

Minutes

HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD

Virtual Meeting
Monday, July 27, 2020
4:00 p.m.

Members Present: Kevin West, Chair; Eileen Meyer, Vice-chair; Tom Hanson, Jana Fallin, and Bethany Pingel.

Members Absent: Ann Kosch and Cameron Tross

Staff Present: Ben Chmiel, Planner.

Public Present: Tracy Anderson; Brenda Spencer; Amanda Purdom, Applicants.

1. MEETING OPENING

West called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. Staff performed roll call and confirmed a quorum. Chmiel noted public comment had been submitted for the meeting, but they were specific to items on the agenda. Meyer moved to approve the minutes from the June 22, 2020 and March 23, 2020 meeting. Fallin seconded. Motion carried 5-0-0.

2. MAJOR REVIEW

Chmiel presented an overview of the project proposed at 314 Poyntz Ave (the Stingley & Company Hardware Building). The general project was to comprehensively renovate and restore the building, accommodating for a new ground floor tenant and two second floor apartments. This included a redesign of the storefront and interior finishes and configurations as described in the staff report. Chmiel described the physical characteristics of the building and gave a brief overview of the building's history, including change in uses and significant modifications over time before going into detail on the proposed changes. Chmiel said City Administration found the proposal generally met the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and recommended approval of the building permit at 314 Poyntz Avenue as proposed.

Fallin noted a grammatical error in the staff report and noted her excitement for the project. West asked if the entrance to the apartments would be on the back of the building and if there were any issues with historic integrity as it related to the new windows to be installed on the rear façade of the second floor. Chmiel confirmed the apartments would be accessed from the alley. Chmiel said the evidence suggested the window openings did exist at one point, but what the window looked like was indeterminable and in such cases, double-hung windows are the safest replacement. Pingel asked how far back the proposed storefront entrance was from the sidewalk. Anderson said nine feet and clarified that it would not meet ADA requirements, though ADA access would be met on the back entrance of the building, closer to where parking would be available. West commended the applicant for the proposal and asked Chmiel if there were any public comment submitted on the item. Chmiel said there was not.

West asked for additional discussion and called for a motion. Fallin moved that the Board found that 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 or destroy any historically significant property or historic character-defining features. Hanson seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

3. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPEAL PROCESS

Chmiel explained that the City was going through a unified development ordinance and noticed that there was no appeal process for Certificates of Appropriateness issued or denied by the HRB. He said it.

West asked Chmiel to read the public comment received prior to the meeting. Chmiel read the public comment from Cheryl Collins of 1724 Fairchild Avenue which read as follows:

I am not sure I understand the memo concerning the Manhattan Local Register and an appeal process.

Is there an appeal process that is being suggested? The memo seemed to indicate that citizens with property on the local register could bring the matter to the attention of the City Commission now, if they wished to have the property removed from the register.

In my view, the reason there are only two properties (and my house at 1724 Fairchild Avenue is one of them) on the local register is that the process is more difficult than getting a property on the State or National Register. I believe that State and National Properties should automatically be accepted to the local register, if the property owner wishes, without the additional paperwork now required.

If this is not time sensitive, I hope that the Board will discuss, but not make any final decision on this until meetings are open to the public again.

Prompted by West, Chmiel responded to the comments by saying he wasn't necessarily suggesting an appeals process needed to be made, but noted that if a property owner were unhappy with a decision rendered by the Board, they could simply petition to have their property removed by the City Commission as an undesirable "nuclear" option. Fallin asked for clarification on what the appeals process would be for. Chmiel explained that it would be for a property owner who was denied a certificate of appropriateness (approval) for a project on the local register. He further explained that State Law reviews that the Board conducts on state and nationally listed properties have an appeal process, but the local review does not. Chmiel explained that the lack of an appeal process might make a property owner hesitant to list their property.

Fallin echoed the Collins's comment speculating that the process for local registration is cumbersome. Chmiel agreed that it was a lot of additional paperwork, demanding more than the State/National register in many ways and doesn't offer any financial incentives. Fallin asked if we would like to see more local listings. Chmiel's sentiment was that it would be good because it offers additional protections in the event that the State or National Register is ever dissolved. West asked why a local registration had to be adopted by ordinance. Chmiel explained that it was the only way to create an additional, special review process for a property and to enforce violations. West suggested looking at the local register more holistically at a future meeting in order to make the listing process easier and friendlier. The Board concurred. West asked if Chmiel expected more Board members to be joining in the future, but Chmiel couldn't say for sure when the Mayor would move to appoint anyone. West suggested having more Board members to enter into the discussion would be helpful. Fallin agreed and added that an appeal process would be important to have and that the local review process should be simpler. West asked if the item could be postponed till September when the Board might be fuller, but Chmiel wasn't completely confident they'd have more members then. Fallin suggested Chmiel draft up some suggestions on ways to improve the concept of the local register to get the ball rolling.

4. UPDATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chmiel reminded the Board of the virtual National FORUM Conference and that scholarships were available for Board members to attend.

5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Elections was scheduled for the next meeting. Chmiel said the Aggieville Historic Survey was completed in the past month and he would like to go over it with the Board next month. He said he would send materials early. West requested the materials be posted on the City website for the public. Chmiel obliged.

6. ADJOURNMENT

West adjourned the meeting at 5:29 pm. The next meeting would be held Monday, July 22, 2020.