

**HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION
AGENDA MEETING – DECEMBER 21, 2006, 7:00 PM
ACTION SUMMARY**

Commissioners present: Veatch, Marvin, Myers, Sizemore, and Antle
Staff present: Zollner, Wagner

ITEM NO. 1: ACTION SUMMARY

Motioned by Sizemore, seconded by Veatch to approve the November 16, 2006 Action Summary with the following modifications:

- No changes

Motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

ITEM NO. 2: COMMUNICATIONS

a) Receive communications from other commissions, State Historic Preservation Officer, and the general public.

1. Presentation by the Kansas Historic Preservation Office on State Law Review to be at the end of the meeting.

b) No abstentions were indicated.

ITEM NO. 3: L-11-03-06 Public hearing for consideration of placing the structure located at 621 Connecticut Street (the Otto Fischer House) on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Christine Brandt, the property owner of record. Adopt resolution recommending listing 621 Connecticut Street to the Lawrence Register of Historic Places and its associated environs definition, if appropriate.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Staff presented photographs of the main and ancillary structure. Staff clarified that the environs would be 250 feet.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

The applicant, Christine Brandt, was present and available to answer any questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dennis Brown, president of the Lawrence Preservation Alliance (LPA) said LPA agrees with staff's recommendations because of the importance of Otto Fischer and his daughter Elfriede, who wrote Lawrence Journal World articles about the history of Lawrence that were published in a book. Architecturally, LPA is typically involved with "grand" buildings, but a part of preservation includes working-man's houses; however, Mr. Brown emphasized that he would not quite call 621 Connecticut Street a "working man's house" because of its porch design. This porch design, he said, makes it a wonderful piece of architecture

Mr. Brown noted that the commercial properties to the east of 621 Connecticut Street had been there a long time and are good neighbors. To the northwest of the subject property, there are newer commercial properties, including the Riverfront Mall. Finally, he said that the current owners of 621 Connecticut Street had been there long time; because they value and care for property they have asked for this protection.

Mr. Brown explained that this house is on the perimeter of the East Lawrence residential area and that LPA is concerned about protecting East Lawrence housing stock. Mr. Brown expressed his concern about paying attention to properties before they are lost. He said East Lawrence cannot afford to lose residential, single family properties. LPA supports the staff report and hopes for a unanimous vote.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Antle said he was unclear on the age of the ancillary structure. The applicant responded that the ancillary structure is a stucco building built for an art studio about 25 years ago. The applicant further added that they had lived at 621 Connecticut since 1976.

Commissioner Sizemore asked staff to describe the nature of any concerned phone calls staff had received. Ms. Zollner said the concerned property owner was apprehensive

about environs review. Ms. Zollner and the citizen talked about the environs definition, which speaks to the commercial area near the subject property. Ms. Zollner also reminded the Commission about the letter of support staff received.

Commissioner Sizemore noted that on first glance there is a lot going on with house, including additions and changes. However, he added that he does not think the additions take away from street presence of the original structure.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Sizemore, seconded by Veatch, to approve the resolution and associated environs definition and forward it to the City Commission recommending the structure be nominated to the Lawrence Register of Historic Places.

Motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

ITEM NO. 4: **DR-09-112-06** 1019 Kentucky Street; Demolition; Certified Local Government Review and Certificate of Appropriateness Review. The property is located in the environs of the Charles and Adeline Duncan House (933 Tennessee), the George and Annie Bell House (1008 Ohio), the Dr. Frederick D. Morse House (1044 Tennessee), Lawrence's Downtown Historic District, National Register of Historic Places, and the Colonel James and Eliza Blood House (1015 Tennessee) National Register of Historic Places and Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Ellen LeCompte, the property owner of record.

This item was deferred prior to the meeting.

ITEM NO. 5: DR-10-123-06 1131-1135 Ohio Street; Site Modifications; Certified Local Government Review. The property is located in the environs the Hancock Historic District AND IN OREAD, National Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Glenhaven LLC, the property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Staff presented photographs of the property and informed the Commission about the history of the application. The applicant has difficulty with the existing trash enclosure and spillage. Staff recommended it be moved to other side of the drive and approved the submission administratively. When the applicant went to survey the area, water meters were found in the recommended area. Now, the applicant wants to expand eastward from the current location. This proposal includes the removal of 17 feet of existing historic curb, which is why the application is now before the Commission.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

The applicant was not present.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Marci Francisco said her main concern is that the proposed trash enclosure will not shield the view of the trash. By moving the enclosure across the driveway, it would become more prominent. Ms. Francisco was pleased that the current proposal retains the enclosure on the existing side. She asked that as the Commission review drawings they look at what the view of the trash would be like.

James Dunn asked why the dumpster is not located near the building, rather than in the public-right-of-way. He said a location nearer the apartment building would make the dumpster more convenient for residents and less unsightly. Mr. Dunn concluded by saying he does not think the dumpster should be located along the street.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Antle asked staff to explain why the trash dumpster was located in the public right-of-way. Staff explained it was originally supposed to be on site, but somehow its placement had migrated to the curb. The property owner requested a city sanitation department worker meet him on site to consider other possible locations. The city worker determined that there was not adequate access if the dumpster were placed by the structure, which could lead to safety and difficulty concerns for trash pickup.

Commissioner Antle noted placing the dumpster near the structure did not appear more difficult for this particular location than other apartment complexes in Lawrence.

Commissioner Veatch was concerned the placement of the dumpster would encroach upon and damage the environs.

Commissioner Marvin asked staff if the trash enclosure was only for trash cans. Staff clarified that the enclosure would be for an actual dumpster.

Commissioner Sizemore asked staff the height of the existing fence around the trash receptacles. Staff did not know the fence height.

Staff clarified that the applicant has proposed to relocate the historic curb on the block. Additionally, the curb is listed as a historic-defining element of the Oread Historic District.

Commissioner Sizemore noted moving the granite curb seemed "reasonable" and that he was in support of staff's opinion.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Sizemore, seconded by Antle, to approve the Certified Local Government Review for site modifications to the property located at 1131-1135 Ohio Street as presented, based on a determination that it will not encroach upon, damage or destroy any listed property or its environs. Approval was subject to the following conditions:

1. Any changes to the approved project will be submitted to the Historic Resources Commission prior to the commencement of any related work.
2. The property owner will mitigate the impact of the project by reinstalling the historic curb to a specified location in consultation with the Historic Resources Administrator and Public Works.
3. The applicant provide complete construction documents with material notations to be reviewed and approved by the Historic Resources Administrator prior to release of a building permit.
4. This recommendation is given with the understanding that the City Commission must approve an encroachment agreement for the placement of the structure in the public right-of-way. Approval of this request by staff or the HRC does not guarantee the City Commission will approve the associated agreement.
5. The applicant sufficiently complete the site plan process pursuant to Chapter 20, Article 1305 of the Code of the City of Lawrence, if required by the Director of Planning. Approval of this request by staff or the HRC does not guarantee the approval of the associated site plan.

Motioned carried unanimously 5-0.

ITEM NO. 6: DR-11-125-06 704 W. 12th Street; Exterior and Site Modifications; Certified Local Government Review and Certificate of Appropriateness Review. The property is listed as a contributing structure to the Hancock Historic District, National Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the environs of the Jane A. Snow Residence (706 W. 12th), National Register of Historic Places and Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by James Modig, for the Kansas University Endowment Association, the property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Staff presented photographs of the structure.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Jim Modig, the applicant, said he was available for questions and that he had no problems with staff's recommendations. He noted that 1931 is the documented year of construction for the sun porch addition.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Carol vonTersch, who has lived at the Jane A. Snow Residence for 30 years, said she is pleased the university is putting forth the effort to do work on house, as it is always a challenge for the university to make repairs. Ms. vonTersch has been looking at the sun porch for thirty years; she said, "it seems like it belongs there."

Frank Pinet told her the house was originally a one room limestone cabin and he thought one of the earliest structures on the hill. Ms. vonTersch said the two foot thick walls around the central room and the other rooms wrapping around the central core create a unique floor plan of the house and confirm the information from Mr. Pinet.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Sizemore asked how the addition was being used and whether or not it was insulated. Mr. Modig confirmed that it is "dead storage" used for odds and ends.

Commissioner Marvin asked the reason for removal of the sun porch. Mr. Modig replied there is rot on the floor of the lower level and around the windows, and a brick façade is easier for long term maintenance.

Commissioner Sizemore asked if openings have been expanded in the main brick structure. Mr. Modig said the openings were mostly the same, but some have been expanded. He also clarified that the proposal was to permanently close the openings by using brick.

Commissioner Veatch emphasized that staff has concerns with the removal of the sun porch because it is historic.

Commissioner Marvin explained that an addition causing damage to the main structure, similar to 523 Louisiana, is a bigger concern.

Commissioner Sizemore asked the Commission about how they felt about removing it. Commissioner Veatch responded removal would not harm the main building in any great way, but understands staff's concerns because the sun porch is historic. Commissioner Antle said he typically only approves demolition if repair costs have been provided and is inclined to follow that procedure. The applicant did not object to providing repair costs.

Commissioner Sizemore said he is not sure the sun porch is a defining characteristic of the house and that the addition has some issues. Commissioner Marvin responded by emphasizing the Commission typically does require repair versus replacement cost estimates. She also said the Commission needs to consider their typical requirements for similar situations.

Commissioner Meyer asked Ms. Zollner if the ARC could be responsible for determining the reasonableness of repair. Ms. Zollner informed the Commission that staff had asked for the construction date, the structural condition of the addition, and repair versus replacement costs in order to allow ARC to make a determination as to the removal of the addition. Commissioner Meyer then emphasized that these documents should have been submitted along with the application materials.

Commissioner Sizemore asked the applicant if sandblasting, as it had been mentioned in the Campus HPB minutes, would be used for cleaning the structure. Mr. Modig said the university typically does not sandblast; their primary method of cleaning is to power wash.

Commissioner Marvin asked Mr. Modig if the house is owned by the university. Mr. Modig confirmed the house is owned by the Endowment Association, which will cover the repair costs. Commissioner Antle asked about the future use of this building. Mr. Modig explained the resident that will live there and maintain the structure, but will also allow regular inspections.

The Commission discussed possible determinations. Commissioner Antle said one option is for the data provided by the applicant to come back to the Commission or the ARC for a determination. Commissioner Meyer emphasized that for a contributing structure and something that appears historic, the Commission should not demolish an addition without further information.

The applicant added that if in the costs analysis they found that they could patch and repair the addition, then he would like the HRA to approve repair.

Staff explained to the Commission that they could approve the application but not the demolition of the sun porch. If the applicant determines they must demolish the sun porch, the applicant could reapply to the HRC, including the pertinent information in the application.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Sizemore, second by Meyer, to approve the Certified Local Government Review and Certificate of Appropriateness Review for exterior and site modifications to the property located at 704 W. 12th Street as presented, based on a determination that it will not encroach upon, damage or destroy any listed property or its environs. Approval was subject to the following revised conditions:

1. All work should be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and *Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings* by Robert C. Mack, FAIA, and John P. Speweik, *Making Historic Properties Accessible* by Thomas C. Jester and Sharon C. Park, AIA. Documentation of process and materials should be submitted to the HRA for approval before the work begins;
2. The applicant shall repair rather than demolish the addition; if demolition is necessary the changes should be presented to the HRC;
3. The applicant provide complete construction documents, with material notations to be reviewed and approved by the HRA prior to release of a building permit;
4. Any changes to the approved project will be submitted to the Historic Resources Commission prior to the commencement of any related work.

Motioned carried unanimously 5-0.

ITEM NO. 7: **DR-11-128-06** 523 Louisiana Street; Demolition and New Construction; Certified Local Government Review and Certificate of Appropriateness Review. The property is listed as a contributing structure to the Pinckney I Historic District, National Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the environs of the Old West Lawrence Historic District, National Register of Historic Places, the Dillard House (520 Louisiana), and the Griffith House (511 Ohio), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Dan Hermreck for Amanda Jay and Jeff MacFarland, the property owners of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Staff presented photographs of the main structure and the ancillary structure. Staff pointed out the two additions to the main structure. Staff completed a site inspection to see how the additions were attached to the structure. In this inspection, staff found the additions to be causing stress on the historic structure. Staff showed pictures of the concrete block ancillary structure to be demolished.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Dan Hermreck was present for the applicant. The original structure was built in 1885; there are notes stating the back porch was enclosed in 1964, and building permits listing 1968 and 1988 as the construction dates for the additions. Mr. Hermreck described the condition of the additions as "sad" because they have pulled away from the house, allowing moisture to enter the main structure. Mr. Hermreck confirmed the plan calls for removing the existing additions and adding a new addition. The garage built around 1955 has also suffered damage. The applicant wants to demolish it and replace the structure with a larger garage. The lot at 523 Louisiana Street is double size; thus, by code, the ancillary structure could occupy 900 square feet, but the applicant is proposing 700 square feet. Mr. Hermreck added he was available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Antle asked Mr. Hermreck to elaborate the information about the damage to the main structure. Mr. Hermreck said the additions had pulled away from house due to the substandard building techniques and materials used in their construction. He noted a gaping hole in top of the addition that had been patched using a steeper pitched roof. There is also damage to the house along the wall connecting the addition to the main structure.

Commissioner Veatch noted staff's recommendation of a visual separation on the north elevation. Mr. Hermreck responded that the addition would not be in line with the house and could even be located a foot north of the main structure.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No member of the public spoke on this item.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Antle asked staff if repair versus replacement costs were required in the HRC process. Ms. Zollner responded once a property has achieved historic significance in its own right repair versus replacement costs are needed to assess whether demolition or repair is prudent. Staff felt the additions had not achieved significance by age, construction techniques, or use.

Commissioner Marvin said she did not see materials specifications. Mr. Hermreck clarified the siding will match the existing all-wood construction of the main structure and all wood windows would be used.

Commissioner Sizemore pointed out the proposed garage is bigger than the existing garage and has a second story for space above the new garage. He asked if staff had any concerns with the size of the garage, which they did not. Commissioner Sizemore also added the frontage from the street seemed acceptable because the proposed project does not have big double doors.

Commissioner Antle asked the applicant about the condition of the garage. Mr. Hermreck said the garage is sagging; the masonry construction is not in best of shape; there are stress cracks; the foundation is less than adequate; and the wood is in poor condition. To repair the garage would entail tearing it down, thus the replacement cost would be the new value.

It was noted that the applicant did a good job designing the garage to be subsidiary to the main structure.

Commissioner Marvin wanted clarification that the garage doors are on the alley-side.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Antle, second by Veatch, to approve the Certified Local Government Review and Certificate of Appropriateness Review for the demolition and new construction of the ancillary structure and additions of the main structure located at 523 Louisiana Street as presented, based on a determination that it will not encroach upon, damage or destroy any listed property or its environs. Approval was subject to the following conditions:

1. Any changes to the approved project will be submitted to the Historic Resources Commission prior to the commencement of any related work.
2. The property owner will allow staff access to the property to photo document the project before construction begins.
3. The applicant provide complete construction documents with material notations to be reviewed and approved by the Historic Resources

Administrator prior to release of a building permit.

Motioned carried unanimously 5-0.

ITEM NO. 8: DR-11-129-06 819 Ohio Street; Exterior Modifications; Certified Local Government Review. The property is located in the environs of the Old West Lawrence Historic District, National Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Kylee Lashley of Sabatini Architects for Daniel Schriener, the property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Staff presented photographs of all elevations of the structure and the streetscape of the 800 Block of Ohio Street.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Kylee Lashley of Sabatini Architects was present and available for questions on behalf of the property owner. She said the basic intent of the application was to enhance this property from its current state. Ms. Lashley used a modern interpretation of Tudor style for the design. Part of the application is to convert the existing attached garage to living space and relocate the garage along the alley. The front drive would be removed and replaced with grass.

Commissioner Antle remarked that it is a significant remodel of the existing building. Commissioner Sizemore added that the applicant is actually retaining some of the old structure.

Ms. Lashley emphasized the existing footprint remains, but there would also be an addition of a sunroom on the rear elevation.

It was noted that the proposed alterations would add to the environs.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No member of the public spoke on this item.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Sizemore felt the proposed alterations would not harm the environs. He asked staff if a detached garage and the proposed size is typical of the environs. Ms. Zollner replied that the proposal is smaller than what the Commission had seen recently for new construction of ancillary structures and that the location was typical. Commissioner Veatch clarified that the proposal is indeed only for a single car.

Commissioner Sizemore noted the garage would be accessible on the alley.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Veatch, second by Sizemore, to approve the Certified Local Government Review for the exterior modifications of the structure located at 819 Ohio Street as

presented, based on a determination that it will not encroach upon, damage or destroy any listed property or its environs. Approval was subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant provide complete construction documents, with material notations to be reviewed and approved by the Historic Resources Administrator prior to release of a building permit;
2. Any changes to the approved project will be submitted to the Historic Resources Commission prior to the commencement of any related work.

Motioned carried unanimously 5-0.

ITEM NO. 9: **DR-11-130-06** 720 E. 9th Street; Exterior and Site Modifications; Certified Local Government Review. The property is located in the environs of the East Lawrence Industrial Historic District, Kansas Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Darron Ammann of Bartlett & West Engineers for Cinco Hombres LLC, the property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Staff presented photographs of all elevations of the structure and the line of sight to the East Lawrence Industrial District.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Mike Myers, the applicant, was present. He commented that the existing structure is a wood frame, metal clad warehouse that was constructed in 1992. Currently, the west façade has loading docks, which are not attractive. The northern portion of this building has already been demolished, but it was also damaged by the microburst.

In light of the redevelopment of the Poehler Building, the property owner wants this structure to blend with its surroundings without drastically changing its current use. The alterations are an attempt to make the building more attractive in order to promote prospective tenants. In order to do this, the applicant wants to remove all of the loading docks on the west façade and add two overhead doors, one on the west façade and one on the north façade. In place of the loading docks, there will be a combination of glass and wall paneling infill with patterns similar to the 830-832 Pennsylvania Street project (resembles glass overhead door look, similar to a firehouse door).

Because a portion of the building sits four feet from the ground, the property owner wants to add new sets of stairs and an elevated sidewalk made of concrete. Mr. Myers showed some of renderings of the proposal.

Additionally, the applicant is requesting to add two free-standing canopies to provide weather protection. Mr. Myers felt the landscaping and canopy would soften the starkness of the building. Furthermore, the new northern half of building will have landscaping islands, canopies, and storefront glass to soften the appearance of the building. Overall, the alterations are an attempt to make simple modifications in order to enhance the attractiveness of the building to the neighborhood and its redevelopment projects.

Commissioner Sizemore noted the extensive effort of landscaping to bring pedestrian scale back to area and would like to commend the applicant for this effort.

Commissioner Marvin asked what would be used to provide screening for the south side of the building. Mr. Myers said there would be a trash enclosure and a loading dock screened by a wood fence, trees and shrubs.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No member of the public spoke on this item.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Antle asked staff if the environs for the UCO had already gone into effect. Ms. Zollner replied that they had not, but currently the East Lawrence Industrial District is listed on the Register of Historic Kansas Places. Therefore, state law and environs review applies. As soon as the zoning for the UCO is published, the design guidelines will go into effect.

Commissioner Sizemore noted his appreciation for the level of effort that went into disguising the existing large metal building.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Sizemore, second by Antle, to approve the Certified Local Government Review for the exterior and site modifications of the property located at 720 E. 9th Street as presented, based on a determination that it will not encroach upon, damage or destroy any listed property or its environs. Approval was subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant provide complete construction documents, with material notations to be reviewed and approved by the Architectural Review Committee prior to release of a building permit.
2. Any changes to the approved project will be submitted to the Historic Resources Commission prior to the commencement of any related work.

Motioned carried unanimously 5-0.

ITEM NO. 10: MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

- A. One demolition permit application was received since the November 16, 2006 regular meeting for 129 W. South Park, an ancillary structure.
- B. Architectural Review Committee and Administrative Reviews since the November 16, 2006 regular meeting.
- The ARC met to discuss 1140 Massachusetts Street (South Park) and determined that the item should be presented at the January 18, 2007 HRC meeting.
 - The ARC met to discuss 920 Louisiana Street and concluded that the application could be released to Neighborhood Resources pending the applicant providing a sample of the stone to be used on the foundation.
 - The ARC met to discuss 824 Ohio Street and determined that the application could be released to Neighborhood Resources provided the applicant remove the dormer from the drawings.

Administrative Reviews

DR-10-122-06 111 E. 11th Street; Sign; Certified Local Government Review and Certificate of Appropriateness Review. The property is located in the environs of Lawrence's Downtown Historic District, the South Rhode Island Historic District, the North Rhode Island Historic District, Watkins Bank (1047 Massachusetts), the English Lutheran Church (1040 New Hampshire), the Douglas County Courthouse (1100 Massachusetts), National Register of Historic Places, and South Park (1140 Massachusetts), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the Downtown Conservation Overlay District. Submitted by Tammy Moody of Luminous Neon Inc for Douglas County, the property owner of record.

DR-11-124-06 734 Vermont Street; Sign; Certified Local Government Review and Certificate of Appropriateness Review. The property is located in the environs of Lawrence's Downtown Historic District, the Eldridge Hotel (701 Massachusetts), the Lucy Hobbs Taylor House (809 Vermont), the United States Post Office (645 New Hampshire), National Register of Historic Places, the House Building (729-731 Massachusetts), Kansas Register of Historic Places and Lawrence Register of Historic Places, and Miller's Hall (723-725 Massachusetts), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the Downtown Conservation Overlay District.

Submitted by Michael Scott of Schwerdt Design Group for Southwestern Bell Telephone Co, the property owner of record.

DR-11-126-06 1218 Tennessee Street; Exterior Modifications; Certified Local Government Review. The property is located in the environs of Lawrence's Downtown Historic District, National Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Lawrence Bodle, the property owner of record.

DR-11-127-06 1417 Kentucky Street; Exterior Modifications; Certified Local Government Review. The property is located in the environs of the William Priestly House (1505 Kentucky) and the John Palmer and Margaret Usher House (1425 Tennessee), National Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Nick Hefner for Emerald Estates LC, the property owner of record.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Meyer, seconded by Marvin to approve all Administrative Reviews as presented by staff.

Motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

C. Provide comment on variance (BZA) requests received since November 16, 2006.

- No BZA requests were received since the November 16, 2006 meeting.

D. General public comment.

- No public comment.

The Commission took a five minute break at 8:40.

E. Miscellaneous matters from City staff and Commission members

a) Presentation by the Kansas Historic Preservation Office on State Law Review.

Bob Bettis, of the State Historic Preservation Office, said it was his intention to talk about the direction for state law review, specifically environs review. The new direction for environs review includes the need to maintain the strength of listed reviews (i.e. for the Pinet House), but to try to move away from viewing environs review equally with the review of listed properties. Mr. Bettis said he is working on a new training for environs review. He would like to give the training session in a separate session, when Commissioner Alstrom was present and when a new commissioner was appointed.

Mr. Bettis noted the desire on the part of the state for more incentives for property owners in the environs, a better notification process, and improved consistency in environs review. In terms of how the state law is perceived state-wide, all Commissions need to be more consistent with the state's interpretation of environs review.

In order to describe how the state does environs review, Mr. Bettis said he tries to be as pragmatic as possible by keeping the review very simple. If the building is not within a line of sight of the listed property, most projects are acceptable except for demolition, large scale additions, and infill constructions, which all receive a higher degree of evaluation. Mr. Bettis said it is difficult to justify how new siding on a house two blocks from a listed property affects that listed property. Overall, he pays the most attention to the major projects: demolition, new construction, and large new additions. For infill construction, for example, he specified that the setback and massing need to be relatively close to those in the environs.

It was noted that Lawrence has no design guidelines in place, except for Downtown.

Mr. Bettis said that the Commission really needed to have better consistency. Commissioner Marvin asked Mr. Bettis to clarify the problem. Mr. Bettis responded that inconsistency interpreting the state law was the problem. He added strictness should be defensible by using local design guidelines not the state law.

Commissioner Meyer said consistency can be a problem city-wide in addition to state-wide.

Commissioner Sizemore asked if there is a difference between the evaluation of the environs of a listed property and a district. Mr. Bettis looks at them all the same. Additionally, he looks at the intactness of the environs, what he refers to as "the circle." In evaluation, Mr. Bettis also considers the date of construction, the line of sight, and the reversibility of the project. For example, signs are very reversible.

Commissioner Veatch added that projects such as the addition of a dormer are very subjective; in order to codify these types of projects, it is almost impossible because of subjectiveness. Mr. Bettis suggested local design guidelines can help define the standards and remove part of the subjectiveness..

Mr. Bettis interjected the City can apply for HPF funding to write design guidelines. However, this can be a hard sell on the local level because of the protection offered by the Kansas State Historic Preservation Act.

Ms. Zollner said any design guidelines should be based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, but could be more elaborate. If local law is stricter and specific, then by meeting local law an applicant has met the less specific regulations, such as the environs law.

It was suggested that the Commission have a separate study session on the topic of design guidelines and environs review.

b) Discussion about Administrative Review policy.

Ms. Zollner explained there is a current movement in the City to streamline processes. She said there was a need to discuss the list of administrative review projects and consider expanding it. Regarding environs review, she then recommended that the Commission only review demolition, new construction, and large additions.

The Commission directed Ms. Wagner to construct a packet with information of 2006 design reviews and Ms. Zollner to write a memo stating the changes staff desired. A full discussion on the matter would be held at the next HRC meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dayna Carlton said she found it ironic that the Commission is discussing doing less regarding administrative reviews when last time they discussed doing more, i.e. 917 Delaware.

Dennis Brown said he had wondered about the specifics about environs review, especially how it relates to windows and siding. He felt like he could do a better job of advocating for preservation if there were more specific guidelines for the environs.

Staff said they would like to be more proactive, by providing more community education and streamlining the application process. Both of which could be a very positive thing for preservation. Staff believes there is a misconception that environs review protects properties not listed on a historic register; if property owners want to protect their properties that are not currently listed on a historic register, then they need to consider historic districts, neighborhood design guidelines, and overlay districts.

ADJOURN – 9:40 p.m.