

**Minutes**  
**HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD**  
City Commission Room, City Hall  
1101 Poyntz Avenue  
Monday, September 23, 2019  
4:00 p.m.

**Members Present:** Kevin West, chair; Eileen Meyer, vice-chair; Renee Erickson; Jana Fallin; Ann Kosch; Tom Hanson; Cameron Tross

**Members Absent:** None

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

**Public Present:** Patrick Schaub, Applicant; Joseph Stock, Applicant; and Linda Glasgow.

**1. Meeting Opening**

West called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Staff called roll and stated there was a quorum. Open Public Comments: there was none. Meyer moved to approve the August 26, 2019 meeting minutes with spelling corrections, Tross seconded. Motion carried 7–0–0.

**2. Major Reviews**

Chmiel presented the renovation proposal for 401 Poyntz Avenue. He noted the history of the building and its physical changes over time. He described the proposal, which was to comprehensively renovate and restore the building, converting the northern retail space to a salon, reconfiguring office spaces in the southern portion of the second floor, adding an apartment on the second floor, and updating two southernmost retail spaces along the ground floor on the south end of the building as white-box finishes. Staff recommended approval of the project as proposed, based on the findings in the staff report.

Hanson asked if there was any plan to restore the raised parapet on the Poyntz Avenue side. Chmiel said that was not a part of the proposal and would be outside of the Historic Resources Board's purview to require such treatment, but noted if the applicant had chosen to restore the parapet, city staff would have no objection. In response to Hanson, Tross said that restoring the parapet would be a huge project that would require additional work to be done with it. Tross said he appreciated the plans to realign the windows with what was originally there.

West opened the floor to public comments.

Schaub explained the issue with the parapet was examined but would include a lot of additional work at a significant cost to the applicant. He added they were not pursuing a roof remodel and if the applicant chose to rebuild the parapet, it would likely happen in addition to a greater roof project. To address the windows, Schwab noted the building was built in 1905 and did not have bulkheads as seen in images provided. He explained the applicant would not go back to the high stone bulkheads, but instead to 18-inch tall wood frame bulkheads.

West asked what the ceiling was like underneath the drop ceiling. Schwab said the ceiling is approximately 13 feet tall and there were 20-inch tall plaster moldings between the columns. He said many of those are still intact but some have been destroyed or damaged by the installation of ductwork.

Linda Glasgow, 2236 Snowbird Drive, wanted to know if the exterior stonework will be cleaned and what method they will use to clean it. Schwab said they are looking at a soda blasting for the very dirty parts but general brush washing without acids for the entirety.

West closed the floor to public comment.

**Meyer made a motion stating that the Board found the proposal met the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as reviewed in accordance with K.S.A. 75-2724 and would not damage, destroy, or significantly diminish any historically significant property or historic character-defining features. Kosch seconded. Motion carried 7-0.**

West recused himself from item 2.2 on the agenda, noting a possible conflict of interest, and stepped down from the dais. Meyer assumed the role of interim chair.

Chmiel presented the renovation proposal for 406 Poyntz Avenue (Smith Building). Staff recommended approval of the project as proposed, based on the findings in the staff report. He noted the history of the building and its physical changes over time. He described the proposal, which was a remodel of the ground floor and basement of the building in order to repurpose the space as a brewpub. Staff recommended approval of the project as proposed, based on the findings in the staff report, though Chmiel noted some potential conflicts with the Secretary of the Interior Standards as it related to the proposed treatment of the rear façade. He noted that potential conditions of approval were provided for the Board's consideration, which included salvaging the removed materials from the rear façade.

Tross asked if the rear façade has been modified before or was even original. By the appearance of the rear façade, he thought the rear façade has been shifted backwards. Chmiel said he had no record of the façade being moved or reconstructed, but thought it possible for that to have happened. Tross wanted to know if there would be a sign permit request in regards to the sign shown on the front façade. Chmiel explained that would be a separate sign application, though from the plans they intended to use the existing sign structure. Erickson asked if any neighboring buildings have a pushed back rear-façade. She also asked if there was original flooring underneath the current flooring, what the applicant would do with that. Chmiel deferred the question to the applicant.

Adam interjected that 406 Poyntz is the only building with a recessed rear façade. Kosch said she would approve a motion with or without conditions.

Meyer opened the floor for public comments. Stock explained they intend to do exploratory demolition to see what is underneath the existing flooring. He added there has been series of patching and repairing over the years, so they intend to find out and restore if possible. If they could restore the original floor they intend to do so. If they were to remove the rear façade,

they would have to hire a mason to carefully remove the bricks. Stock said they could relocate the two limestone sills to the basement.

West approached the Board as a member of the public and said he did not believe the rear façade has been moved back because he sees no indication of it being moved. He also did not think saving the limestone and bricks from the rear façade would be useful, adding it would be improbable that they would be replaced exactly as they were. He saw no real benefit to keeping those materials.

Meyer closed to floor to public comment.

**Kosch made a motion stating that the Board found the proposal met the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation as reviewed in accordance with K.S.A. 75-2724 and would not damage, destroy, or significantly diminish any historically significant property or historic character-defining features. Tross seconded. Motion carried 6–0.**

### **3. Minor Review Updates**

Chmiel presented a sign permit review for 408 Houston Street (Mid-Town Plaza Building) This sign permit was for a non-illuminated sign on a non-contributing building. The Board had no comments.

Chmiel presented a building permit review of an interior finish for and office space on the west end of 212 South 4th Street (Bus Depot Addition). The

Chmiel presented a sign permit review for 327 Poyntz Avenue an unnamed, non-contributing building. The sign permit was for a small pedestrian sign projecting from the building. Tross asked if the sign would protruded over the sill. Chmiel said it will likely be protruding out. Tross asked how the proposed sign compares to others like it along Poyntz Avenue. Chmiel said sign regulations dictate it has to be between 8 and 10 feet from the ground. He also said the building was not historic and the secretary’s standards did not really apply.

### **4. Updates & Announcements**

West mentioned a typo on the next meeting date. Kosch asked about the rationale behind the public comment procedure statement. Chmiel said staff are in the process of getting it incorporated into the bylaws so it wouldn’t have to be stated at every meeting. Chmiel said the City Commission wants all Boards to have public comment language. Kosch said she finds the current language to be intimidating to members of the public.

Adam mentioned that staff was resubmitting for phase four of the Juliette Street brick reconstruction project. Staff would probably be requesting a letter of recommendation for state funds. The Board asked if the City planned to extend brick to Fort Riley Boulevard. Adam said at this time, phase four is the final stage. The Board asked what is going to be done at the intersection of Juliette and Pierre Street. Adam said they intend to install curb extensions, which should help slow traffic and slightly improve line of sight. West asked about what type of oversight is put on subcontractors and cited instances of carelessness. Adam said he does

not have an answer at this moment but would be willing to bring someone in who has more direct information.

**5. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 28, 2019.