

Minutes
HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
Monday, January 23rd, 2017
4:00 P.M.

Members Present: Chris Banner; Suzanne Orr, Chair; Cameron Tross; Craig Hager; Eileen Meyer, Vice Chair; and Kevin West.

Members Absent: Betty Mattingly-Ebert.

Others Present: Rod Dechant, Applicant; Linda Thomas, Applicant; Mel Borst, Applicant; Linda Glasgow; and Kathy Dzewaltowski.

Staff Present: Ben Chmiel, Planner; John Adam, Senior Planner; and Wyatt Thompson, Senior Park Planner.

1. Consider the minutes from November 28th, 2016 meeting.

West moved to approve the minutes as written. Banner seconded. Motion Passed 6-0.

2. Major Review Applications.

822 Pierre Street (Carriage House Rehabilitation).

Chmiel presented the proposed rehabilitation of the carriage house in the rear yard of 822 Pierre Street. The rehabilitation included straightening, stabilization, repair, and adaptation of the 1895 carriage house. It would be adapted to accommodate for automobile use, requiring an increased width of the original swing door entrance on the west side of the north façade from eight feet in width to ten feet in width, expanding the opening to the east. The original out-swing door would be replaced with an overhead track-rolling door, built with material matching the out-swing doors, that would slide open to the east. Chmiel explained that the swing doors on the north façade could be reinstalled on the south façade to replace the modern garage door. The roof of the structure would be braced to eliminate sag and extant asphalt shingle would be replaced with shingles matching the principle house. Exterior wood siding would be rehabilitated and painted, however deteriorated materials would be replaced with like materials if necessary. Structural walls would be braced and reinforced from the interior. The hayloft door on the north façade would be rehabilitated for use. The modern entry (pedestrian) door on the east side of the south façade could be replaced with a site-built in-swing door of similar appearance and construction of the existing out-swing doors on the north façade, or match appearance of the original door if evidence could be found. The

remaining out-swing doors on the east side of the north façade would stay in operation and be repaired if needed. A modern concrete floor exists that would remain in place with no modification.

Banner asked if the door on the north side of the building would be site-built. Borst said that salvaged materials could be repurposed on the south side entrance, but a new overhead sliding door would have to be constructed on the north side using new, like materials. He asked if the sliding door style would have been used during the time period of the carriage house's construction. Borst believed it would have. Tross asked if zoning would allow the garage to be so close to the alley without requiring a variance. Chmiel explained that the garage's setback violation was grandfathered and that the structure footprint wasn't expanding, so no variance would be required. Tross asked when the south side of the carriage house was modified with a modern garage door. Thomas said the modern door was there when she bought the house, however she had the mechanics for the automatic garage door opener installed about 25 years ago. Tross asked about the siding material to be used. Borst explained that some of the siding material around the base of the structure would have to be replaced as it was deteriorated beyond repair. He did however find a product similar to the historic material. West noted the bracing on the exterior of the building in the photos. Borst explained that the building was leaning about 13 inches. Meyer asked if the building would be allowed to be rebuilt were it to collapse. Chmiel explained that the city would allow it to be rebuilt as long as its demolition was not a willful act of the property owner, though variances would be recommended to clean up the title. West noted that the sliding door would be similar to what you'd find on a barn of that era, though it would be automatically operated. Tross asked if the structural frame would be replaced or "sistered" to reinforce the building. He said replacing the frame floor to ceiling would be ideal. Borst planned on removing and sistering rotting pieces, but placing diagonal beams on the interior to straighten the building. Tross also asked if paving on the alley would be part of the project. Borst said he was unsure how or what paving material would be used, but the alley was generally lower than the structure, so drainage was not a significant concern. Borst explained there was a concrete floor extant on the interior of the building in decent shape. Banner asked if the windows on the east side of the building were original. Borst wasn't sure. Tross stated he had no major concerns with the rehabilitation but that the repurposing of the building for auto use by widening the original opening on the north entrance wasn't necessarily an appropriate treatment due to the fact that returning the building to its original state would require reconstruction. However as a whole, stabilization of the building is a drastic improvement and will preserve the building in the long run. West agreed.

West moved that the proposal for the proposed interior renovation met the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as reviewed in accordance with K.S.A. 75-2715 – 2725 and would not damage, destroy, or diminish any historically significant property and its character-defining features. Meyer seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

223 S. 4th Street (Interior Renovation).

Chmiel presented the proposed interior renovation of an office space located in the southern most tenant space of the J.J. Marshall Building (223 S. 4th Street). The extant finishes of the interior, none of which are historically significant in nature (hailing from the '80s and '90s) would be removed and replaced with modern finishes, including hardwood floors, tile floors, gypsum wall board, paint, and a wood plank dropped acoustic ceiling, replacing the extant dropped ceiling. The essential office-style layout of the floor plan would be maintained and no modifications to the exterior facades, windows, or doors of the building would be made.

Tross asked when the building was constructed. Chmiel stated it was built in 1924 by H.B. Winters. West wondered if the building were originally one large, open interior. Chmiel explained that it was originally built with individual tenant spaces. Banner asked why a drop ceiling was being proposed as opposed to exposing the original ceiling material. Dechant explained that removing the drop ceiling was part of the original plan, as the other spaces he'd worked on in the building had raised ceilings, however in this case, he could not get the return air mechanical system clearance to fit on the roof. West noted that the project was simply a remodel of a modern interior. Tross asked if any layers of ceiling above the existing drop ceiling would be removed. Dechant said they would not be. Tross summarized that the proposal was simply a face lift of a 1980s interior and nothing of historic significance was being altered or removed.

West moved that the proposal for the proposed interior renovation met the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as reviewed in accordance with K.S.A. 75-2715 – 2725 and would not damage, destroy, or diminish any historically significant property and its character-defining features. Tross seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

3. 2018-2023 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Requests.

Chmiel explained what the CIP was and noted that the board typically requests funding for rehabilitation projects or surveys. He included last year's requests in the packet and went through the items to explain why the Board may want to consider carrying them over or removing them from the current year's requests.

He explained that the Union Pacific Depot repair grant cash match was not being carried over because the City failed to get awarded a grant for the project in 2016 and repairs were more or less being made by Parks and Rec in 2017 for the full cost. Thompson further explained that all repair needs were going to be met including soffit repair and repair of the subfloor. Carpet tiles mentioned in the 2016 grant would not be included. Banner posed installing wood laminate. Tross posed installing a floating floor. Tross inquired about the previous request to fund a showcase for depot memorabilia and if it would make a good request. Chmiel explained that the Arts and Humanities Board would be a better Board to sponsor a request and that the request has failed to get funded several years in a row. Chmiel said he would contact the liaison for that Board to gauge their interest.

Chmiel went on to explain that the Community House window replacement/repair was carried over into the 2017 CIP Requests since it was a need, though the full cost of the project at \$100,000 is reported due to the projects likely unfavorable grant award odds, similar to the Depot project last year. Tross agreed that it should remain since it was not a cost included in the feasibility study for reuse of the building. West asked if replacing the windows would warrant a review. Chmiel explained that it would. Thompson explained that the cost is so high due to the number of windows on the building and that finding compatible window styles was difficult.

Chmiel went on to explain that the Sunset Cemetery- Carriage House roof repair project was carried over at \$25,000. It was a project budgeted for parks and rec to complete in 2017, however it is unsure if the amount budgeted will be enough to complete the work, especially if bids come back higher than expected. Therefore a CIP request for \$25,000 would cover any additional costs.

Chmiel explained that the Aggieville Community Vision Plan, to be adopted later in the year, called for preservation of the historic core of the Aggieville area. He explained that city administration is therefore recommending a historic resources survey of the area, focusing on the 1100 and 1200 block of Moro Street; the 600 and 700 block of N. Manhattan Avenue; select sections of N. 12th street between Bluemont Avenue and Laramie Street; and 519 N. 11th Street at an estimated cost of \$36,000.

Orr asked about the Sunset Area Survey. Chmiel explained that CIP funds for the grant match were budgeted for 2017 and that city administration would be applying for the grant in the coming months, but it would be in a separate grant year from an Aggieville survey.

Chmiel asked the Board if they had any suggestions or ideas about other projects to request as a CIP project. Tross asked if there were any updates for the future of the Goodnow Youth Cabin. Thompson explained that an RFP went out in the past to solicit reuse of the building; however no feasible proposals were submitted. He explained that the building was not in use, however it was secure. Tross asked if there were any major repairs or projects concerning the cabin that the HRB could support with a CIP request for a cash match for a grant. Chmiel and Thompson agreed to investigate a need for a project to keep the building in good condition.

Dzewaltowski asked if there was support from the business owners for conducting a historic survey of Aggieville or establishing a district. Chmiel explained that the majority of business owners surveyed in the Aggieville Community Vision Community Survey supported the notion of a district; however they were more supportive of historic

designation being limited to individual buildings. At the same time, the opinion of property owners was not entirely clear. The intention of a survey would be to explore the feasibility of a historic district of the area and then assess the desire to establish some other form of a district or other conservation tool. In the meantime, property owners could pursue listing their individual buildings if they wanted using the survey data.

4. Upcoming Meetings.

Monday, February 27th, 2017.

Monday, March 27th, 2017.

5. Adjourn.