

CITY OF LEAVENWORTH PRESERVATION COMMISSION

COMMISSION CHAMBERS, CITY HALL

100 N 5th Street, Leavenworth, Kansas 66048

Wednesday, May 3, 2017 5:00 PM

The Leavenworth Preservation Commission met Wednesday, May 3, 2017. Chairman Ken Bower called the meeting to order. Other commissioners present were: John Karrasch, Rik Jackson, Stephen Hansen, Debi Denney, and Sherry Hanson. Also present for the meeting were City Planner Julie Hurley and Administrative Assistant Michelle Baragary.

The chairman welcomed new board member Sherry Hanson. It was noted a quorum was present. Mr. Bower called for a motion to accept the minutes from November 2, 2016 as presented. Mr. Karrasch moved to accept the minutes, seconded by Mr. Otto and approved by a vote of 5-0. Mr. Bower and Ms. Hanson abstained.

OLD BUSINESS:

None.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. 2017-06 LPC – 320 S 7TH STREET

Consider exterior alteration of the property located at 320 S 7th Street, in the Leavenworth Downtown Historic District. A Major Certificate of Appropriateness is required for the proposed exterior changes to the building.

Chairman Bower opened the public hearing and called for the staff report. City Planner Julie Hurley stated that a State Law review under the US Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation for the proposed alteration of the property located at 320 S 7th Street is required.

The subject property is the former Leavenworth Terminal Railway and Bridge Company (LTRBC) building. The building was constructed in 1893 and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and has formerly housed a number of various commercial operations. The applicant is proposing to repurpose the building as five apartment units.

The structure is located immediately west of the Haymarket Square and retains much of its original industrial character. It was originally constructed as a train depot, with two distinct portions: a 2 story brick building on the east 1/3 of the structure, and a metal-sided storage area on the west 2/3. The exterior appearance of the brick portion of the building will remain as it is. The applicant proposes to install corrugated steel panels on the storage portion of the building to reflect the original industrial appearance of the structure. There are three proposed residential units in the western portion of the building, and a small stoop will be constructed for each.

This location is part of the Redevelopment Overlay District, whose purpose is to facilitate the development of property in the downtown and northeast Leavenworth in accordance with the 2010 Downtown-North Leavenworth Redevelopment Master Plan. In particular, this location is identified as part of the Downtown West Gateway sub-area. The intent of the district is to accommodate diverse business and building formats within the urban block and streetscape framework, complementing and supporting other areas of the Downtown. Preservation of historic structures is identified as a goal in the Redevelopment Plan.

REQUIRED REVIEWS:

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

The structure is being repurposed as a multi-family resident, and the exterior modifications are being made to bring the appearance of the structure back into conformance with buildings of the original time period while accommodating for multiple residential units.

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

No removal of historic materials or features is proposed. Materials are being proposed to reflect the original appearance of the building.

3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

The proposed changes would be in harmony with existing structures in the historic district, and present a more accurate historical appearance.

4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

There are no prior changes with known historic significance to the building.

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

No existing historic features, finishes or construction techniques will be altered.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

The proposed changes do not involve replacement of any historic features.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

No chemical or physical treatments are proposed.

8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

No known significant archeological resources exist for preservation.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

The proposed changes do not destroy any historic materials that characterize the property.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

No new additions are proposed.

Chairman Bower opened the public hearing. With no one in the audience to speak, Chairman Bower called for comments or questions from the commissioners.

Mr. Karrasch mentioned the subject property was heard by the Planning Commission for a request to change the zoning from General Business District (GBD) to Residential Mixed Use (RMX). Although the subject property will currently be used as residential, the RMX district affords the option to be used as both residential and commercial.

Mr. Jackson asked about the requirements for residential structures in the flood plain. Ms. Hurley stated that historic structures are exempt from the flood plain requirements. Jeremy Greenamyre stated no unit will be at or below the 100-year flood level.

Ms. Hanson asked about the two different options and the corrugated panels. Ms. Hurley stated they will be new corrugated panels, which will be chosen to have the same look as the original panels. She further stated option 1 is the corrugated metal panels the entire height of the building and option 2 is the corrugated panels with brick at the bottom portion of the building. The consensus among the commissioners is option 1.

After reviewing the sample color panel, the commissioners were in agreement with the Cityscape color for the corrugated panels.

Mr. Bower asked if the historic marker was removed from the building. Mr. Greenamyre stated the historic marker was not removed; it is located on the north east side of the building.

Mr. Bower asked if the individual units will have roofs over the entry doors. Mr. Greenamyre stated the thought was to have roofs over the entry doors to allow tenants to get out of the elements when entering the apartment. The commissioners feel the covers should have a pitch and be of the same material; corrugated steel.

Mr. Bower asked if the parking would be paved. Mr. Greenamyre stated the required parking is one stall per one-bedroom unit; however he plans on having 8-10 parking stalls. The plan is to recontour the lot but not bring in or remove dirt and asphalt only the area to be used for parking. The rest of the parking lot will be landscaped to soften the look.

With no further comments, the Chairman Bower closed the public hearing and called for a motion. Mr. Jackson moved to approve the request for a Major Certificate of Appropriateness based on the findings of the review; seconded by Ms. Hanson and passed by a unanimous vote 7-0.

OTHER BUSINESS/CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Bower noted there were twelve Minor Certificates of Appropriateness:

- 781 Shawnee – roof
- 517 Marshall St – roof
- 410 N Broadway – roof
- 429 Delaware – sandwich board sign
- 417 S 2nd St – double-sided flag wall mount
- 130 Cherokee – minor interior wall changes and update existing signage
- 419 Shawnee – 4' x 12' black ornamental fence
- 208 Choctaw – replace 15 windows
- 513 Delaware – installing handicap bathroom & ramp. Installed fire alarm system
- 900 S Esplanade – replacing roof, gutters, downspouts and driveway. Also doing landscape work
- 519 N Broadway – sidewalk replacement
- 501 N Broadway – repair fire damage: replace entrance to basement, fix damage with like-same material, repair/replace window

Chairman Bower called for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Otto moved to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Hansen and passed by a unanimous vote 7-0.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:35 pm.

JH:mb