

Minutes
HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
Monday, September 26nd, 2016
4:00 P.M.

Members Present: Chris Banner; Betty Mattingly-Ebert, Vice-Chair; Eileen Meyer; Suzanne Orr, Chair and Kevin West.

Members Absent: Craig Hager and Cameron Tross.

Others Present: None.

Staff Present: Ben Chmiel, Planner; and Eric Cattell, Assistant Director for Planning.

1. Consider the minutes from August 22nd, 2016 meeting.

Mattingly-Ebert moved to approve the minutes as written. Banner seconded. Motion passed 4-0.

2. Election for Vice Chair.

Mattingly-Ebert nominated Meyer for Vice Chair. Meyer granted. West seconded. Motion passed 5-0.

3. Downtown Design Guidelines.

Chmiel explained that the downtown design guidelines presented in the packet originated in 2005 as guidelines for the downtown redevelopment process, but was never officially adopted. He continued explaining that the Board suggested some edits to the document as it relates to the Downtown Historic District to propose as an adoptable document, which Chmiel had prepared for the meeting, to be used for design review.

Chmiel explained some challenges in adopting such a document. Firstly, that there was currently no mechanism to trigger a review of certain design aspects of a project on a building, because they would not require a building permit to be completed, such as change in materials, color, addition of small awnings, etc. all of which are spoken to in the current edited document. A new kind of permit system would have to be created that had a lower level review trigger. Secondly, adding guidelines on top of a district would prove to be a bit redundant, as many design aspects of building projects mentioned in the document can already be controlled for during the historic review process that require a building permit, like window/door openings, façade arrangement, height, bulk, and in some cases awnings. Chmiel suggested narrowing down the aspects of building design

downtown that the Board feels are the biggest issues interfering with historic integrity to take that to Downtown Manhattan Inc. (DMI).

Mattingly-Ebert asked why the guidelines were never adopted. Chmiel and Cattell explained that they were never intended to be adopted, but used as a reference document in the downtown redevelopment that took place in the late 2000s.

West asked how much of the edit document was left after the edits. Chmiel explained that there were a lot of irrelevant sections dealing with the north and south end of downtown that were cut out from the original 80 pages, so there were about 40 remaining.

Chmiel also explained that there would need to be a process put in place to review projects under guidelines and that would need to be fully ironed out by the time anything was adopted.

Meyer asked if aspects of parking lot design were dictated by zoning, since it is addressed in the guidelines. Chmiel explained that certain aspects of parking lot design were, such as landscaping, parking dimensions, and aisle width.

Mattingly-Ebert explained that DMI might be interested in additional regulation to give assurance to business and building owners who look favorably on the historic character of the district that it will stay that way.

Chmiel suggested approaching DMI and asking what their concerns would be and if there are additional design characteristics they would like to be enforced. Mattingly-Ebert suggested inviting DMI or a representative or sending a representative to DMI to discuss what they might be interested in regulating as far as building design in the district. Meyers suggested there are aspects of building design that businesses would favor more control over. West agreed that the issues needed to be narrowed down. Chmiel said city administration would contact DMI and arrange a time to discuss the issue.

4. Minor Review Application.

Chmiel presented a sign permit application for a wall sign at 116 S. 4th St. (Mid-Town Plaza). A section of an awning was removed to place the sign.

5. Updates and Announcements.

Chmiel notified the board that the PSIQ for Floral Hall was reviewed by the Kansas Historical Society and would appear to qualify for the State Register of Historic Places. According to the correspondence, the integrity of the building has been compromised as not to qualify for the National Register at this time. Staff will continue working on the nomination form.

6. Adjourn.