

Minutes
HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
Monday, February 25, 2019
4:00 p.m.

Members Present: Craig Hager, Acting-Chair; Kevin West; Jana Fallin; Cameron Tross; and Ann Kosch.

Members Absent: Betty Mattingly-Ebert, chair; and Eileen Meyer.

Staff Present: Ben Chmiel, Planner; and John Adam, Sr. Planner.

Others Present: Linda Glasgow; Linda Morse; Debbie Saroff, Owner/Applicant; Ben Moore, Applicant.

1. Meeting Opening

Hager called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm with a quorum and read the public comment policy.

Linda Glasgow, 2236 Snowbird Drive, asked if the historic survey of Aggieville has been authorized. Hager commented that it is a CIP request. Chmiel said the City Commission has not taken action on the recommendation to authorize a historic survey for Aggieville that was recommended by the Historic Resources Board in December. Glasgow, speaking on behalf of the Manhattan-Riley County Preservation Alliance, said historic surveys are often paid for by a SHPO grant requiring a match but because Manhattan is a CLG the match in this case would be substantially waved. The Manhattan-Riley County Preservation Alliance agreed that the historic survey was warranted and needed and a major alternation of historic Aggieville should not be an exception if the cost to the City is negligible and the results are purely informational. Hager said the board wants to have the historic survey done and the survey should take place in 2020. Chmiel said the recommendation from the Board was to apply for an HPF grant in the spring. The deadline for application was the end of March. He explained the recommendation was forwarded to the City Commission who had not taken action on the item. Chmiel noted the survey topic was part of the CIP discussion later in the meeting order and recommended delaying further conversation till that time.

West moved to approve the minutes of the January 28, 2019 meeting. Fallin seconded. Motion passed 3-0-2.

2. Major Review: 329—331 Poyntz Avenue (Ulrich Building) Interior Renovation

Chmiel explained the history of the property, noting known alterations made to the building over its existence, its character-defining features, and status as a contributing building in the Downtown Historic District. He described the interiors of the building, with the eastern-most bay of the building being occupied by Glass Impressions, a retail glass shop, and the western two bays being occupied by Fortuity, a retail clothing store.

Chmiel explained the proposal, which was to generally to renovate the interior of both the Fortuity space (331 Poyntz) and the Glass Impressions space (329 Poyntz) in order to unify the space for a single tenant. The demolition would consist of removing existing interior walls, a bathroom, and changing rooms. The demising wall would largely remain, except for two penetrations made allow these spaces to function as one space. The front (north) penetration would be 10' in width and 9' in height, the back (south) penetration would be 42" in width and 9' in height. The existing ceiling in 331 would remain as is with the modern pressed-tin style. The drop-ceiling in 329 would be removed and a new ceiling with can lighting will be added to mimic the ceiling in 331. A new HVAC system will be installed in the 329 space, but the ceiling will be raised as high as possible. Both floors would be pulled up and a commercial carpet square type product would replace them. Three 10'x10'-9" partitioned bridal suite rooms would be installed on the west side of the remaining demising wall. Three 4'x5' partitioned dressing rooms would be installed on the eastern-most exterior wall in the 329 space. A new ADA bathroom would be installed toward the back of the 329 space. In the very back of the space, where the existing bathroom is, new basement access will be added and a bathroom would be removed where the new access between 329 and 331 would be created. Two closets and sections of interior walls would be removed. Existing basement access will be relocated requiring a small infill floor to match the existing. Chmiel explained that the exterior walls and the facades of the building would not be altered, except new glass would be installed in the store fronts of both spaces. It would be the exact same size, color, and transparency of what is currently there, but would be an insulated product. As well, the old signage would be removed and new signage would be proposed on the north façade on the transom above the center bay. Lettering was also proposed on the panel between the display window and the prism glass as well as a sign mounted on the prism glass that made up the transom window. Chmiel explained that city administration believed the proposal met the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and recommended approval of the proposal.

Tross said the staff report stated the modern building was split between two tenants; he asked if historically it was one space or if the demising wall always existed. Chmiel said the information available did not have that level of detail. Staff attempted to look

through the Polk Directory but their resources only went back to 1965, which at that time the space was divided. He mentioned the applicant believed the demising wall was relatively modern so it probably did not go back to the origin of the building, but at the least existed in 1965. Chmiel explained that the demising wall would be minimally impacted and still maintain the spatial appearance of two spaces. West said he remembers from a previous application in this building (105 South 4th) that it had been one store at one point. Hager asked Chmiel to refer to the adjacent space the Board reviewed for remodeling. Chmiel said 105 South 4th Street was united at some point and subdivided at a later date, but that was a different space. Tross said looking at the front façade you could easily see it as one space so he did not have a problem with it, noting that the exterior would not change. He noted the signage for the building was a little different than they typically see but it did not seem out of character. He asked if it would be a mounted or painted sign going on the lower portion of the transom. Chmiel said it would be mounted. West said façade improvements have been done in the last 15 years so most of the current façade is not the original. Chmiel confirmed he was referring to the 1980s remodel. Chmiel concurred the prism glass and the smooth-face limestone bulk head was modern. Hager asked if the existing basement access is original to the building. Chmiel said judging by the doorframes it is old but he cannot say if it is original, adding that generally with less visible spaces, the level of scrutiny for changes is pretty low.

Hager called for public comment. There were none.

Kosch made a motion to approve that the application as it meets the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for treatment of Historic Property as reviewed in accordance with KSA 75-2724 and will not damage, destroy, or diminish any historic character or features. West seconded. Motion passed 5-0-0.

3. Major Review: 1906 Leavenworth (McFarlane-Wareham House) Addition

Chmiel explained the historic significance of the property explaining why the home was listed on the National Register of Historic places, noting its pasted owners, designer, and builder. Chmiel also described the physical aspects of the house, noting character-defining features of its Tudor Revival architectural style, both in the interior and exterior. He also noted an addition to the rear of the house, reviewed and approved by the HRB in 2011. Chmiel went on to describe the proposal, which was to construct a 1-story, 450 square foot brick-cladded addition off of the west façade of the house. The addition would expand the existing ground-floor bedroom and add a bathroom and walk-through closet. The addition was generally evocative of the Tudor-Revival style. Demolition would remove the entirety of the northwest porch where the addition would

integrate into the roof structure above the space. The western and northern exterior wall enveloping the northwest bedroom, including all interior wall features would also be demolished. Two windows and the exterior door would be removed and reused in the new construction and the extent of existing floors would be preserved throughout demolition. New construction would expand the footprint of the home about 10 feet west, with a depth of about 35 feet. The addition would be about 10 feet tall, plus about 2.5 feet for the decorative wood railing atop the structure. The addition would be set back about 11 feet from the front façade and 9 feet from the furthest point of the rear façade. The structure would be clad almost entirely with red brick to match that of the rest of the house's ground floor. A new foundation and a crawl space would be constructed. The wood railing atop the structure would match that of the 2011 addition and downspouts and gutters would match those existing around on the exterior of the house. The roof of the structure would be nearly level with the finished second floor and be mostly flat. Lastly, mechanical equipment would be moved and reinstalled westward up against the western wall of the new addition. The proposed addition would be very similar in style to the addition approved by the HRB in 2011.

West asked how big the 2011 addition was. Chmiel said he did not have a square footage but pointed out the size relative to the original structure. Tross asked if there were any features other than the window that would be used in the addition. Chmiel said the windows and a door would be repurposed. Tross asked if the kitchen was a part of the 2011 addition. Chmiel said yes. Tross said the 2011 addition would have required the removal of an existing exterior wall to get the addition to function with the remainder of the home and asked if the brick is veneer or a solid masonry wall. Chmiel said it was a veneer. Tross said he would have less concerns with the removal and demo of the existing wall if it is veneer because it is just imitating masonry wall. Looking at where loads are coming down there would have to be some sort of structure left in place to hold things up so while they are removing a portion of the exterior wall, it would not be impossible to put things back. He asked if they are removing any foundation beneath the exterior wall.

Ben Moore, 513 Leavenworth Street, approached the Board and explained they did have to extend the column down to get the load to carry down through the crawlspace and that the columns location would not move as it was essential for extending it down. Tross asked what the exterior treatment of the foundation would be. Moore said it would be a slab and the bedroom wall would be wood framed with brick veneer. They would be using the same brick used in the 2011 remodel. Tross said he asked because the Secretary of the Interior have Standards for the permanent modification but you can look at it as not necessarily being permanent, as the corner of the building would still exist. If the roof was modified it would be less likely that it could go back to the

original. The 2011 and proposed renovations had the flat roof style and it works with the existing home and the previous addition. He assumed the utilities would be rescreened once moved since they were screened. Tross said if it would have been a solid masonry wall he would have been more reluctant but since it is a veneer wall he would be more forgiving. Hager said the rear porch that would be removed had distinct character but he agrees with Tross about reusing what they could and matching what was there outweighs the loss of the porch. West said he liked the look and the house but asked what the effects of a no vote would be in terms of potential delisting. Chmiel asked if he was referring to denial or no vote. West clarified that the motion is not to approve or deny the work; it is asking if the renovations do or do not meet the standards.

Chmiel explained the applicant could not get a building permit without the Board affirming the project met the Secretary of the Interior Standards. If the Board were to deny or no vote the item, it would have a similar affect. If denied, the Board would have to explicitly state which standards it did not meet. Staff would then submit a letter of the result to the property owner and SHPO, who would have five days to respond to the letter. At that point the property owner would have the choice to appeal the decision to the City Commission who would have the option to override the Board's denial by a majority vote. West said the item was only before the Board because it is on the National Register and the NPS says under federal law that it cannot affect what an owner can or cannot do. Chmiel said the owner could pursue de-listing the property and then move forward with their project, but would be very unlikely. Fallin said she lives in a historic property and they fight to keep the neighborhood going, adding that the renovation allow for longevity of the owners remaining in the home.

Debbie Saroff, 1906 Leavenworth (applicant and property owner), said during the 2011 addition, the west wall, a porch, and an overhang were removed. They wanted to preserve as much of the original home as possible including the steel casement windows with the original glass. The window openings would be repurposed with mirrored glass and they were restoring another window that was removed in 2011 to be put on the front of the house. A wood lentil would be used in the front and they would try to save what is existing on the west side. She did not like removing the back porch but it was the only way to fit everything on the first floor and they tried very hard to keep with the historic character of the home with the renovation. Tross asked if the trim around the steel beam would be across the entirety of the opening. Moore replied there would be a vacant spot at the wood bulkhead, adding that the addition would be less intrusive than the 2011 addition which was a tax credit project. Tross said with the bulkhead remaining it lets you locate where the original exterior wall was. If this home were ever to be toured it allows people to see exactly where the original home stopped and new additions were added. Moore said it will be evident on the floor too. Even

though the new flooring would be oak to match the original, it would still be slightly different. They would be compatible but the trained eye will be able to see the difference.

Fallin moved to approve that the board finds the project meets the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation for treatment of Historic Property as reviewed in accordance with KSA 75-2724 and will not damage, destroy, or diminish any historically significant property or historic character defining features. Tross seconded. Motion passed 5-0-0.

4. CIP Requests 2020—2024

Chmiel presented the previous year's CIP Request that have yet to be fulfilled. It included an Aggieville Historic Survey, Floral Hall Rehab Study, Strong Neighborhood Survey, and UPC Display Case.

Tross commented that the city had already given public parking to the new hotel and began working on major renovations to Aggieville. They had already denied the historic survey once and would probably deny it again. He added they are already looking at a three year timeline for the survey and the city would be three years into the improvements. It seemed the city wants to make the changes before anything is determined historic and needs to be saved or protected from modification. He recommended that Aggieville be a top priority; initially the Strong Survey was higher on the list but the priorities have changed. He suggested moving the Strong Survey to number two and Floral Hall to the bottom because it was a feasibility study. He said if the city did not grant funding for the Aggieville Survey, he would not feel comfortable granting anything else that would come before the Board. He added it is a request but with all the improvements, it is a requirement and without the survey the Board cannot do their job. Fallin agreed. She thought they would be much farther with this, adding that the Board voted on it because it needed to be done. Tross said they voted to put it in the CIP request.

Chmiel said the recommendation from December to the City Commission was to authorize city staff to apply for the \$9,500 grant because it was not awarded through last year's CIP request. He added the state said a match is not always required for CLG's and they have the power to waive the grant match as a part of the project. That recommendation from the Board to the commission asked to authorize city staff to apply for the grant regardless of having funds for the match, but the City commission had not taken action on that recommendation.

Tross asked if the downtown redevelopment plan that was put forth was paid for by the city and completed by city staff. Chmiel said yes, there were consultants that helped with later aspects, but the planning document was completed by the city. Tross said he did not understand why it is so difficult to get the historic survey done. They need a historic survey of Aggieville; he asked why a grant is necessary as they should just include it in the work that is already being done.

West asked if the City Commission was just refusing to consider something that potentially will not cost any money. Chmiel said it was beyond him, but he assumes it is not a matter of money, but political issues between property owners, businesses, and the City in regards to the whole project. Tross said Chmiel had previously said the property owners were supportive of the survey. He asked how the City can prevent the property owners from conducting the survey if there is no funding necessary. Chmiel said property owners have been apathetic; no one is in favor, but no one has given formal opposition. Tross said they did want the historic survey because of a historic district. Tross said if they want a historic district, there must be a historic survey to provide evidence of its importance.

Fallin said Aggieville is an important, vibrant area of Manhattan. Anyone associated with Aggieville should support the survey. Tross commented that the Board needs to have a starting point and the survey is a fact finding mission. West asked if it is elected officials saying they do not want to consider the item or is it city staff not putting the item on the agenda. Chmiel said the recommendation went forward because we have to be granted authorization by the City Commission to apply for a grant and enter into a grant agreement which outlines the parameters of the grant. That recommendation went forward with a memo explaining the recommendation, but the City Commission had not put the item on an agenda. Tross asked if the Board's support of the the Aggieville Improvement Plan was contingent upon a historic survey being completed. Chmiel said he could not recall, but that it was part of the adopted plan. Tross said he thought they talked about that. He asked what would happen if they withdrew their support of the plan. Chmiel said the plan did not have to be approved by any advisory boards and it would not necessarily stop the plan if the Board were to suddenly withdraw their support. Adam said that is not just because there is no historic district that the City did not have to seek approval. The City Commission just requested advisory board's opinions on the matter and they can accept or disregard the recommendations.

West asked how many commissioners have to agree to put it on the agenda to get it on the agenda. Chmiel did not have an answer. Fallin said she is shocked that they do not want more information on the district. Chmiel said they could probably conduct the

survey without a grant match but that authorization from the City Commission is required to accept the grant. Tross asked if there is a way to include the historic survey in the Aggieville Improvement Plan. Chmiel said it was in the adopted plan, but the action of applying for the grant must come from the City Commission. Tross asked if the historic survey could just be included in the proposed work. He wants to make sure that the historic survey is completed before the improvements are made. Chmiel said he did not know what process it could be tied to. They are looking at streetscape and parking garage design right now. Tross said it would just be included in the scope of required work to include the historic background of the buildings. Chmiel said the survey is included in the plan. It has been a CIP request for the last two years and this is the process they are currently using. Tross said the plan is just a guideline and there is no enforcement for the survey. There needs to be a trigger that requires the historic survey be completed before the project can move forward. West said other than the Aggieville Survey, nothing on the CIP request is worth doing. If they do the survey it may cause hiccups in the progress of the improvements but before tax revenue is diverted from other areas of the community for rehabilitation of the district a survey needs to be done.

Linda Morse, City Commissioner, commented that she did not recall this item coming before her. She believes it did come to the commission in a CIP request the previous year but did not get approved like many other requests. She added if the Board would take a strong position and make a motion and come forward to say what they are after that would be important to the City Commission. She believed the Board has made good points for the survey and suggested taking a strong position on the matter. Fallin said Manhattan has something to lose without the survey. That area is very historic and very few cities have a district like that. The board needs to make sure that the redevelopment is positive. Morse said a historic survey was completed downtown and it seemed beneficial. She stated the survey seems logical. Fallin said she wants the Board to be good stewards of their community. Aggieville is unique and historic and that is why she is willing to serve on this Board because they need to preserve that. Morris agreed. Glasgow said she spoke with the SHPO and confirmed the grand match would be substantially waived for the historic survey. She did not believe it to be a money problem. She endorsed what Morris had said to take a strong position on the matter.

Tross agreed that money did not seem to be the issue. There will need to be a combination of political and business pressure. Fallin asked where this statement needs to go. Adam said last year the Board requested this as a CIP request item which goes to the City Commission along with all other CIP requests. If the survey could be completed without CIP funding then a different question needs to be proposed. Staff

could proposed the Aggieville Survey as a CIP item that does not need funding and let the City Commission review it. The Board can also submit a letter to be included with the memo. Fallin suggested staff draft the supplemental letter and email it to the board for review. West asked about the deadline. Chmiel said the CIP request are for fiscal year 2020 so even if it got through the budgeting process the funds would not be approved until later in 2019, too late to apply for this grant year. The recommendation that the Board submitted in December was independent of that funding, emphasizing that an application could be submitted without a grant match to submit the application by March.

Tross asked if the request for the grant has gone through from December. Chmiel said the recommendation from the Board in December was for staff to apply for the grant before March without a match. Tross asked if they are applying to not include the match. Chmiel said that was the recommendation but the City Commission has not taken action on the recommendation. Hager asked when the next City Commission meeting is. Chmiel said Tuesday, March 5th. Tross asked if there was a way to indicate on the CIP request that it would be at no cost to the City. Chmiel said yes, for 2020. For 2019 the Board had done all they could do. Tross asked if staff could apply for the grant hoping they commission approves the request. Chmiel said they could not. Kosch asked if they could make a motion that the Board's December recommendation be resubmitted to be considered a second time.

Morris commented that the purpose of a Capital Improvement Program is to prioritize money and if there is not money tied to this then it does not have to be a CIP request so it could be that you are able to go directly to the City Commission with the request. Fallin suggested not going the CIP route. Chmiel said they do not have to; it is the safe route in regards to having a grant match to present to SHPO when they apply but since they have be told the grant match will likely be waved it does not have to be tied to the CIP request. Tross said they still have to give staff permission to submit the paperwork for the grant. The December recommendation was saying the CIP is not necessary and asking if they could apply but the City Commission did not review it, noting a previous recommendation from the Board was pulled from the agenda. West asked if the City Commission has to approve a grant application without funds. Chmiel said yes, because they would enter into an agreement with the State. Hager asked how does the chair get notified about what is going on today. Chmiel said since the Board has already made a recommendation in December, he can amend that to include some of the minutes from this meeting and have it resubmitted. Hager said that should be done.

Chmiel clarified that the Board would like to remove all other CIP items except the Aggieville Historic Survey. Tross said he does not think they need to strip all other

items but identify that they are putting all request on hold until the Aggieville Survey is completed. Chmiel recommended putting Aggieville as a 2020 request and shift the other request down. The Board agreed. Tross suggested shifting Floral Hall below the Strong Survey. Kosch and Hager supported the suggestion.

5. Updates & Announcements

There were none.

6. Adjournment

Hager adjourned the meeting at 5:45 pm.