

HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Action Summary

March 16, 2006 – 7:00 p.m.

Commissioners present: Veatch, Sizemore, Alstrom, Hickam, Marvin,
Staff present: Zollner

ITEM NO. 1: ACTION SUMMARY

One revision was requested, attributing comments to Staff instead of Comm. Marvin.

Motioned by Hickam, seconded by Marvin to approve the minutes of the February 23, 2006 meeting as revised.

Motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

ITEM NO. 2: COMMUNICATIONS

- Response from the City's Legal Department regarding 1136 Mississippi Item 5 [DR-01-08-06]
- No abstentions were indicated.

HRC 3/16/2006

ITEM NO. 3: DR-12-110-05: 429 Indiana Street; Demolition; Certified Local Government Review. Submitted by William Mumford and Kristi Kesinger, property owners of record. The property is located in the environs of the Pinckney I Historic District and the Pinckney II Historic District, National Register of Historic Places. *This item was deferred from the February 23, 2006 meeting.*

STAFF PRESENTATION

Staff showed pictures of all elevations and gave an overview of the proposal. The property owner had been cited by Neighborhood Resources for Code violations and had been ordered by the City Commission to deal with the property – either through repair or demolition by March 21, 2006.

Ms. Zollner explained the applicants had only recently gained full control of the property and repair of the existing structure was not their intent. Staff had been unable to gain interior access to the property, so Staff Report analysis was based solely on the building's exterior.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Kristi Kesinger, property owner, explained that the house had been caught in probate for some time and had only recently been released to their full control. She said health issues facing several family members made repair of the structure unfeasible at this time.

Alstrom arrived at 7:05 p.m.

The applicant stated an intent to clear and sell the lot, leaving decisions about the replacement structure to a new owner. She said one potential buyer had indicated preliminary interest in the existing structure, but had changed their mind when seeing the interior.

Ms. Kesinger said only one room (a back kitchen) inside the house was not “completely stripped”. She described extensive ceiling and floor damage and noted a few places where repairs had taken place (window replacement) before current health issues had set in.

The applicant suggested that, if demolition were denied at the point and the property did change hands, the new owner would likely submit the same request in the future.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No member of the public spoke on this item.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission noted the presence of multiple existing additions that appeared to be separating from the primary structure.

There was discussion about the March 21st deadline imposed by the City Commission. Staff said the City Commission would receive the minutes of this meeting and would

take the HRC's decision into consideration. If the HRC denied the request, the applicant could choose to file an appeal of this decision to the City Commission. Staff noted that the property was already on the City Commission's March 20th agenda, so the appeal could be made at that time. Based on discussions with Code Enforcement, Staff thought it likely that demolition would be the ultimate outcome.

The Commission expressed sympathy for the applicant's situation, but expressed concern about breaking precedent:

1. The Commission typically requires the applicant to provide cost estimates of repair vs. demolition/new construction. In this case, this analysis cannot be prepared before the March 21st deadline.
2. The Commission typically does not approve demolition without a proposal for the replacement structure. In this case, the applicant does not propose a replacement structure, leaving that element to the eventual new property owner.

It was suggested that the applicant would be unduly hampered if the Commission denied the request based on strong precedent, since it was likely the City Commission would take action to allow demolition to proceed.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Antle, seconded by Hickam to deny the Certified Local Government Review for the project at 429 Indiana Street, based on concerns of precedent and lack of information as discussed.

Motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

HRC 3/16/2006

ITEM NO. 4: DR-01-05-06: 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th and Massachusetts Street; Communications Antennas; Certified Local Government Review and Certificate of Appropriateness Review. Submitted by Lawrence Freenet for the property owner of record. The property is located in Lawrence's Downtown Historic District, National Register of Historic Places. The property is in the environs of the House Building (729-731 Massachusetts) and the Hannah Building (933 Massachusetts), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the Downtown Conservation Overlay District.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Zollner noted that this item was deferred from the February 2006 meeting per Staffs' recommendation. The City Commission had directed Staff to investigate concerns raised by the HRC regarding communications towers in historic districts/environs. Staff was to return findings to the City Commission and further direction for the HRC was anticipated at that time.

Staff recommended continued deferral of the item.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Hickam, seconded by Marvin to defer the item to the April 2006 meetings.

Motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

HRC 3/16/2006

ITEM NO. 5: DR-01-08-06: 1136 Mississippi Street; New Construction; Certified Local Government Review. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for the property owner of record. The property is located in the environs of the Hancock Historic District and the Jane A. Snow Residence (706 W. 12th), National Register of Historic Places.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Zollner noted that this item was deferred from the February meeting for additional legal comment. The Commission was provided with a letter from Attorney for the City, Jerry Cooley, stating the City's legal opinion that denial of this request would not constitute a taking, since the applicant proved with his previous application that alternate access was possible.

Staff presented pictures of the subject property, as well as of other homes in the district, noting the applicant's statement that other curb cuts (similar to the one he proposed) existed in the area.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

_____, property owner, showed a drawing of the new structure for which a building permit had been approved, noting his previous to place parking behind the building. He explained his revised plan to pull the parking area to the front of the lot and eliminate the sizable retaining wall shown adjacent to the parking area in the approved plan. He said the newly-proposed front parking area would push the primary structure further from the curb, and landscape screening would make the view more pleasant from the listed property.

Mr. ___ said that many houses on 12th Street had existing curb cuts with off-street parking. He estimated that the new curb cut would be about 15' wide.

There was discussion about the build-to line in the approved design vs. the new design, noting this line was designated at the building's main façade, not the front steps. It was established that the build-to line was about 8' further east in the approved plan. It was noted that rear parking area in the approved plan maintained a build-to line matching the adjacent buildings.

The Commission discussed with the applicant the need for a retaining all of such height to deal with the grade from Indiana Street. It was suggested that the Commission did not object to the retaining wall as shown, or they would have addressed that element when considering the approved plan. It was further suggested that retaining the streetscape façade was of highest priority and was achieved through the approved plan.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dennis Brown, Lawrence Preservation Alliance, said the applicant's multiple appearances before the HRC and the BZA appeared to be trying an attempt to apply a use to the lot that did not fit. He said the LPA would prefer a single-family home were built on this property and felt the Commission should not "bend the rules to accommodate an imposing project."

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

It was discussed that the new proposal, regardless of its aesthetic appeal, did not fit the guidelines, and that at least one other project in the area had provided rear parking. It was suggested that the right screening elements could make the retaining wall less intrusive and allow the preservation of the existing streetscape.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Veatch, seconded by Antle to deny the Certified Local Government Review for new construction at 1136 Mississippi Street, based on a determination that it would encroach upon, damage or destroy the environs of a listed property.

Motion carried 5-1, with Hickam voting in opposition.

HRC 3/16/2006

ITEM NO. 6: DR-01-13-06 1040 Vermont Street; Rehabilitation; Certified Local Government Review. Submitted by Sabatini Architects Inc., for the property owners of record. The property is located in the environs of Lawrence's Downtown Historic District, Watkins Bank (1047 Massachusetts), and the Douglas County Courthouse (1100 Massachusetts), National Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the Downtown Conservation Overlay District.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Zollner noted that this item had been deferred from the February agenda because no one had been present to respond to questions on behalf of the applicant.

Staff showed pictures of all elevations, explaining the applicant's intent to rehabilitate the existing building for mixed office and residential uses. It was noted that the subject property was within the Downtown conservation overlay district.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

No one was present to speak on behalf of the applicant. Ms. Zollner said the applicant had been made aware of the reasons behind the February deferral. They had asked Staff to put the item on the March agenda but had made no further contact.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No member of the public spoke on this item.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Alstrom suggested this was not so much a new use as a "facelift" for an existing use, since the building had contained a mercantile use in the past. He felt this conformed to the guidelines and did not change the nature of the building. He clarified that these remarks pertained only to the main structure since he shared Staff's concerns about the proposed parking structure.

Ms. Zollner responded to questioning that Staff had discussed with the applicant possible alterations that would bring the proposal into compliance, such as bringing the parking garage into the main building. Staff said there had not yet been any discussion about the proposed stucco façade, which was strictly against the guidelines. Ms. Zollner added that the applicant did not want to eliminate the proposed balconies from the project, feeling these were an important element.

The Commission stated their continued hesitancy to take action without an applicant representative present.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Antle, seconded by Marvin to defer the item to the April 2006 meeting.

Motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

HRC 3/16/2006

ITEM NO. 7: DR-02-14-06: 716 Mississippi Street; New Construction of Ancillary Structure; Certified Local Government Review. Submitted by John Preis, property owner of record. The property is located in the environs of the Old West Lawrence Historic District, National Register of Historic Places.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Zollner explained the applicant's request to construct a new garage in a location identified on an aerial for the Commission. It was noted that the applicant was approved in 2005 to replace the front porch on this same subject property.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

_____, property owner, said a garage had once existed on the lot, as evidenced by an existing concrete apron, but had been removed by previous owners. Mr. ____ said his request might be considered a "replacement", since he intended to put his garage in the same location on the lot.

The applicant described his intent to model the garage after the primary structure, using smooth hardy siding for its cost-effectiveness and wood-like appearance.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No member of the public spoke on this item.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

It was verified that the Staff Report was intended to state that a full materials list must be provided to the Historic Resources Administrator.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Sizemore, seconded by Hickam to approve the Certified Local Government Review for construction of an ancillary structure at 716 Mississippi Street, 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 applicant provide a material list and complete construction documents to the Historic Resources Administrator prior to the release of the project for permitting.

Motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

HRC 3/16/2006

ITEM NO. 8: DR-02-15-06: Intersection of 13th & Oread; Gateway Entrance; Certified Local Government Review. Submitted by Design and Construction Management, The University of Kansas, for the property owner of record. The property is located in the environs of the Hancock Historic District, Spooner Hall (1135-45 Louisiana), Dyche Hall (1031 Oread), National Register of Historic Places.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Staff described the proposal to replace the existing traffic kiosk with a more decorative gateway feature at the subject intersection. It was noted that the property was in the environs of three listed properties.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Jim Long, Chair of the Kansas University Preservation Board, explained that this was a cross-jurisdictional review and stated the KUPB's determination that the proposal would not negatively impact any of the listed properties.

Mr. Cannell said the University's consideration had dealt significantly with the Hancock Building, since they felt that would be the City's main concern. This consideration had addressed the three elements of environs review: demolition of the existing booth, new construction, and signage. Mr. Cannell described how the new feature was designed to fit the environs better than the existing traffic booth:

- The new feature will be within the same footprint as the existing booth.
- The materials and design will be similar to those of the nearby Kansas Union.
- The signage is designed to be consistent with other KU way-finding signage but with a more modern design.
- The new design includes patterned concrete, a small water feature and landscaping for aesthetic appeal.
- Brick and concrete paving in front of the Kansas Union will be continued as part of this project.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No member of the public spoke on this item.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

It was verified that a new traffic booth would be constructed south of 14th Street and Jayhawk Boulevard, but its design was not yet finalized.

It was suggested that the feature would be about 8.5 to 9' tall and that this would not noticeably detract from other buildings.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Hickam, seconded by Veatch to approve the Certified Local Government Review for new gateway entrance construction at 13th & Oread, based on a determination that it will not encroach upon, damage or destroy any listed property or its environs. Approval was based on 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; and

2. Any changes to the approved project will be submitted to the Historic Resources Commission prior to the commencement of any related work.

Motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

HRC 3/16/2006

ITEM NO. 9: DR-02-16-06: 1425 Tennessee Street; Site Modifications & Accessory Structure; Certified Local Government Review. Submitted by Helix Architecture for the property owner of record. The property is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Staff showed pictures of the subject property, which is listed on the National Register as the Usher House. She explained the applicant's proposal for site modifications that would include the addition of an accessory structure.

It was noted that it was challenging to photograph an accurate view of where the accessory structure was proposed due to the orientation of the lot.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Bruce Sneider, US Architecture, said the project was designed at the request of several University alumni as a memorial to deceased alumni who had been members of the fraternity residing in the Usher House. He showed renditions of the proposed recreation shelter and fire pit.

Mr. Sneider said the recreation shelter would be designed and detailed to complement the primary structure, and was proposed to be located as far from the main building as possible to reduce fire hazards.

The applicant said Staff had raised concerns about the increase in impervious surface proposed in this project. He said the design would be revised to bring the impervious surface increase under 10%, so it would not trigger the Code requirement for on-site detention. About 500 square feet of asphalt would be removed from the current design, changing its size, layout and location.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Betty Alderson, Lawrence resident, said the proposal looked like a "fairground" and questioned its appropriateness in this neighborhood. She noted that a fire pit had existed previously and been removed from the subject property.

Ms. Alderson said her biggest concern was the loss of greenspace and she was pleased to hear about the intent to reduce the proposal.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

It was discussed that the artist's rendering made the project appear closer to the property line and more visible than it would actually be, given the proposed location and grading of the property.

It was suggested that the Commission defer the item to see revised drawings with changes referenced earlier by the applicant to reduce impervious surface. The applicant asked if there were any other elements the Commission would want addressed at that time. There was discussion about design elements that might further reduce the structure's visual impact.

The Commission said they would like to see the following concepts reflected in revised drawings, which would be sent to the ARC for review:

- The covered pavilion should not be attached to the directly to the primary structure
- The fire pit should be relatively easy to reverse
- Total added pavement reduced
- Overall size of the addition reduced
- Entire design moved further to the west
- ARC final review

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Hickam, seconded Alstrom to approve the Certified local Government Review for the proposal at 1425 Tennessee Street, 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 proposed fire pit be located to the west of the proposed location and well behind the plane of the adjacent portion of the main structure not including the porch;
2. 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;
3. Any changes to the approved project will be submitted to the Historic Resources Commission prior to the commencement of any related work.
4. The property owner will allow staff access to the property to photo document the project; and
5. This recommendation is given with the understanding that the City Commission must approve the associated site plan. Approval of this request by staff or the HRC does not guarantee the City Commission will approve the associated site plan.

Motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

HRC 3/16/2006

ITEM NO. 10: DR-02-17-06: 820 Ohio Street; Demolition and New Construction of Ancillary Structure; Certified Local Government Review. Submitted by Dan Riedemann for the property owner of record. The property is located in the environs of the Old West Lawrence Historic District, National Register of Historic Places.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Zollner stated that the subject property had been reviewed and approved for demolition and new construction after extensive fire damage in 2005. The applicant now asked to demolish the existing ancillary structure and build a new garage in the same location.

Staff had not found the existing garage on any Sanborn Maps. It was suggested that the existing garage was old enough to be historic, but that it was not in context with the primary structure.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Dan Riedemann spoke on behalf of property owner. He explained the existing garage was not property built to begin with; the metal siding did not cover sheathing, but only a spaced 2 X 4's frame that was now leaning.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dennis Brown, Lawrence Preservation Alliance, said he had visited the site since the last hearing, and he agreed with the applicant's assessment of the existing garage. He withdrew the opposition (to demolition of the garage) he stated at the previous meeting.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission had no additional comments or questions.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Antle, seconded by Veatch to approve the Certified Local Government Review for demolition and new construction of an ancillary structure at 820 Ohio Street, based on a determination that it would not encroach upon, damage or destroy any listed property or its environs. Approval was subject to the following conditions:

1. The property owner will allow staff access to the property to photo document the project before construction begins;
2. Any changes to the approved project will be submitted to the Historic Resources Commission prior to the commencement of any related work; and
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.

Motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

HRC 3/16/2006

ITEM NO. 11: DR-02-18-06: 805 Ohio Street; Garage Remodel; Certified Local Government Review. Submitted by Dan Riedemann for the property owner of record. The property is located in the Old West Lawrence Historic District, National Register of Historic Places.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Zollner showed pictures of the subject property, noting that it was listed on the National Register. She explained the property had been in a state of significant disrepair and the City had approved a Use Permitted upon Review (UPR) to allow a multi-family use in this single family zoning district to financially assist in the property's rehabilitation.

Several conditions had been placed on the UPR to assure that rehabilitation and a return to a single-family use took place in a timely manner. One of these conditions was to make the existing garage more compatible with the listed property and the rest of the neighborhood.

Staff suggested that the intent of this condition was the removal of the modern-style garage and new construction of a more complementary ancillary structure. The applicant instead proposed modifications to the existing garage.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Dan Riedemann spoke on behalf of the property owner, saying the garage was built around 1974 and was still in fairly good condition, it was simply "next to the wrong building."

Mr. Riedemann said the original primary structure was built intentionally without a garage. With this proposal, the applicant hoped to make the existing garage blend better with the property and the neighborhood while making it capable of accommodating modern vehicles. He said the UPR language was vague and he had never understood it to mean the existing garage should be removed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No member of the public spoke on this item.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission referenced Staff concern that the proposal did not meet the intent of the UPR, noting that UPR compliance was not within their purview. It was noted that the proposal would also go before the Planning Commission and City Commission for UPR review.

There was discussion about the challenge of making this obviously modern structure more compatible with this historic environment. It was also discussed how much funding for the property's rehabilitation was reasonable to divert to the garage.

It was established that Staff and the Commission were amenable to an asphalt roof instead of metal. The Commission expressed no opposition to Mr. Riedemann's comment that he would like to use a slate or heavily-textured roof material.

The Commission stated that, if approval were given, the intent of such approval was that changes to the garage were for the purpose of making the building blend better with the neighborhood and to make it more compatible with the primary structure.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Hickam, seconded by Veatch to approve the Certified Local Government Review for the garage remodel at 805 Ohio Street, based on a determination that it would 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 Administrator 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 Architectural Review Committee prior to release of a building permit; and
4. The applicant work with Planning Staff to identify and schedule for completion the required conditions of UPR-5-9-94, as amended, prior to the release of building permit.

Motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

HRC 3/16/2006

ITEM NO. 12: DR-02-23-06 Located W. of N. Michigan Street & S. of I-70; Communications Tower; Certified Local Government Review. Submitted by Selective Site Consultants for the property owner of record. The property is located in the environs of the Judge Nelson T. Stephens Residence (340 N. Michigan), National Register of Historic Places.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Zollner said Staff had been working with the applicant's representatives to move the proposed tower to the western edge of the subject property, outside of the 500' notification boundary. This would, in Staff's opinion, greatly reduce the project's impact on the listed property. Staff had received no comment from the applicant regarding this change as of 5:00 pm that day.

Ms. Zollner said the owner of the listed property had expressed significant concern about the impact of the proposal. It was noted that the tower would require a Use Permitted upon Review (UPR) that would be reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Commission.

Staff explained the difficulty of reviewing this kind of proposal, saying there was a line of sight to the listed property, but how clear this line was depended on the exact location of the viewer.

Ms. Zollner said the SHPO reviewed cell tower proposals in the county, and this proposal would have been approved by the SHPO if it had been with State purview.

Staff acknowledged the concerns of the historic proper owner, but found it difficult to identify how the tower would encroach upon or damage the environs for two main reasons:

1. The area is industrially zoned and is already developed with fairly unsightly uses.
2. N. Michigan Street forms a large visual barrier between the subject area and the listed property.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

No one was present to speak on behalf of the applicant.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No member of the public spoke on this item.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

It was suggested that, even if the applicant was willing to move the tower further to the west, it would not make a significant difference; "it's still a tower." Ms. Zollner clarified that Staff's preference for moving the tower to the west was based on the fact that this obscured the view of the base structure and associated fencing from the listed property.

It was stated that, according to strict analysis, the proposal "probably [did] meet the guidelines". However, it would be legitimate for the Commission to deny the request based on concerns outlined by Staff. Also, the Commission had adequate precedent of

deferring an item when, as in this case, no one was present to respond to questions on behalf of the applicant.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Antle, seconded by Veatch to defer the item to the April 2006 meeting.

Motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

HRC 3/16/2006

ITEM NO. 13: MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

- A. Review of any demolition permit applications received since the February 23, 2006 regular meeting.

There were no demolition permit applications for review.

- B. Architectural Review Committee and Administrative Reviews since the February 23, 2006 regular meeting.

The ARC had met to discuss the proposal at 1420 New York Street. They had come to an agreement with the applicant on most elements. Specific discussion on the front porch design resulted in direction from the ARC to simplify this element to better fit existing porches in the area.

Administrative Reviews

DR-12-104-05: 716½ B Massachusetts Street; Sign; Certified Local Government Review and Certificate of Appropriateness Review. Submitted by Farm Fresh Graphics for the property owners of record. The property is a contributing structure to Lawrence's Downtown Historic District, National Register of Historic Places. The property is in the environs of the House Building (729-731 Massachusetts) and Miller's Hall (723-725 Massachusetts), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the Downtown Conservation Overlay District.

DR-02-19-06: 1501 Pennsylvania Street; Driveway Removal; Certified Local Government Review. Submitted by the City of Lawrence for the property owner of record. The property is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

DR-02-20-06: 806 Massachusetts Street; Sign; Certified Local Government Review. Submitted by Luminous Neon for the property owners of record. The property is a non-contributing structure to Lawrence's Downtown Historic District, National Register of Historic Places. The property is in the environs of the Lucy Hobbs Taylor House (809 Vermont), National Register of Historic Places and the House Building (729-731 Massachusetts), Kansas Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the Downtown Conservation Overlay District.

DR-02-22-06: 846A Illinois Street; Sign; Certified Local Government Review. Submitted by Star Signs and Graphics for the property owner of record. The property is located in the environs of the Old West Lawrence Historic District, National Register of Historic Places.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Staff asked for direction regarding the extent of information that the Commission would like to have provided for individual Administrative Reviews. It was agreed that Staff should provide a summary, description, analysis, picture and recommendation.

Marvin said she must abstain from item DR-02-21-06 and this case was pulled for separate consideration.

ACTION TAKEN

Motioned by Hickam, seconded by Veatch to confirm Staff's recommendation for all Administrative Reviews listed above.

Motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

DR-02-21-06: 1008 Massachusetts Street; Sign; Certified Local Government Review. Submitted by Luminous Neon for the property owners of record. The property is located in the environs of Lawrence's Downtown Historic District, North Rhode Island Historic District, English Lutheran Church (1040 New Hampshire), Watkins Bank Building (1047 Massachusetts Street), National Register of Historic Places and the Shalor Eldridge House (945 Rhode Island) Kansas Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the Downtown Conservation Overlay District.

Marvin abstained.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Ms. Zollner explained that this request was initially recommended for denial. The applicant had appealed this decision to the Downtown Design Guidelines ad hoc committee, with a revised sign design and a claim that a Downtown business that is now out of business nevertheless had once had a similar sign. The ad hoc committee approved the sign in a 2-1 vote. Staff anticipated the item would return as an Administrative Review in April with a recommendation for approval based on the ad hoc committee's decision.

ACTION TAKEN

The Commission took no action on this item.

C. Provide comment on variance (BZA) requests received since February 23, 2006.

There were no BZA items for consideration except for 1136 Mississippi, which the Commission had taken action on in DR-01-08-06.

D. General public comment.

There was no additional comment from the public.

E. Miscellaneous matters from City staff and Commission members

- a. Ms. Zollner outlined preliminary plans for the 2006 Historic Preservation Conference, May 4-6:
 - Joanlee Hernley has been hired as the conference coordinator.
 - The keynote speaker will be Don_____, who will address Economics of Historic Preservation.

- Website registration is being arranged through the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce.
 - The Commission is encouraged to request that the Mayor pick up the lost custom of proclaiming May as Historic Preservation Month. Staff will draft a proclamation at the direction of the Commission and will discuss co-sponsorship with the LPA.
- b. Staff has been discussing with the LPA how to accomplish historic preservation goals with limited staff and volunteers. Public education, the neighborhood garage study and the reinstatement of the Paul E. Wilson Award are among the projects that Staff would like to see taken up in 2006.
- c. Staff has tentative plans to take on an additional Summer Intern to complete older projects.
- d. Staff reminded the Commission that 2006-2007 elections would take place at the April meeting. Committees would also be reformed at that time.

ADJOURN – 10:00 p.m.

Official minutes of are on file in the Planning Department office.