listed as historic, a recommendation for park designation is more of an expression of support. Tross moved that due to the historical potential of the site, the Historic Resources Board expresses its support to the City Commission for the Landmark Water Tower site to be dedicated as a park. Mattingly-Ebert seconded. Motion passed 5-0.

5. Minor Review Applications Update

Chmiel updated the board on the administrative approval of a minor review of a sign permit application for 108 N. 3<sup>rd</sup> St. He explained the building is a contributing structure to the Downtown Historic District and the sign was appropriately attached as to not damage or destroy any historical characteristics of the building.

6. Updates and Announcements

Dzewaltowski requested one of the board members serve as a representative of the Friends of the Peace Memorial Auditorium Task Force, meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>

Wednesdays of the month at 7:00 in the evenings. She asked any board member to contact her if interested.

7. SHPO/CLG Discussion

Katrina Ringler, with the State Historic Preservation Office discussed with the board the various requirements of Certified Local Governments and historic preservation operation. She gave an evaluation of the meeting and helped clarify the role of the board. She also advised the board on how to be more effective in their procedures.

8. Upcoming Meetings

- Monday, April 27, 2015.
- Monday, May 18, 2015 (moved to third Monday from Memorial Day Holiday).

9. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at: 6:05 pm.