

**LAWRENCE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
REVISED ACTION SUMMARY JUNE 26, 2002
LAWRENCE PUBLIC LIBRARY, 707 VERMONT, AUDITORIUM
7:00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Commissioners Dean, Messick, McKenzie, and Eck.
Dennis Enslinger and Mark Wilson represented staff.

ITEM NO. 1: DR-05-27-2002: 150 Maple Street; Construction of a warehouse building. The property is located within the environs of the Union Pacific Depot, 402 Locust. The Commission will conduct a CLG Review [Environs: NR].

INTRODUCTION:

Alan Belot introduced the item. Mr. Belot presented revised drawings addressing issues raised in the Staff Report. Mr. Belot stated that the overall height of the structure had been reduced by ten feet.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

A Commissioner inquired about the developers' intentions regarding existing trees on the site. Mr. Belot responded by laying out the landscaping plan and the staff report photos, referencing both to show the specific location of existing and proposed trees. He indicated most of the existing trees would remain, and should serve as an effective screen for the Union Pacific Depot. Evergreen trees will be used to effectively screen during winter months when most of the existing trees lose their foliage. Mr. Belot expressed his belief that the overall visual impact to the Depot is minimal.

Commissioner Messick asked Mr. Belot if the garage doors depicted on the drawings were actually paneled doors, or if their panel design was stamped into the face of the doors. Mr. Belot assured the Commission that the doors would be constructed of real beveled panel faces to match the depot freight doors.

Commissioner Messick inquired as to the actual number of trees that would remain on the site. Mr. Belot pointed to the site plan again, and assured the Commission that the numbers of trees indicated on the site plan were accurate as he had counted the trees himself.

Commissioner McKenzie requested Mr. Belot to clarify, by reference to the site plan, where additional landscaping would be done. Mr. Belot pointed to the specific areas depicted on the site plan where landscaping would occur.

Commissioner Dean asked Mr. Enslinger if the proposed landscaping and new elevations were acceptable. Mr. Enslinger indicated that since the revised drawings were just provided tonight he had not had time to review them.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There was no public comment.

ACTION TAKEN:

Commissioner Messick made a motion on the basis that the proposed alterations meets the intent of the Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effect of Projects on Environs (1998), and the standard of evaluation, to approve the project and make the determination that the proposed modifications do not encroach upon, damage, or destroy any listed historic property or its environs with the following conditions:

1. The Architectural Review Committee work with the applicant to provide a more compatible design with elements found within the environs; and
2. The Architectural Review Committee and/or staff review and approve construction documents prior to release of the building permit.

Commissioner Eck seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Belot asked for clarification concerning staff's conditions. A Commissioner explained the conditions were fairly standard and the Architectural Review Committee meets upon demand.

ITEM NO. 2: DR-06-30-2002: 1344 Massachusetts. Construction of a garage/office structure on the site. Submitted by the property owners of record, Tahseen and Kathe Alkoudsi. The property is located within the 500' environs notification area of the John N. Roberts Residence (1307 Massachusetts) [Environs: NR] Certified Local Government Review.

INTRODUCTION:

Kathe Alkoudsi, the applicant, assured the Commission of her intention to hire an architect with the goal of producing an acceptable site plan. She indicated her willingness to place the garage door on the east side of the building instead of the north side, basically reversing the building's existing orientation. She also indicated her willingness to remove the porch and balcony elements from the front elevation. Mrs. Alkoudsi stressed that she was willing to work with the Commission on the design of the structure but could not change the placement. Mrs. Alkoudsi further indicated the Castle Tea Room is not visible from her property. She described the demand for larger garage structures by modern consumers and the Neighborhood Association support and approval for her proposed structure.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The Chair clarified for Mrs. Alkoudsi that the scope of the Commission is limited in its substantive review of this matter, and must remain focused on the standards of review, and cannot be considering such collateral issues as consumer demand.

A Commissioner voiced agreement with Commissioner Dean by adding the orientation and size of the building is what is important, and that the building being constructed does not fit the pattern of development for the area. The Commission indicated the acceptable location of such a structure is along the alley, which exists to provide ingress and egress from garages.

Mrs. Alkoudsi responded by saying the City Code makes it illegal to build garages along the alley as recommended.

The Commission asked for staff clarification of the placement of garage structures.

Mr. Enslinger replied that, according to City Code, accessory structures may be located up to 13 feet from the centerline of an alley if the garage door faces the alley, or east, in this case. If the garage door faces north or south the garage could be placed on the property line abutting the alleyway.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Jane Garrett, a neighboring property owner residing at 1336 Massachusetts, voiced her support for the proposed structure.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The Commission indicated to the applicant one of the main issues is the placement of the garage. If the project had come before the Commission prior to construction, the Commission would not have approved the current location. Garage structures should relate to the alley and should not be even with the house.

The Commission stressed that the sightline was not the only consideration in reviewing projects within the environs of a listed property. There are a number of factors that are important. Mrs. Alkoudsi stated that she was one of the first individuals to upgrade her property. She has

always tried to keep the property well maintained and saw this project as an improvement. Mrs. Alkoudsi said she has always tried to use good taste when improving her property.

The Commission stated that taste was not the issue. The Commission was required to look at specific guidelines in review projects. There were a number of elements of the project that did not conform to these guidelines, such as site placement, orientation, the front porch, balcony area, and window placements. The proposed structure looked more like a residence than a garage structure.

The Commission said that a number of the suggestions made earlier by Mrs. Alkoudsi would improve the compatibility of the structure. However, site placement was a very important pattern in the environs. Because the applicant could not change the site placement of the structure, it would be very difficult for the Commission to approve the project as presented, even with some design modifications.

ACTION TAKEN:

Commissioner Messick moved that in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effect of Projects on Environs (1998) and the standard of evaluation, the proposed project (DR-06-30-2002) **does** encroach upon, damage, or destroy the environs of the environs of the John N. Roberts Residence based on the following Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effect of Projects on Environs (1998):

1. The character of a historic property's environs should be retained and preserved. The removal or alteration of distinctive buildings, structures, landscape features, spatial relationships, etc. that characterize the environs should be avoided.
2. The environs of a property should be used as it has been historically or allow the inclusion of new uses that require minimal change to the environs' distinctive materials, features, and spatial relationships.
3. New additions, exterior alterations, infill construction, or related new construction should not destroy character-defining features or spatial relationships that characterize the environs of a property. The new work shall be compatible with the historic materials, character-defining features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the environs.

NEW / INFILL CONSTRUCTION

Recommended

New construction should relate to the setback, size, form, patterns, texture, materials, and color of the features that characterize the environs of listed properties.

Not Recommended

New construction that is inconsistent and/or not compatible with the character of the environs of the listed property.

New construction that destroys existing relationships within the environs of a listed property.

New construction that dominates the environs.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Eck, and unanimously approved.

ITEM NO. 3: Review of letter to Governor Graves regarding the University of Kansas' appeal of the Ohio Street Project.

The Chair asked for discussion of the letter to Governor Graves.

A Commissioner recommended the word "demolition" be removed from the second paragraph.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Janet Gerstner expressed her appreciation to the Commission's for sending a letter to the Governor.

marci fransico, Allan Black and Candy Davis also expressed their appreciation for the Commission's consideration of this item.

Staff stated the City Commission also sent a letter to the Governor.

ADJOURNMENT 8:05 p.m

Official minutes filed in Planning Department Office