ITEM NO. 1: COMMUNICATIONS
A. Receive communications from other commissions, State Historic Preservation Officer, and the general public.
B. Disclosure of ex-parte communications.
C. Declaration of abstentions for specific agenda items by commissioners.
D. Committee Reports

ITEM NO. 2: CONSENT AGENDA
B. Administrative Approvals
   1. DR-17-00064 1616 New Hampshire Street; Solar Array; Certificate of Appropriateness
   2. DR-17-00068 1212 Pennsylvania Street; Sewer Repair; Certificate of Appropriateness
   3. DR-17-00086 815 Vermont Street; Sign Permit; Downtown Design Guidelines Review and Certificate of Appropriateness
   4. DR-17-00105 623 Vermont Street; Patio Canopy; Downtown Design Guidelines Review and Certificate of Appropriateness

ITEM NO. 3: PUBLIC COMMENT
ADDRESSING THE COMMISSION: The public is allowed to speak to any items or issues that are not scheduled on the agenda after first being recognized by the Chair. As a general practice, the Commission will not discuss/debate these items, nor will the Commission
make decisions on items presented during this time, rather they will refer the items to staff for follow up. Individuals are asked to come to the microphone, sign in, and state their name and address. Speakers should address all comments/questions to the Commission.

**AGENDA ITEMS MAY BE TAKEN OUT OF ORDER AT THE COMMISSION’S DISCRETION**

**ITEM NO. 4:** L-17-00061 Public hearing for consideration of placing the property located at 1509 Massachusetts Street, the Henry Buel (Bert) Ober House, on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Lawrence Preservation Alliance on behalf of Victor Wallace, Trustee, the property owner of record. Adopt Resolution 2017-04, if appropriate.

**ITEM NO. 5:** DR-17-00065 1028 Connecticut Street; Demolition; Certificate of Appropriateness. The parcel is located in the environs of the Parnham House (1028 Rhode Island Street). Submitted by Peter Shenouda on behalf of Victor Milad Shenouda Trust, property owner of record.

**ITEM NO. 6:** DR-17-00066 934 Connecticut Street; Demolition and New Construction; Certificate of Appropriateness. The parcel is located in the environs of the McFarland House (940 Rhode Island Street) and the William Watts House (946 Connecticut Street). Submitted by Linda Gwaltney, property owner of record.

**ITEM NO. 7:** DR-17-00069 639 Mississippi Street; New Addition; Certificate of Appropriateness. The parcel is located in the environs of the Wilder-Clark House (643 Indiana Street). Submitted by Adams Architects, LLC on behalf of Travis & Melissa Narum, property owners of record.

**ITEM NO. 8:** DR-17-00112 607 Louisiana Street; New Addition; State Law Review. The property is listed in the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing structure to the Old West Lawrence Historic District. Submitted by Adams Architects, LLC on behalf of Andrea Albright & Lance Adams, property owners of record.

**ITEM NO. 9:** DR-17-00118 Consider Z-17-00103, a request to rezone 6 properties located at 305 E 7TH STREET, 705 CONNECTICUT STREET, 747 NEW JERSEY STREET, 837 CONNECTICUT STREET, 839 CONNECTICUT STREET, and 845 NEW YORK STREET from CS (Commercial Strip District) to RS5 (Single Dwelling Residential District). 1 property is listed in the National Register of Historic Places and requires State Law Review. (Deferred pending action by the Lawrence City Commission.)

**ITEM NO. 10:** MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

A. Provide comment on Zoning Amendments, Special Use Permits, and Zoning Variances received since March 16, 2017.

B. Review of any demolition permits received since March 16, 2017.

C. Miscellaneous matters from City staff and Commission members.
ITEM NO. 1: COMMUNICATIONS
A. Ms. Zollner said staff received communication from the State Historic Preservation Office verifying the nomination of Olive Stanford’s house on the February agenda.
B. There were no ex-parte communications.
C. Commissioner Hernly said he would abstain from Administrative Approval DR-16-00499.
D. There were no Committee Reports.

ITEM NO. 2: CONSENT AGENDA
A. December 15, 2016 Action Summary
B. Administrative Approvals
  1. DR-16-00488 1144 Rhode Island Street; Accessory Structure Rehabilitation; State Law Review
  2. DR-16-00492 888 New Hampshire Street; Sign Permit; Downtown Design Guidelines Review and Certificate of Appropriateness
  3. DR-16-00499 719 Massachusetts Street; Sidewalk Dining; State Law Review, Downtown Design Guidelines Review, and Certificate of Appropriateness
  4. DR-16-00524 920 Massachusetts Street; Sign Permit; State Law Review, Downtown Design Guidelines Review, and Certificate of Appropriateness
  5. DR-16-00525 843 Massachusetts Street; Mechanical Permit; State Law Review
  6. DR-16-00526 1326 Massachusetts Street; Residential Remodel; Certificate of Appropriateness
  7. DR-16-00527 941 Massachusetts Street; Mechanical Permit; State Law Review

ACTION TAKEN
Motioned by Commissioner Arp, seconded by Commissioner Buchanan, to confirm the Administrative Reviews with the exception of DR-16-00499, pulled for separate vote, and to defer the December 15, 2016 Action Summary.

Unanimously approved 6-0.

Motioned by Commissioner Arp, seconded by Commissioner Fry, to confirm Administrative Approval DR-16-00499.

Motion carried 5-0-1.

ITEM NO. 3: PUBLIC COMMENT
There was no public comment.
**ITEM NO. 4:** DR-16-00497 319 E. 7th Street; Demolition Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness. The structure is located in the environs of the A. J. Griffin House (645 Connecticut), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Peter Shenouda on behalf of Eric D. Barton, property owner of record.

**STAFF PRESENTATION**
Ms. Zollner presented the item.

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION**
Mr. Peter Shenouda, applicant, said his father is looking to purchase the property. He explained how dangerous the property is currently.

Commissioner Hernly asked if graphic documentation will be covered.

Ms. Zollner suggested that should be an added condition.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**
Ms. KT Walsh said everyone is so sad about this barn but she understands it is a demolition by neglect. She mentioned the rich history tied to the property and reminded the applicant they would be eligible for tax credits.

Mr. Brad Gibson said the applicant would like to remove a structure within the environs of another listed property. He mentioned other projects approved by the HRC that seem far more invasive. He said this property is very unsafe and that denying it would be inappropriate.

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION**
Commissioner Buchanan said the house was identified in 1976 as a significant property in reference to the United States bicentennial.

Mr. Shenouda added that they will save as many materials as possible.

Commissioner Quillin said they always look at these projects on a case by case basis and these are special circumstances.

Commissioner Arp agreed and said he doesn’t see any other option.

**ACTION TAKEN**
Motioned by Commissioner Quillin, seconded by Commissioner Arp, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for 319 E 7th Street and direct staff to administratively review any minor alterations.

Unanimously approved 6-0.

**ITEM NO. 5:** DR-16-00528 707 Massachusetts Street; New Commercial Addition; State Law Review, Downtown Design Guidelines Review, and Certificate of Appropriateness. The vacant lot is located adjacent to 701 Massachusetts Street and is located in Lawrence’s Downtown Historic District, and the Downtown Urban Conservation Overlay District. The property is also located in the environs of Millers Hall (725 Massachusetts) and the House Building

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Zollner mentioned that the applicant has submitted revised plans that have not yet been reviewed by staff. She asked the applicant if he wants to stick with the original drawings.

Mr. Jan Schaake, applicant, said he's used to changing things until he begins construction, so he was hesitant to commit to either set of plans.

Ms. Zollner said they can either move forward with the original design the applicant can defer or Commission can defer to the February meeting.

Commissioner Arp asked how they can approve a design if they don't have the current version.

Ms. Zollner said the original and revised plans are included in the packet.

Commissioner Buchanan said she would like staff to review the revised plans before they make a decision.

Commissioner Bailey asked if anyone had a chance to compare the plans.

Commissioner Hernly suggested the applicant could explain the differences.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION
Mr. Schaake explained the differences between the original and revised set of plans.

Commissioner Bailey asked if the north elevation has changed.

Mr. Schaake said it has not but staff suggested they add a window or two.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Commissioner Arp said he’d prefer to wait for a staff review of the revised plans.

Commissioner Hernly feels the original submittal looks to be a better design solution.

Commissioner Arp said he has an issue with the garage and parking.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Zollner presented the item based on the original submittal.

Commissioner Hernly asked if stacked parking will be no longer permitted in all of the Oread Neighborhood or just in the historic district.
Ms. Zollner said she believes that applies to the whole overlay, but probably not in the high density district.

Commissioner Hernly asked if that is still a permitted configuration in other areas.

Ms. Zollner said yes.

Commissioner Arp asked about the attached garage and typical historical patterns.

Ms. Zollner explained the history of the distinct parking patterns in historic districts, which consist mostly of detached parking structures.

Commissioner Hernly asked if a duplex could be a freestanding structure with living space above it.

Ms. Zollner said it would require a Special Use Permit.

Commissioner Arp asked how the standards guide them in a situation like this.

Ms. Zollner said environs is challenging because there’s a presumption of approval unless you can show an encroachment. The challenge with this property is the environs review is on a sliding scale, there are no attached garages in the neighborhood, and the pattern in the area shows a distinct spatial relationship. She said the design is contemporary and compatible in many ways, so the Commission must decide if the attached garage is part of the contemporary design or if it is an encroachment on the pattern for the area.

Commissioner Buchanan said stacked parking is proposed and is not appropriate in historic districts.

Commissioner Hernly said it’s in the environs of a listed property, not a district.

Commissioner Buchanan argued that if something changes a pattern it alters the environs.

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Mr. Schaake reiterated the details of the original submittal.

Commissioner Hernly asked if the bigger door on the garage is for two cars, and the other for a single. He asked if there are three spaces inside and two outside.

Mr. Schaake said you could park at least three or four outside.

Commissioner Buchanan asked if he would be opposed to all five spaces being outside.

Mr. Schaake said he’d have all spaces in the front yard if that was going to be a requirement. He further explained design details.

Commissioner Hernly asked about the option of two one-car garages.

Mr. Schaake said there’s a lot of space in the garage and he likes the flexibility of having multiple garage doors for parking and for storage. He feels the more space inside for parking vehicles the more attractive the space will be for tenants.
PUBLIC COMMENT
Mr. Dennis Brown, Lawrence Preservation Alliance (LPA), said they have several issues with the proposal. He said the lot is directly adjacent to a lot registered on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places. He said windows are a big deal in historic environs, and the exterior review is very important. He feels the revised plans have more problems than the original.

Ms. KT Walsh agreed with Mr. Brown’s comments. She added that the area is safe so she doesn’t agree with the argument in support of attached garages for that purpose. She said they are looking at not allowing stacked parking in potential design guidelines for East Lawrence.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Commissioner Arp said he doesn’t think attached garages are appropriate but he’s not sure the standards would support that as a blanket statement.

Commissioner Hernly agreed, noting that their task is to determine the attached garage’s impact on the listed property.

Commissioner Buchanan feels the attached garage is creating a pattern that is not consistent with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Arp said the pattern of the neighborhood isn’t the issue, only the impact on the house next door.

Ms. Zollner said they are looking at the environs of the listed property and how changes impact that property.

Commissioner Buchanan feels there are design solutions that would be appropriate but she feels the current proposal damages the environs.

Commissioner Fry disagreed- he does not feel the project damages the listed property.

Commissioner Bailey reminded them that this is an environs review. He said you can’t tell there’s a garage door from the listed property, and detaching the garage will only add to the visual massing. He feels it appropriate to always make these decisions on a case-by-case basis.

Commissioner Buchanan feels the lack of a backyard makes the mass inappropriate.

Commissioner Arp acknowledged how difficult it is to meet all of these historic standards while maximizing the use of a lot.

Commissioner Hernly said he doesn’t feel the plan is maximizing the lot, if it was it would be a duplex with four bedrooms in each unit and there would be six parking spaces. He said the lack of design guidelines for that area is an issue because developers don’t have any direction for building expectations. He discussed other design options.

They agreed the garage needs to be detached and discussed whether the proposed truly damages the listed property.

Mr. Schaake said he doesn’t feel the project damages anything.

Commissioner Bailey doesn’t feel this project damages the environs.
They agreed the windows on the original submittal are far better than the revision, with the addition of windows on the north side.

Commissioner Fry said he can’t get past the fact this should be the least stringent review for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Commissioner Quillin said the fact that the garage faces the alley minimizes the impact of being attached.

Commissioner Buchanan said she’d like to see options that don’t create stacked parking.

**ACTION TAKEN**
Motioned by Commissioner Bailey, seconded by Commissioner Hernly, to defer the item and direct the applicant to work with the ARC on fenestration on the north side and the dormer on the south side.

Motion carried 5-1 with Commissioner Buchanan dissenting.

**ITEM NO. 7: MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS**

A. Provide comment on Zoning Amendments, Special Use Permits, and Zoning Variances received since December 15, 2016.

Ms. KT Walsh asked why they register properties if the review doesn’t matter. She discussed the East Lawrence Rezoning process.

Commissioner Hernly said they’re learning and the code is in the review process and he reiterated how helpful neighborhood design guidelines are.

Commissioner Bailey asked if Chapter 22 is still being reviewed by the City Attorney’s office.

Ms. Zollner said she hopes to have something to the Commission in February.

B. Review of any demolition permits received since December 15, 2016.

C. Miscellaneous matters from City staff and Commission members.

Ms. Zollner mentioned that this would be Commissioner Quillin’s last meeting and Commissioner Arp’s last meeting will be in February.

Commissioner Buchanan asked if being a board member of LPA is a conflict of interest.
Ms. Zollner said no.

**ADJOURN 8:22 PM**
A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00064 1616 New Hampshire Street; Solar Array; Certificate of Appropriateness

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Installation of a rooftop solar array.

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Chapter 22 of the Code of the City of Lawrence (Certificate of Appropriateness)

D. STAFF DETERMINATION

In accordance with Chapter 22 of the Code of the City of Lawrence, the standards of evaluation, staff determined the proposed project will not significantly encroach on, damage, or destroy the landmarks or their environs and issued the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed project.
A. **SUMMARY**

DR-17-00068 1212 Pennsylvania Street; Sewer Repair; Certificate of Appropriateness

B. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Sewer Repair Permit

C. **STANDARDS FOR REVIEW**

Chapter 22 of the Code of the City of Lawrence (Certificate of Appropriateness)

D. **STAFF DETERMINATION**

In accordance with Chapter 22 of the Code of the City of Lawrence, the standards of evaluation, staff determined the proposed project will not significantly encroach on, damage, or destroy the landmarks or their environs and issued the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed project.
A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00086 815 Vermont Street; Sign Permit; Downtown Design Guidelines Review and Certificate of Appropriateness

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Sign Permit

The sign will be a 8’ X 3’ banner between two poles placed 8’ behind the sidewalk on the open lot at 815 Vermont Street.

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Chapter 22 of the Code of the City of Lawrence (Certificate of Appropriateness)

Downtown Design Guidelines (Downtown Urban Conservation Overlay District)

D. STAFF DETERMINATION

In accordance with Chapter 22 of the Code of the City of Lawrence, the standards of evaluation, staff determined the proposed project will not significantly encroach on, damage, or destroy the landmarks or their environs and issued the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed project.
Based on the information provided by the applicant and in accordance with Chapter 20-308(f)(3) of the City Code, staff reviewed this project using the Downtown Design Guidelines and determined that the project, as proposed, meets these development and design standards.
A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00105 623 Vermont Street; Patio Canopy; Downtown Design Guidelines Review and Certificate of Appropriateness

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The existing patio canopy shown below will be modified to meet fire code and to be more compatible with the Downtown Conservation Overlay District and the environs of the listed properties.

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Chapter 22 of the Code of the City of Lawrence (Certificate of Appropriateness)

Downtown Design Guidelines (Downtown Urban Conservation Overlay District)
D. **STAFF DETERMINATION**

In accordance with Chapter 22 of the Code of the City of Lawrence, the standards of evaluation, staff determined the proposed project will not significantly encroach on, damage, or destroy the landmarks or their environs and issued the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed project.

Based on the information provided by the applicant and in accordance with Chapter 20-308(f)(3) of the City Code, staff reviewed this project using the Downtown Design Guidelines and determined that the project, as proposed, meets these development and design standards.
LAWRENCE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION
ITEM NO. 4: L-17-00061
STAFF REPORT

A. SUMMARY

L-17-00061 Public hearing for consideration of placing the property located at 1509 Massachusetts Street, the Henry Buel (Bert) Ober House, on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Lawrence Preservation Alliance on behalf of Victor Wallace, Trustee, the property owner of record.

This report includes the proposed environ definition for 1509 Massachusetts Street.

Legal Description:

NORTH 50 FEET LOT 13 & SOUTH 50 FEET LOT 14 100 X 125 BLOCK 10 IN BABCOCK’S ENLARGED ADDITION, AN ADDITION TO THE CITY OF LAWRENCE, IN DOUGLAS COUNTY, KANSAS, HAVING THE ADDRESS OF 1509 MASSACHUSETTS STREET, LAWRENCE, KANSAS

The public hearing for the nomination of the structure to the Lawrence Register of Historic Places will be held at 6:30 p.m., or thereafter, in the City Commission Room at Lawrence City Hall located at 6 E 6th Street.

B. HISTORIC REGISTER STATUS

1509 Massachusetts Street is not listed on the Register of Historic Kansas Places or the National Register of Historic Places.

C. REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS

1) History Summary

According to the nomination, the primary structure located at 1509 Massachusetts was constructed from 1913 to 1914. The accessory structure on the property was also constructed during this time or shortly after in 1915. The architect/builder of the structure is not known.

The structure at 1509 Massachusetts Street is architecturally significant as a good example of Mission Revival architecture. According to the Historic Resources of Lawrence, Douglas County, Kansas Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF), the 1913-1914 period in Lawrence’s growth is identified as “Quiet University Town from 1900 – 1945.” The Mission style of architecture was rare in Lawrence and is not identified as one of the specific styles of architecture during this 20th Century Revival and American House Movement as discussed in the MPDF. However, the Mission Revival style of architecture is identified in A Field Guide to American Houses by Virginia and Lee McAlester as an eclectic house that was generally constructed between 1905 and 1920 in residential areas across the country.
While the structure is being nominated for its architecture, the nomination provides some of the history for the property and identifies that the structure was constructed for H.B. Ober. Ober owned a clothing store in downtown Lawrence that he had purchased from Abe Levy in 1896. Ober had been in the department store business with his father in Salina prior to moving to Lawrence. The nomination states that Ober was associated with the National Retail Clothiers Association and served as president and vice president of the organization. Ober was also well-known for his association and leadership with the growth of the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce and was a charter member of the Lawrence Rotary Club. Other owners of the house include: Dolph Simons (Senior), publisher of the Lawrence Journal World; John Peters, an executive with the Lawrence National Bank; and Professor Victor Wallace and his wife Mary who both worked at the University of Kansas.

2) Architectural Integrity Summary

The structure at 1509 Massachusetts Street is architecturally significant as a good example of the Mission Revival style of architecture. The nomination notes that the large two-story building is rectangular with a central entrance in a symmetrical three-bay façade. The exterior cladding is stucco (likely over wood frame construction). The hipped roof with front and rear hipped roof dormers is covered with red tile. The entrance of the structure has a one-story hipped-roof portico with stone steps, a stone railing, and ornamental limestone posts rising to an arched lintel and surmounted by a shaped parapet. This feature is the most dominate example of the structure's Mission Revival style.
The structure has a prominent porte-cochere extending from the center of the south elevation that continues the use of limestone and hipped roofs. An exterior chimney constructed of rough-cut stone blocks pierces the porte-cochere roof and extends to pierce through the wide eaves of the main roof structure. The fenestration pattern differs on each elevation but the primary/east elevation has a symmetrical fenestration pattern. The second story sleeping porch on the west elevation is enclosed with nine-light windows.

The applicant has submitted an undated historic photograph that shows there have been no significant changes to the property. The nomination application notes one known alteration to the interior of the structure.

There is a garage to the southwest of the primary structure. This is a rectangular one-story structure with a hipped roof and tile roofing is sheathed in stucco. Original windows in the south and north facades have 6/1 double-hung sash. The main entrance to the east has a contemporary overhead door and there is a contemporary entrance door in the north façade. The garage is a contributing structure to the property although the original doors have been replaced.
3) Historic and Current Context Description

Historic character information is based on historic photographs, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, the nomination information, 1873 Douglas County Atlas, Living with History: A Historic Preservation Plan for Lawrence, Kansas, by Dale Nimz, and Historic Resources of Lawrence, Douglas County, Kansas Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF), including the amendment Lawrence Modern, 1945 to 1975, and the Hemly and Associates South Mass Survey 2008. Existing context is based on personal observation, city zoning maps, and recent aerial photographs.

The Henry Buel Ober House is a rare example of the housing that was constructed in Lawrence during the “Quiet University Town” (1900 – 1945) as defined by the MPDF. While many eclectic architectural styles were constructed in Lawrence during this period, the Ober House is a good example of Mission Revival architecture that was not common in Lawrence. The area surrounding 1509 Massachusetts Street is primarily single family residential, with the exception of the religious building to the north. Building types and uses in the area developed over several decades from ca. 1880 to 1930 with modern infill construction after 1945. Babcock’s Enlarged Addition was platted in 1865.

The following information was part of a historic resources survey completed by Hemly and Associates as part of a Historic Preservation Fund Grant.

The original town plat included the original eight and a half block portion of Massachusetts Street extending from its north end just north of Pinckney Street (6th) at the Kansas River southward to a point one-half block south of Adams Street (14th). In the nineteenth century, Massachusetts Street north of South Park became the primary commercial district and Massachusetts Street south of South Park was a sparsely developed residential area.

By 1866 two subdivisions, South Lawrence and Babcock’s Enlarged Subdivision, extended lots along the east side of Massachusetts Street to 19th Street and the west side to 21st Street. By 1887, three additional subdivisions extended lots along both sides of Massachusetts Street to 23rd Street. These were all straight line extensions of the original northern portion of Massachusetts Street. The 1887 state Atlas shows that the south end of Massachusetts Street at the very end of the map. 15th, 19th, and 21st Streets were the primary east-west streets extending eastward away from Lawrence, while 22nd and 23rd are only short local 4-block street stubs. Lot sizes in the area vary, in part, because of the historical platting patterns.

Massachusetts Street is a minor arterial street and is an important gateway to the historic central business district of Lawrence. The primary uses in the area are single-family residential and the scale, massing, setback, and materials of these buildings define the fundamental architectural character of the area.

Development patterns in the area correlate with historic transportation modes and planning practices. Transportation, primarily the automobile, had a significant role in the historic context of the area and continues to affect the current context. The effects of available transportation and technology are evident in the development of the buildings and uses in the area as well as the development patterns.
Originally, transportation by individuals along Massachusetts Street would have been by foot, on horseback, or by horse drawn carriage/wagon. Over the years, horse drawn streetcars (1872-1903) and the electric trolley (1909-1933) were added to these choices, as was the automobile (widely available after 1915). With each of these changes in transportation modes, the character along the street changed. Transportation routes influenced the development of the commercial nodes and residential blocks on Massachusetts Street. Expansion of the use of 23rd Street as a major east/west arterial has created a major traffic circulation node at Massachusetts Street. However, all four corners of this intersection developed as residential rather than commercial properties.

Alleys were not incorporated into the subdivisions extending south along Massachusetts Street. As the automobile came into common use and construction of individual garages, and porte cocheres like the one at 1509 Massachusetts Street, became prevalent for each property, the number of driveway curb-cuts grew and their presence continues to impact traffic patterns on Massachusetts Street.

When the Ober House was constructed, this area had all of the available amenities like water, sewer, gas, and electricity. This area has continued to grow with the introduction of new city amenities.

The existing context of the area includes minimum pedestrian amenities. Sidewalks exist in the area but do not continue on both sides of the street from South Park to 23rd Street. The increased vehicle traffic on Massachusetts Street does not allow for easily crossing the street and there are few signal-controlled intersections.

The impact of automobile traffic has created a negative quality-of-life for residents in the area.

While the existing transportation network and use has increased the impacts of vehicle traffic, the overall residential character in the area around 1509 Massachusetts Street remains.

**Conclusion**

The Environs for 1509 Massachusetts Street, the Henry Buel (Bert) Ober House have not significantly changed since the 1914 date of construction. The primary changes in the area are the increase in traffic, the continued installation of utilities and signs, and the construction of the church to the north in 1947. The historic and current character of the area is residential. The environs should be reviewed as one area in the following manner:

The area consists of residential structures and a church that is a historically compatible use in a residential area. The residential character of the environs is important. The area should maintain the overall residential character of the historic environs and the following should apply:

The proposed alteration or construction should meet the intent of the Criteria set forth in 22-505. Important design elements include scale, massing, site placement, height, directional expression, percentage of building coverage to site, setback, roof shapes, rhythm of
openings, and sense of entry. Main structure demolitions would be approved only if
documentation was provided that indicated that the structure was unsound and/or a
certificate of economic hardship was approved and compatible new construction is proposed.
Maintaining views to the listed property and maintaining the rhythm and pattern within the
environs are the primary focus of review.

All projects except for demolition of main structures, new infill construction, or large additions
(25% or greater than the footprint of the existing structure) will be reviewed administratively
by the Historic Resources Administrator. The proposed alteration or construction should meet
the intent of the Criteria set forth in 22-505. The main issues in the review are the
continuation of the residential character of the area and whether the project will encroach
upon, damage or destroy the environs of the listed property. If the project does not meet the
Criteria set forth in 22-505, the project will be forwarded to the Historic Resources
Commission for review.

Major projects (demolition of main structures, new infill construction, and large additions
greater than 25% of the footprint of the existing structure) will be reviewed by the Historic
Resources Commission. The proposed alteration or construction should meet the intent of the
Criteria set forth in 22-505. The main issues in the review are the continuation of the
residential character of the area and if the project will encroach upon, damage or destroy the
environs of the listed property.
4) Planning and Zoning Considerations

1509 Massachusetts Street is zoned RS7, Single-Dwelling Residential District. The primary purpose of the RS district is to accommodate predominantly single detached dwelling units on individual lots. The RS district is intended to create, maintain, and promote housing opportunities for individual households, although nonresidential uses that are compatible with residential neighborhoods are permitted.

5) Fiscal Comments

There are no monetary benefits directly associated with nomination of a structure to the Lawrence Register of Historic Places at this time. However, Chapter 22 of the Code of the City of Lawrence does identify mechanisms for financial incentives. If these programs become available in the future, structures listed on the Lawrence Register will be eligible for participation.

Listing on the local register does help preserve built resources important to Lawrence's history and helps to maintain streetscapes in older neighborhoods through environs reviews.

The original information submitted with nominations for properties to the Lawrence Register is kept on file in the City Planning office for public review and consultation with regard to development projects within the notification area. Copies of this information are also on file at the Kansas Collection in Spencer Research Library on the University of Kansas main campus and at the Watkin’s Community Museum. This type of information is useful, for example, if present or future property owners seek nomination to the State or National Register of Historic Places.

6) Positive/Negative Effects of the Designation

The positive effect of designation is the creation of a permanent record of the historical significance of an individual property, for its architectural quality or its association with a significant local individual or event. This provides the local Historic Resources Commission, an advisory board, with pertinent historical data which can help to provide an 'historic' perspective to property owners when they desire to improve, add on, or redevelop a property within an older section of the City.

The public accessibility of this information is also a resource as it can be used by realtors, builders/developers, and others in the community prior to a property's resale, redevelopment or rehabilitation. In a more general sense, this information can be used by the Chamber of Commerce and existing businesses and industries to ‘identify’ one of the facets that makes up Lawrence's Quality of Living.

Additional effects of designation are the creation of an arbitrary, 250' environs notification and review area. Within this 250' circle, projects which require city permits, e.g., demolition, redevelopment, renovation or modification, require review by Historic Resources staff or the Commission. These environs reviews permit scrutiny of proposed development/redevelopment by individuals sensitive to historic preservation.
A Certificate of Appropriateness or a Certificate of Economic Hardship is required to be issued by the Historic Resources Commission before a City permit can be issued for the proposed project. If the Historic Resources Commission denies a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Certificate of Economic Hardship, the property owner can appeal to the City Commission for a new hearing. The City Commission can uphold the decision of the HRC or it can grant the proposed development over the Historic Resources Commission's action.

Examples of projects which would require review and approval are projects involving the exterior of a building, and demolitions or partial demolitions. Minor changes which require a city permit can be administratively approved by the Historic Resources Administrator.

7) Summary of Applicable Designation Criteria

Chapter 22, of the City Code is the Conservation of Historic Resources Code for the City of Lawrence. Section 22-403 of this code establishes criteria for the evaluation of an application for nomination to the Local Register of Historic Places.

D. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION AND DESIGNATION - Section 22-403

Nine criteria are provided within this section for review and determination of qualification as a Landmark or Historic District. These criteria are set forth below with staff's recommendations as to which this application qualifies for:

(1) Its character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the community, county, state, or nation;

(2) Its location as a site of a significant local, county, state, or national event;

(3) Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the community, county, state, or nation;

(4) Its embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials;

(5) Its identification as a work of a master builder, designer, architect, or landscape architect whose individual work has influenced the development of the community, county, state or nation;

(6) Its embodiment of elements of design, detailing, materials, or craftsmanship that render it architecturally significant;

    1509 Massachusetts Street is an excellent example of Mission Revival style architecture for Lawrence. It contains elements of design, detailing, materials, and craftsmanship that render it architecturally significant. Both the primary structure and the accessory structure represent this style and features.

(7) Its embodiment of design elements that make it structurally or architecturally innovative;
(8) Its unique location or singular physical characteristics that make it an established or familiar visual feature;

(9) Its character as a particularly fine or unique example of a utilitarian structure; including, but not limited to farmhouses, gas stations, or other commercial structures, with a high level of integrity or architectural significance.

The HISTORIC RESOURCES CODE establishes a procedure to follow in the forwarding of a recommendation to the City Commission on applications for listing on the local register.

"Following the hearing the commission shall adopt by resolution a recommendation to be submitted to the city commission for either (a) designation as a landmark or historic district; (b) not to designate as a landmark or historic district; or, (c) not to make a recommendation. The resolution shall be accompanied by a report to the city commission containing the following information:

The Historic Resources Commission needs to formulate its recommendation in response to the following subsections section 22-404.2 (b):

(1) Explanation of the significance or lack of significance of the nominated landmark or historic district as it relates to the criteria for designation as set forth in section 22-403;
(2) Explanation of the integrity or lack of integrity of the nominated landmark or historic district;
(3) In the case of a nominated landmark found to meet the criteria for designation:
   (A) The significant exterior architectural features of the nominated landmark that should be protected; and,
   (B) The types of construction, alteration, demolition, and removal, other than those requiring a building or demolition permit, that cannot be undertaken without obtaining a certificate of appropriateness.
(4) In the case of a nominated historic district found to meet the criteria for designation:
   (A) The types of significant exterior architectural features of the structures within the nominated historic district that should be protected;
   (B) The types of construction, alteration, demolition, and removal, other than those requiring a building or demolition permit, that cannot be undertaken without obtaining a certificate of appropriateness.
   (C) A list of all key contributing, contributing and noncontributing sites, structures and objects within the historic district.
(5) Proposed design guidelines for applying the criteria for review of certificates of appropriateness to the nominated landmark or historic district.
(6) The relationship of the nominated landmark or historic district to the on-going effort of the commission to identify and nominate all potential areas and structures that meet the criteria for designation.
(7) A map showing the location of the nominated landmark or the boundaries of the nominated historic district.

E. RECOMMENDATION:

The Henry Buel Ober House at 1509 Massachusetts Street qualifies for designation as a Landmark on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places pursuant to Criterion #6, as described in Section 22-403.

If the Historic Resources Commission recommends this property for local nomination, the Commission should adopt a resolution for recommendation to be submitted to the City Commission for designation as a landmark. In addition to the resolution, the Commission should direct staff to prepare a report to accompany the resolution including the information set forth in Section 22-404.2(1)-(7) and the environs definition.

Staff recommends the following for the report to the City Commission:

(1) Explanation of the significance or lack of significance of the nominated landmark or historic district as it relates to the criteria for designation as set forth in section 22-403;

The Henry Buel Ober House and accessory structure are significant for their architectural style.

(2) Explanation of the integrity or lack of integrity of the nominated landmark or historic district;

The structures maintain sufficient integrity of location and design that make them worthy of preservation.

(3) In the case of a nominated landmark found to meet the criteria for designation:

(A) The significant exterior architectural features of the nominated landmark that should be protected; and,

Fenestration pattern and window and door openings, window types, roof shapes, the roof eave depths, design features and red clay tile material, the historic form of the structure, the chimney location and materials, and the design and materials of the portico on the east elevation including size and architectural detailing.

(B) The types of construction, alteration, demolition, and removal, other than those requiring a building or demolition permit that cannot be undertaken without obtaining a certificate of appropriateness.

Changes to the fenestration pattern and window and door openings, window types, roof shapes, the roof eave depths, the roof design features and red clay tile material, the historic form of the structure, the chimney location and materials, and the design and materials of the portico on the east elevation...
including size and architectural detailing should require a Certificate of Appropriateness.

(E) Proposed design guidelines for applying the criteria for review of certificates of appropriateness to the nominated landmark or historic district.

U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, published in 1990, and any future amendments, in addition to any criteria specified by Chapter 22 of the Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas.

The HRC has adopted an Environs Definition for 1509 Massachusetts Street to delineate how environs review will be conducted in relation to the listed property. (See above)

(F) The relationship of the nominated landmark or historic district to the on-going effort of the commission to identify and nominate all potential areas and structures that meet the criteria for designation.

A primary goal of the HRC is to build a Register of properties which show the diversity and growth of Lawrence since its inception. The nomination of this property is another step toward registering a wide variety of historic properties which together present a visual history of Lawrence’s past. The goal of the Lawrence Register of Historic Places is to represent all socioeconomic strata; businesses and industries which illustrate the diversity that has been prevalent in Lawrence since its inception.

(G) A map showing the location of the nominated landmark. (Attached)
Properties within the Environs

1509 Massachusetts Street
LANDMARK APPLICATION

PLEASE BE ADVISED: THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE SCHEDULED FOR A PUBLIC HEARING UNTIL THE HISTORIC RESOURCES ADMINISTRATOR HAS DETERMINED THAT THE APPLICATION HAS BEEN COMPLETED. (City Code 22-105(Y))

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Name of Historic Property ________________________________________________________________________
Henry Buel (Bert) Ober House

Address of Property ____________________________________________________________________________
1509 Massachusetts Street

Legal Description of Property ____________________________________________________________________
Bacock's Enlarged Addition, Block 10, N 50 ft Lot 13 & S 50 ft Lot 14

OWNER INFORMATION

Name(s) Victor Wallace, Trustee

Contact Victor Wallace

Address 1509 Massachusetts Street

City Lawrence State KS ZIP 66044

Phone (231) 947-5345 E-mail __________________________________________________________________

Is this an owner initiated nomination? ☐ Yes □ No

If not, has the owner been notified of this nomination? ☐ Yes □ No

APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION

Contact Dennis Brown, President, Lawrence Preservation Alliance

Company __________________________________________

Address P. O. Box 1073

City Lawrence State KS ZIP 66044

Phone (785) 841-2460 E-mail djbrown806@gmail.com

Pre-Application Meeting Required
Planner __________________________
Date ____________________________

Henry Buel (Bert) Ober House
1509 Massachusetts Street
Bacock's Enlarged Addition, Block 10, N 50 ft Lot 13 & S 50 ft Lot 14
Victor Wallace, Trustee
Victor Wallace
1509 Massachusetts Street
Lawrence KS 66044
231 947-5345

Dennis Brown, President, Lawrence Preservation Alliance
P. O. Box 1073
Lawrence KS 66044
785 841-2460 djbrown806@gmail.com
DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Number of structures, objects, or landscape features located on the property 2

Historic Use(s) Residence, garage
Present Use(s) Residence, garage

Date of Original Construction c. 1913
Architect and/or Builder (if known) Unknown
Date(s) of Known Alterations c. 1940

Describe any known alterations including additions to the property. (Add additional sheets if needed)

According to the present owner, a interior wall on the south side of the first floor was removed by the Dolph Simons family to enlarge the dining area. Also, the overhead garage door and entrance door have been replaced.

REGISTER STATUS

☐ Property is listed in the National Register of Historic Places
☐ Property is listed in the Register of Historic Kansas Places

HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROPERTY

Why do you think this property is significant? Please check all that apply.

☐ Location of a significant event
   Event

☐ Association with a significant person
   Person

☑ Architectural significance (Please attach an architectural description of the property)

☐ Other
HISTORY OF THE PROPERTY (Add additional sheets if needed)
See attached appendix.

DESCRIBE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE AREA SURROUNDING THE PROPERTY AT THE TIME OF CONSTRUCTION.

What year was the property platted?  July 30, 1865
What is the name of the subdivision?  Babcock's Enlarged Addition
What was the zoning?  Unknown
What were the land uses?  Residential
What size and types of buildings existed in the area?  Residences

Did the area have paved streets, sidewalks, gas service or electrical service? Please describe.
Yes, by 1913 Massachusetts Street was paved. Sidewalks generally were concrete. Gas and electrical service was available.

ATTACH COPIES OF ANY HISTORIC PHOTOGRAPHS OR DOCUMENTATION INCLUDING CITATIONS FOR THIS PROPERTY.
SIGNATURE

I/We, the undersigned am/are the (owner(s)), (duly authorized agent), (Circle One) of the aforementioned property. By execution of my/our signature, I/we do hereby officially apply for landmark designation as indicated above.

Signature(s): _______________________________ Date ________________

_________________________________________ Date ________________

_________________________________________ Date ________________
OWNER AUTHORIZATION

I/WE___________________________________________________________________, hereby referred to as the “Undersigned”, being of lawful age, do hereby on this ________ day of _________, 20 __, make the following statements to wit:

1. I/We the Undersigned, on the date first above written, am/are the lawful owner(s) in fee simple absolute of the following described real property:

   See “Exhibit A, Legal Description” attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

2. I/We the undersigned, have previously authorized and hereby authorize ___________________________________________________________ (Herein referred to as “Applicant”), to act on my/our behalf for the purpose of making application with the Planning Office of Lawrence/Douglas County, Kansas, regarding ___________________________________________________________ (common address), the subject property, or portion thereof. Such authorization includes, but is not limited to, all acts or things whatsoever necessarily required of Applicant in the application process.

3. It is understood that in the event the Undersigned is a corporation or partnership then the individual whose signature appears below for and on behalf of the corporation or partnership has in fact the authority to so bind the corporation or partnership to the terms and statements contained within this instrument.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I, the Undersigned, have set my hand and seal below.

____________________________________________________________________  _____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
Owner                                                                 Owner

STATE OF KANSAS
COUNTY OF DOUGLAS

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on this ________ day of __________, 20 __, by _____________________________________________________________.

My Commission Expires: ____________________________________________
Notary Public
REQU IDED Inf ORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED WITH AN APPLI CATION FOR NOMINATION TO THE LAWRENCE REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

☐ Completed Application Form (If the property is nominated for architectural significance, include an architectural description of the structure.)

☐ Certified property owner list from the Douglas County Clerk’s office for properties within 250’ of the nominated property.

☐ At least one photograph of each elevation of the structure(s) and streetscape views.

☐ Legal description of nominated property.

☐ If the property is listed on the State and/or National Registers of Historic Places, copies of the resource materials submitted with the application.

☐ Any additional documentation you believe is relevant to this nomination which you would like considered in the review process.

☐ The fee for application processing is $10.00 for landmark nominations and $50.00 for district nominations.

Research Resources

- Lawrence Public Library (707 Vermont Street, Lawrence)
  http://www.lawrence.lib.ks.us/research-resources/genealogy-and-local-history/

- Watkins Museum of History (1047 Massachusetts Street, Lawrence)
  http://www.watkinsmuseum.org/index.php

- Kenneth Spencer Research Library at the University of Kansas (1450 Poplar Lane, Lawrence)
  https://spencer.lib.ku.edu/

- Kansas State Historical Society (6425 SW 6th Ave., Topeka, Kansas)
  http://www.kshs.org/

- City of Lawrence Interactive map
  http://gis.lawrenceks.org/flexviewers/lawrence/

PLEASE BE ADVISED: This application will not be scheduled for a Public hearing until the Historic Resources Administrator has determined that the application has been completed. (City Code 22-105(Y))
LANDMARK APPLICATION

PLEASE BE ADVISED: THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE SCHEDULED FOR A PUBLIC HEARING UNTIL THE HISTORIC RESOURCES ADMINISTRATOR HAS DETERMINED THAT THE APPLICATION HAS BEEN COMPLETED. (City Code 22-105(Y))

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Name of Historic Property _______________________________________________________
Address of Property ____________________________ 1509 Massachusetts
Legal Description of Property ___________________________________________________

OWNER INFORMATION

Name(s) Victor Wallace
Contact __________________________________________________
Address _____________________________________________________________
City Lawrence State KS ZIP 66044
Phone (785) 842-7930 E-mail Wallace@ku.edu

Is this an owner initiated nomination? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If not, has the owner been notified of this nomination? ☐ Yes ☑ No

APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION

Contact Dennis J Brown
Company Lawrence Preservation Alliance
Address PO Box 1073
City Lawrence State KS ZIP 66044
Phone (785) 841-2460 E-mail djbrown806@gmail.com
OWNER AUTHORIZATION

I/WE Victor L. Wallace, hereby referred to as the "Undersigned", being of lawful age, do hereby on this 4th day of November, 2016, make the following statements to wit:

1. I/We the Undersigned, on the date first above written, am/are the lawful owner(s) in fee simple absolute of the following described real property:

   See "Exhibit A, Legal Description" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

2. I/We the undersigned, have previously authorized and hereby authorize Lawrence Preservation Alliance (Herein referred to as "Applicant"), to act on my/our behalf for the purpose of making application with the Planning Office of Lawrence/Douglas County, Kansas, regarding 1509 Massachusets (common address), the subject property, or portion thereof. Such authorization includes, but is not limited to, all acts or things whatsoever necessarily required of Applicant in the application process.

3. It is understood that in the event the Undersigned is a corporation or partnership then the individual whose signature appears below for and on behalf of the corporation or partnership has in fact the authority to so bind the corporation or partnership to the terms and statements contained within this instrument.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I, the Undersigned, have set my hand and seal below.

[Signature]
Owner

Owner

STATE OF KANSAS
COUNTY OF DOUGLAS

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on this 4th day of November 2016

by Victor L. Wallace

My Commission Expires: 11-25-2017

Susan C. Parscal
Notary Public
Appendix – H.B. (Bert) Ober House, 1509 Massachusetts, Local Landmark

Architectural significance of the property
The H.B. Ober House (constructed 1913-14) is eligible for listing as a local landmark as a well preserved example of the Mission architectural style. With its prominent porch roof parapet, balanced façade and simple rectangular plan, it is an example of the symmetrical sub-type identified by Virginia S. McAlester.¹ This style originated in California and appeared in house plan books. By 1900 houses in this style were being constructed in early twentieth-century suburbs throughout the country. Most examples date from the years between 1905 and 1920.² Overall, this residence has excellent architectural integrity and fully meets the criteria for listing in the Lawrence Register of Historic Places.

Description
The H.B. Ober house is a detached single-family residence on a large lot. The house faces east on Massachusetts Street, Lawrence’s main street, and is located in a residential neighborhood a few blocks south of the central business district. The large two-story building is rectangular with a central entrance in a symmetrical three-bay façade. The house is stuccoed (probably over wood frame construction). It has a hipped roof with front and rear hipped roof dormers. The roofing is red tile.

There is a one-story hipped-roof entrance portico with stone steps, a stone railing, and ornamental limestone posts rising to an arched lintel and surmounted by a shaped parapet. Also, there is a prominent porte-cochere extending from the center of the south façade. This is constructed on square limestone posts with a hipped roof. The entrance deck extends across the main front and forms an ell connecting to the porte-cochere. An exterior chimney constructed of rough-cut stone blocks rises through the porte-cochere. A rear two-story partial-width wing extends from the main block to the northwest and there is a one-story rear entry beside it.

There is a glazed wooden entrance door. There are double hung windows with paired ten-light storm windows on the first floor front. Aluminum storms on the second floor are flanked by ornamental black shutters. The main entrance is flanked by ten-light sidelights. There is a tripartite window above the entrance portico and tripartite windows in the roof dormers. Two paired twelve-light doors on either side of the chimney provide access to the porch and porte-cochere. There is a fifteen-light rear entrance door. Windows in the south and west facades have 6/1 double-hung sash. Windows in the north façade have 4/1 double-hung sash. The second floor sleeping porch in the rear wing has 9-light windows. Basement windows have three lights.

There is a garage in the rear to the southwest. This is a rectangular one-story stuccoed structure with a hipped roof and tile roofing. Original windows in the south and north facades have 6/1 double-hung sash. The main entrance to the east has a contemporary overhead door and there is a contemporary entrance door in the north facade.

As the historic photograph provided by the current owner shows, the H.B. Ober house has excellent architectural integrity. Generally, the house retains its original interior plan and ornamental features. On the interior, a wall between rooms on the south side of the first floor was removed to provide a larger dining area.

Historic significance of the property
The Ober house is significant for its association with H.B. Ober, a prominent Lawrence businessman during the early twentieth century, and for its association with the residential development of Massachusetts Street. During this period, several leading families lived in the houses on this block. The property is eligible for listing under Criteria 1 because of its character and value as part of the development and heritage of Lawrence and Douglas County, Kansas. Also, the house is eligible for listing under Criteria 6 for its embodiment of popular elements of design, detailing, materials, and craftsmanship that render it architecturally significant.

Chronology

This substantial residence on the town’s main street was built in 1913-14 by H. B. Ober who owned a clothing store in downtown Lawrence. Ober purchased the clothing business of Abe Levy in 1896. At that time, the Massachusetts Street store occupied a building fifteen by sixty feet. By 1929, the store (821-823 Massachusetts) had grown to a business occupying a space sixty by one hundred feet and seventeen feet high with both basement and the second floor in use. Before coming to Lawrence, Mr. Ober lived in Salina where he was in business with his father, E. W. Ober, in their department store. Ober’s enterprise in Lawrence became “one of the best known clothing stores in the United States due to the fact that the students from the University, who have traded there, speak of it in their travels and also to the fact that Mr. Ober was associated with the National Retail Clothiers Association as president and vice president.”

Henry Buel Ober was born in Salina on February 5, 1873. His father, Ezra William Ober, came to Kansas in 1869 and built up his business to a scale so that for some years E. W. Ober was regarded as “the largest merchant in Central Kansas.” Henry B. Ober was one of the first two students to graduate from St. John’s Military Academy in Salina and worked in his father’s store. He attended the University of Michigan for three semesters, spent a year in the clothing business in Hays and from there came to Lawrence. As an article in the National Retail Clothier described, “Mr. Ober is big in stature, and with a commanding physique he has unusual ability to organize, and a unique understanding of human nature. . . Mr. Ober is progressive in everything for the good of his town and of the University of Kansas, which is located in Lawrence. He is identified with all the community activities of any consequence.” As the description continued, “always Mr. Ober has tried to have a general clothing store, catering to college students and price customers—men, young men and boys.” Mr. Ober was reelected president of the National Association of Retail Clothiers and Furnishers in March, 1927. For three years he was head of the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce assisting in building it up from an organization of less than fifty to three hundred twenty members. He was a charter member of the Lawrence Rotary Club, a member of the Masonic Lodge and Shrine, B.P.O. Elks, and a charter member of the Lawrence Country Club.

The store continued under the Ober name until 1973. At that time, co-owner Bob Radcliffe commented, “there is a lot of pride associated with this store. We’re probably the oldest members of the clothing trade association in the state and, I think, the oldest family-owned store in the state.” He also mentioned that Ober’s was the first store in town with an air conditioner. Radcliffe’s grandfather, Clarence, was H.B. Ober’s son-in-law. Clarence Radcliffe became a partner in the Lawrence business in 1903 and then in 1945 the Radcliffe family purchased the entire business.

The house at 1509 Massachusetts Street has been associated with prominent residents of Lawrence throughout its history. Dolph Simons, Senior, bought the house in 1929. Simons was publisher of the Lawrence Journal-World from 1944 to 1962 and editor from 1950 to 1979. His father W. C. Simons founded the newspaper and was the publisher from 1891 to 1944. Mr. John Peters, an executive of Lawrence National Bank, owned the house from 1963 to 1976. Professor Victor Wallace and his wife Mary bought it in the spring of 1976 and occupied it that summer after moving from Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Victor Wallace was the chair of the computer science department, University of Kansas, and Mary taught journalism and served as assistant dean of the School of Journalism and Mass Communications.

History of the area
The historic context for this property is outlined in the National Register multiple property listing “Historic Resources of Lawrence, Douglas County, Kansas,” (1998). By the turn of the century, Lawrence had matured as a community; its commercial and industrial interests had stabilized. In 1910 a promotional issue of the Lawrence Daily Journal boasted that the town was “the trading metropolis for a rich and populous agricultural county.” During this period, the town’s

---

population grew at a slow gradual rate. There were 12,374 Lawrence residents in 1910, only 12,456 in 1920, and 13,726 in 1930.9

Early in the twentieth century, city leaders made some long overdue improvements in the urban infrastructure. Local publisher E.F. Caldwell boasted in 1898 that, “a complete system of water works has been put in, uniform street grades have been established, a number of streets have been macadamized, a great mileage of curbing and guttering, and stone and brick sidewalks laid.”10 A major improvement in 1909 was the organization of the Lawrence Light and Railway Company to build an electric trolley system for Lawrence. Besides the main route from the Union Pacific depot in North Lawrence to the southern end of Massachusetts Street, there were branches on Indiana and Mississippi Streets to the University of Kansas. The streetcar system reached its maximum extent during the years from 1922 to 1927.11

Development of the area surrounding the proposed landmark
When the H. B. Ober House was constructed, this area of Massachusetts Street was an established residential district with contemporary infrastructure.

References

Photographs
Wallace, Victor. Historic photograph, c. 1925, 1509 Massachusetts Street, view from southeast.

---

9 “Historic Resources of Lawrence, Douglas County, Kansas,” National Register Multiple Property Document, E-21
10 E.F. Caldwell, Souvenir History (1898, n.p.
Dear Ms. Zollner,

I am the owner of the property located at 1521 Vermont Street and am very much opposed to designating this property as a “Historic Place”. It is a handsome home with inherent value that has induced the property owner to maintain it. However, it is by no means so special that it could not be recreated if one had the inclination to do so. And certainly to the extent of the negative impact that the historic designation will have on no less than 20 adjacent properties that will be burdened with an additional set of regulation(s) and their cost forevermore. For the property owner at 1509 Massachusetts St. to enjoy the benefits of this designation to the detriment of his/her neighbors without compensation is wrong and inherently against our rights as property owners.

William D. Jager
1521 Vermont St.
Lawrence, KS
A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00065 1028 Connecticut Street; Demolition Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness. The structure is located in the environs of the Pawham House (1028 Rhode Island Street), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Peter Shenouda on behalf of Victor Milad Shenouda Trust, property owner of record.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The property owner is requesting approval for the demolition of the accessory structure located at 1028 Connecticut Street. There are no plans for a replacement structure.

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Chapter 22 of the Code of the City of Lawrence (Certificate of Appropriateness)

(A) An application for a certificate of appropriateness shall be evaluated on a sliding scale, depending upon the designation of the building, structure, site or object in question. The certificate shall be evaluated on the following criteria:

1. Most careful scrutiny and consideration shall be given to applications for designated landmarks;

2. Slightly less scrutiny shall be applied to properties designated as key contributory within an historic district;
3. Properties designated contributory or non-contributory within an historic district shall receive a decreasing scale of evaluation upon application;

4. The least stringent evaluation is applied to noncontributory properties and the environs area of a landmark or historic district. There shall be a presumption that a certificate of appropriateness shall be approved in this category unless the proposed construction or demolition would significantly encroach on, damage, or destroy the landmark or historic district. If the Commission denies a certificate of appropriateness in this category, and the owner(s) appeals to the City Commission, the burden to affirm the denial shall be upon the commission, the City or other interested persons.

(B) In considering an application for a certificate of appropriateness, the Commission shall be guided by the following general standards in addition to any design criteria in this Chapter and in the ordinance designating the landmark or historic district:

1. Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property that requires minimal alteration of the building, structure, site or object and its environment, or to use a property for its originally intended purpose;

2. The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural feature should be avoided when possible;

3. All buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and that seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged;

4. Changes that may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure, or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected;

5. Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize a building, structure or site shall be treated with sensitivity;

6. Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather then replaced, whenever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new materials should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplication of features, substantiated by historic, physical, or pictorial evidence, rather than on conceptual designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures;

7. The surface cleaning of structures shall be undertaken with the gentlest means
possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building material shall not be undertaken;

8. Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archaeological resources affected by, or adjacent to, and project;

9. Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alteration and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural, or cultural material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, or environs.

Environs Definition for the Parnham House

The environs for 1028 Rhode Island Street, the Parnham House, were divided into two areas and 1028 Connecticut Street is located in Area 1.

The following standards apply to Area 1:

Area 1: Maintaining the existing structures and visual appearance of the environs is the primary
focus of review. Main structure demolitions would be approved only if documentation was provided that indicated that the structure was unsound and/or a certificate of economic hardship was approved.

The proposed alteration or construction should meet the intent of the Criteria set forth in 22-505. Design elements that are important are scale, massing, site placement, height, directional expression, percentage of building coverage to site, setback, roof shapes, rhythm of openings and sense of entry. Maintaining views to the listed property and maintaining the rhythm and pattern in the environs are the primary focus of review.

Minor projects will be approved administratively by the Historic Resources Administrator. The proposed alteration or construction should meet the intent of the Criteria set forth in 22-505.

Major projects (demolition of main structures, new infill construction, significant additions, etc.) will be reviewed by the Historic Resources Commission. The proposed alteration or construction should meet the intent of the Criteria set forth in 22-505.

D. STAFF ANALYSIS

The existing accessory structure located at 1028 Connecticut Street is a Dutch-gabled roof, 1 story structure. The existing wood frame structure is clad with wood siding and seamed metal roof. It appears that originally the structure had a stone foundation. Currently, the structure shows visible foundation failures where daylight is visible between the structure and the ground. The stone foundation has crumbled in visible locations. The structure has a pedestrian access door that faces the primary structure (west elevation) and a pedestrian access door that faces the alley. The alley door is currently boarded up (east elevation). The north and south elevations have two window openings, which are boarded. There is an additional accessory structure on the northwest corner of the parcel which is of similar size that is used as a garage and is in better condition than the one proposed for demolition.

The subject property is located in the far eastern portion of the environs and there is no direct line of sight to the listed property located at 1028 Rhode Island Street (Parnham House). The shed itself is not located in the environs. Aerial photos show an accessory structure was constructed at this location on the parcel sometime between 1976 and 1986. Sanborn maps show there was an accessory structure located close to the the center of the lot as early as 1918. The location of the existing accessory structure is located close to the south property line.
The current project is a request to demolish the existing accessory structure and no replacement structure is proposed at this time.

Demolition of historic structures is rarely positive for a neighborhood because it destroys the relationships between the structures, landscape features, and open space, and as a result the overall character of the area is diminished. When possible, staff prefers rehabilitation to retain structures and their relationship to the patterns within the district. If demolition is approved, it removes the opportunity for a future owner to rehabilitate the existing structure.

The accessory structure located at 1028 Connecticut Street is a structure type that is disappearing in the East Lawrence neighborhood. This accessory structure also has a roof form that is rapidly disappearing from the area.

The poor condition of this structure can be attributed to the neglected maintenance and care of the structure. The decline of the structure has been ongoing for some time. Staff is of the opinion the poor condition of this structure is primarily the result of the failure of owners to properly care for the structure.

The definition of demolition by neglect described by the National Trust for Historic Preservation is the “process of allowing a building to deteriorate to the point where demolition is necessary to protect public health and safety.” It is staff’s opinion that the existing accessory structure located at 1028 Connecticut Street has deteriorated to the point that it meets this definition. It appears that few attempts have been undertaken to stabilize the structure.

While there is no detailed structural analysis or a detailed cost replacement analysis, the applicant has provided a description of the condition of the structure. Typically staff and the commission have requested a cost/replacement analysis. This analysis provides information to determine the extent of new material that would be required to rehabilitate the structure. A visual evaluation of the structure indicates that it may be a candidate for rehabilitation. However, the extensive rot, termite damage, foundation failure, and the separation of the structure portions of the building from the foundation would all have to be repaired and likely replaced. The metal roof is also failing and the infiltration of water has significantly added to the amount of structure that will need to be replaced. The failure of structural elements has also caused the building to tilt from center to the south. The amount of replacement material may create more of a copy of the original structure.

It is not typical that staff will recommend demolition of an accessory structure without a replacement structure. There has been a significant loss of small accessory structures in the historic areas of Lawrence. Each request for demolition should be reviewed on a case by case basis and the approval of demolition for one property does not support the demolition of other structures. Staff continues to be concerned about the loss of accessory structures within the historic areas of Lawrence. Historically, this structure contributed to the environs of the listed property. The size, scale, massing and placement of the structure continue to contribute to the environs of the listed property. However, the significant loss of integrity due to the overall condition of the structure is
significant.

The subject property has another accessory structure on the lot. This structure is placed toward the north property line and the gabled roof runs east to west. The building was constructed c. 1920. The existence of this structure may help to mitigate the loss of the subject structure in that it will help to continue the spacial relationships in the environs.

Staff is of the opinion that while the structure may be a candidate for rehabilitation, the resulting structure would likely be mostly new material. Although there is no replacement structure, the spacial relationships of this block of the environs will not be significantly damaged by the removal of the structure that is non-contributing due to the lack of integrity. If this structure were listed in any historic register, staff would evaluate the project more stringently. Because the structure is not listed and is only in the environs, staff is of the opinion that the demolition of the structure will not significantly encroach upon, damage, or destroy the environs of the listed property.

E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

In accordance with Chapter 22 of the Code of the City of Lawrence, the standard of evaluation, staff recommends the Commission approve the Certificate of Appropriateness and make the determination that the proposed project does not encroach upon, damage, or destroy the environs of the listed historic property.
DEMOLITION PERMIT APPLICATION

Date: 1/19/2017

Site Address: 1028 Connecticut

Legal Description: Connecticut 108

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the information on this application and on documents submitted in support of this application are accurate. I understand that any demolition performed that is inconsistent or in conflict with this application, the supporting documents, or the provisions of Chapter Y, Article 12 of the City of Lawrence Code, Demolition of Structures is a violation of the City Code. I also understand that no demolition work shall take place until a permit has been approved by the City. I further understand that the discovery that the building or structure contains friable asbestos or materials containing friable asbestos shall be cause for the immediate revocation of a demolition permit.

Applicant Signature: ___________________________ Date: 1/19/2017
Applicant Name (Print): Peter Shenouda
Email: peteshenouda@gmail.com

Property Owner Signature: ___________________________ Date: 1/19/2017
Property Owner Name (Print): Victor Milad Shenouda Trust
Email: victor1940@hotmail.com

Person, Firm, or Corporation responsible for the building, if is someone other than the owner:
Name (please print): Peter Shenouda
Address: 4100 Teal Drive, Lawrence, KS 66047
Email: peteshenouda@gmail.com Phone: 785-550-4148

Brief Description of Structure:
There are 2 garages on the property. The demo request is for the garage on the back south of the property.

Contractor Company Name: Peter Shenouda
Contact Name: Peter Shenouda
Address: 4100 Teal Drive, Lawrence, KS 66047
Email: peteshenouda@gmail.com Phone: 785-550-4148

There is a 30-day public comment period before any demolition work can begin. Expiration of the public comment period, along with verification from gas, electric, and water utility providers that services have been retired is necessary before a permit will be issued. This application must be signed by the record owner(s) and any contract purchaser(s).
PROPERTY CONDITION ASSESSMENT

1028 Connecticut
Lawrence, KS 66046

Prepared by
Peter Shenouda
I Peter Shenouda did a “walk-through” condition study of the garage at 1028 Connecticut Street, Lawrence, KS 66046 on January 15, 2017.

The purpose of the Property Condition Assessment is to determine the general condition and reasonably predictable repairs or replacement of garage building components that may be required.

General Comments
The garage consists of wood frame structure and metal roofing with a deteriorating foundation. The dimension of the garage is 10 feet wide, 10 feet long and 12 feet high (highest point of the garage). The age of the garage is unknown and can’t be determined. The entire garage is in poor condition and would cost more to repair then purchase a pre-assembled storage shed from Home Depot. The foundation has deteriorated over the years. The structure does not maintain any degree of integrity. The lack of integrity may preclude it from being a character defining element for the environs. The structure is not cost effective to repair. The interior is in very poor condition and the exterior. The wood floor itself is either deteriorated or destroyed (see pictures). There is absolutely nothing in the structure that can be saved or fixed.
Plywood to cover the holes. Hole in the foundation.
Foundation issues.
Interior walls with holes throughout. Ceiling holes
No windows but plywood to cover the holes. Foundation and siding deteriorating.
Hole in the foundation and ceiling.
Foundation and siding in bad shape.
Beam not all the way from one side of garage to the other.

Floor inside garage
Another picture of floor inside garage.

Foundation sitting on nothing.
Inside picture view of the outside from just one side.

One corner of the garage is detached from the other end.
LAWRENCE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION
ITEM NO. 6: DR-17-00066
STAFF REPORT

A. SUMMARY
DR-17-00066  934 Connecticut Street; Demolition and New Construction; Certificate of Appropriateness. The parcel is located in the environs of the McFarland House (940 Rhode Island Street) and the William Watts House (946 Connecticut Street). Submitted by Linda Gwaltney, property owner of record.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The applicant is proposing the demolition and new construction of a single dwelling unit on an original townsite lot that is 50’ from north to south and 117’ from east to west. The proposal also includes a new garage structure to be located off of the alley in the southeast corner of the parcel. (A large accessory structure set just off the alley in the middle of the lot is identified by the County Appraiser’s Office as constructed in 2004. The structure shows on city aerials from 2006-2016. There are no permit files for this structure.)

The proposed new construction is of modern design and is set back from the west property line 20’. The north setback is 12’, the south setback is 5’ and the east setback (not including the proposed garage) is approximately 33’ allowing for the building to be 62’ from east to west and 32’ north to south. The foundation will be slab-on-grade with the main entrance facing Connecticut Street. The structure will be clad with vertical fiber cement with trim of the same material. The recessed portion of the west elevation for the primary entrance will have horizontal siding. All of the windows will be aluminum clad wood windows. The fenestration pattern for the structure is irregular although paired windows are the primary window pattern. The roof design of the structure is similar to a skillion and lean to roof form with the “lean to” portion of the roof running the full length of the structure. The roof design provides room for south facing clerestory windows into the living areas of the home. The top of the primary roof is approximately 20’ with the lower portion of this roof approximately 8.5’. The lean to roof is approximately 14’ in height with the lower edge 8.6’. Roofing will be asphalt shingles.
The new garage will be approximately 528 sf and will be 22' X 24” to accommodate two vehicles. It will be set back from the south property line 3’ and will be approximately 25’ from the north property line. It will be clad with same material as the house and will have a shed roof with the height at the top approximately 17’. The garage door will face north and a pedestrian door will face west. Other than the doors, no other fenestration is proposed. A driveway is proposed to cover the remainder of the 50’ lot to the north.

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Chapter 22 of the Code of the City of Lawrence (Certificate of Appropriateness)

(A) An application for a certificate of appropriateness shall be evaluated on a sliding scale, depending upon the designation of the building, structure, site or object in question. The certificate shall be evaluated on the following criteria:

1. Most careful scrutiny and consideration shall be given to applications for designated landmarks;

2. Slightly less scrutiny shall be applied to properties designated as key contributory within an historic district;

3. Properties designated contributory or non-contributory within an historic district shall receive a decreasing scale of evaluation upon application;

4. The least stringent evaluation is applied to noncontributory properties and the environs area of a landmark or historic district. There shall be a presumption that a certificate of appropriateness shall be approved in this category unless the proposed construction or demolition would significantly encroach on, damage, or destroy the landmark or historic district. If the Commission denies a certificate of appropriateness in this category, and the owner(s) appeals to the City Commission, the burden to affirm the denial shall be upon the commission, the City or other interested persons.

(B) In considering an application for a certificate of appropriateness, the Commission shall be guided by the following general standards in addition to any design criteria in this Chapter and in the ordinance designating the landmark or historic district:

1. Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property that requires minimal alteration of the building, structure, site or object and its environment, or to use a property for its originally intended purpose;

2. The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural feature should be avoided when possible;

3. All buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and that seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged;
4. Changes that may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure, or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected;

5. Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize a building, structure or site shall be treated with sensitivity;

6. Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, whenever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new materials should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplication of features, substantiated by historic, physical, or pictorial evidence, rather than on conceptual designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures;

7. The surface cleaning of structures shall be undertaken with the gentlest means possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building material shall not be undertaken;

8. Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archaeological resources affected by, or adjacent to, and project;

9. Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alteration and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural, or cultural material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, or environs.

**Environ**

**McFarland House (940 Rhode Island Street)**

There was no process for environs definitions when the McFarland House was listed in the Lawrence Register of Historic Places. The 250’ environs associated with the McFarland House identified by Chapter 22 includes 934 Connecticut Street and should be reviewed as described in 22-505(B) and 22-506.
William Watts House (946 Connecticut Street)
The Environs for the 946 Connecticut Street, the William Watts House, should be reviewed in the following manner. The Environs should be reviewed as one area and the following standards applied to the area:

Area 1: Maintaining the existing structures and visual appearance of the environs is the primary focus of review. Main structure demolitions would be approved only if documentation was provided that indicated that the structure was unsound and/or a certificate of economic hardship was approved.

Minor projects (minor additions, porch remodeling, window and door changes, demolition of outbuildings, etc.) will be approved administratively by the Historic Resources Administrator. All design elements are important. The proposed alteration or construction should meet the intent of the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and the Criteria set forth in 22-505.
Major projects (major additions, new infill construction, major alterations, etc.,) would be reviewed by the Historic Resources Commission. All design elements are important. The proposed alteration or construction should meet the intent of the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and the Criteria set forth in 22-505.

D. STAFF ANALYSIS

On the 1873 Beers Atlas a structure is shown on Lot 86 of Connecticut Street in the Original Townsite. The lot is 50’ wide and 117’ deep. The structure is similar in size and location to the original portion of the historic structure. The 1880 Bird's Eye View of Lawrence also shows a residential structure on the lot similar in size to the original historic shape of the existing structure. Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps show the structure in 1887 with the wing addition and this shape is shown on the 1905, 1912, and 1918. On the 1927 map, the front porches have been joined together.
While the quality of the early airels is grainy, it appears that this house was in this location in 1937 and shows on the current cityairials. (Aerial for 2014 was chosen for better clarity.)

The information in the Kansas Historic Resources Survey database identifies the house as the Leberson House.

The current project is a request to demolish the existing structure and replace the structure with a modern residential structure. A new detached garage is also proposed as part of the project.

Environ review for a Certificate of Appropriateness begins with a presumption that a Certificate of Appropriateness will be approved unless the proposed construction or demolition would significantly encroach on, damage, or destroy the landmark or historic district. Significantly is not defined in the definition section of Chapter 22.
Demolition of historic structures is rarely positive for a neighborhood because it destroys the relationships between the structures, landscape features, and open space, and as a result the overall character of the area is diminished. When possible, staff prefers rehabilitation to retain structures and their relationship to the patterns within the environs. If demolition is approved, it removes the opportunity for a future owner to rehabilitate the existing structure.

The structure located at 934 Connecticut Street was likely constructed prior to 1900 and possibly prior to 1873. It is a vernacular form often identified as upright-and-wing or a National Folk form of Gable Front. *Living in East Lawrence* does not include this specific structure as a prototype, but the structure fits within vernacular architectural context styles identified in the document and is a form and style that were dominant in the area in the 19th and 20th century.

The poor condition of this structure can be attributed to the neglected maintenance and care of the structure. The decline of the structure has been ongoing for some time. Staff is of the opinion the poor condition of this structure is primarily the result of the failure of owners to properly care for the structure. The current owners purchased the property in 2017 and the deed was filed on 02/13/2017.

The definition of demolition by neglect described by the National Trust for Historic Preservation is the “process of allowing a building to deteriorate to the point where demolition is necessary to protect public health and safety.” It is staff’s opinion that the existing structure located at 934 Connecticut Street may have deteriorated to the point that it possibly meets this definition. It appears that few attempts have been undertaken to stabilize the structure. The 1995 reconnaissance survey of East Lawrence identifies the condition of the structure as poor and shows some of the alterations that still exist.

The applicant has submitted the structural analysis and a cost/replacement document. Staff is in agreement with the information of these documents. While the structure is in extremely poor condition, the demolition of the structure should be weighed heavily in the review of this project. Because the likelihood of the construction date for at least a portion of the structure located at 934 Connecticut Street is pre-1873, and because it appears the wing addition is c. 1897, staff is of the opinion that additional documentation of the structure should be done prior to the decision on demolition. It should also be noted that if these construction dates are correct for the existing house, the house has always been a part of the context of the listed property at 946 Connecticut Street that was constructed c. 1886.

Staff inspected the exterior of the structure but not the structural systems of the structure. Based on the visual inspection, staff is of the opinion the structure has structural failure. However, the opportunity for rehabilitation may be possible depending on additional review and documentation. Unlike the demolition of accessory structures, this primary structure demolition may damage the environs of the listed property. Staff rarely recommends demolition of primary structures. Historically, this structure contributed to the environs of the listed property. The scale, massing, site placement, height, directional expression, percentage of building coverage to site, setback, roof shapes, rhythm of openings, and sense of entry of the structure continue to contribute to the environs of the listed property. However, the deterioration of the structure
as well as the alterations of the structure reduces the integrity of the structure.

The environs definition for the William Watts House (946 Connecticut Street) gives additional guidance for the review of projects. Maintaining the existing structures and visual appearance of the environs is the primary focus of environs review for this listed property. Main structure demolitions should only be approved if documentation is provided that indicates that the structure is unsound and/or a certificate of economic hardship is approved. (There is no environs definition for the McFarland House located at 940 Rhode Island Street.) There is no line of sight to the McFarland House. While the Watts House is very significant to the environs of the proposed project, the line of sight is obscured because the buildings are on the same side of the street. The buildings are approximately 116’ apart.

New Construction

The proposed new construction should be reviewed for scale, massing, site placement, height, directional expression, percentage of building coverage to site, setback, roof shapes, rhythm of openings, and sense of entry.

The proposed project is compatible with the environs of the listed property in regards to scale, massing, directional expression, percentage of building coverage to site, and sense of entry.

While the overall proposed site placement and setbacks are within the range of setbacks and site placement in the area, an important characteristic of the environs of the listed property is the pattern created by the area of front yard, structure, rear yard, and accessory structures located adjacent to the alley or at the rear of the lot. The proposed project respects some of these patterns specifically the detached garage adjacent to the alley. However, the space between the east elevation of the primary structure to the west elevation of the garage is only 8’. The length of the primary structure and the size of the garage and drive reduce the rear yard space to approximately 300 square feet. This area is between the drive and the house north to the property line. In addition to this rear yard green space, there will be a strip of green space to the north of the structure 13’ wide. While this new form of significantly reduced green yard space is becoming more popular in East Lawrence, it is not the historic pattern of the area. If the proposed new structure utilized the exception for front yard setbacks as provided in the Land Development Code (20-602(e)(1)(i)), the front yard setback could be approximately 9’ which would move the structure 11’ feet to the west. This would create a rear yard space of 950 square feet (19’ X 25’). This will significantly change the size of the rear yard and will create a rear yard space that maintains the spacial relationships of the environs of the listed property.

The size of the proposed detached garage is typical for modern garage structures in historic areas. As mentioned above, it is also adjacent to the alley which is the historic location of accessory structures. The materials used on the garage are compatible with the materials in the environs. Most accessory structures have horizontal lap siding, but some examples of vertical siding existed historically in the area but the angle and extended overhang were less than on the proposed structure.
The proposed materials for the project are compatible with the environs for new construction. Asphalt shingles and aluminum clad windows are appropriate for the environs. If the fiber cement siding is of the smooth variety, it may also be compatible. The vertical use of the siding on the primary structure is atypical for the area. Most of the structures in the environs have horizontal lap siding. In the environs of the listed property, vertical siding was primarily used on accessory structures. Historically, some primary structures had board and batten siding but it is unclear if this type of siding existed in the environs of the listed property. To achieve the greatest compatibility of this material, staff recommends the Architectural Review Committee review the final material and style choice.

The overall fenestration pattern for the primary structure is appropriate for the modern structure. The clerestory that faces south is an important character defining element of the new structure. Staff has only two concerns about windows: window size on the west elevation and the lack of a window on the northwest end of the north elevation. The use of taller windows on the primary elevation would help this main elevation be more compatible with the environs and would also help to create a more pedestrian scale for this elevation. The windows would not need to be full height windows but could be at least as tall as the south elevation windows and perhaps slightly taller to differentiate the primary elevation from the north and south elevation.

The absence of a window on the western end of the north elevation creates a blank wall when viewing the structure from the north. A blank wall in this location is not typical for structures in the environs and has been addressed in previous new construction in the area. While staff recognizes the size and placement of the proposed windows is due to the interior layout of the structure, possible adjustments to these two elements could significantly increase the compatibility of the structure to the environs of the listed property.

The proposed roof type for the primary structure does not currently exist and likely has never existed in the environs of the listed property. While the design of the roof makes possible the clerestory on the south, the form is not appropriate for the environs. The standards established in Chapter 22, specifically standard 9, states:

> Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alteration and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural, or cultural material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, or environs.

While the contemporary design of the roof should not be discouraged, the standard also states that the design should be compatible with the character of the environs. Alterations to the existing roof form could possibly help the element be more compatible with the environs. Staff is of the opinion that the applicant should work with the Architectural Review Committee to investigate possible design options that will alter the designed roof form while keeping the contemporary design of the roof.

Like the roof style for the proposed primary structure, the roof of the garage is atypical for
accessory structures in the area. Historically, shed roof structures existed in the area on accessory structures but the angle and extended overhang were less than on the proposed structure.

Staff is of the opinion that the proposed new construction may be compatible with the environs of the listed property if adjustments can be made: to the roof shape of the structures, alteration of the front yard setback to create a larger rear yard, window size and placement, and appropriate use of and type of siding material. However, staff is concerned about the demolition of the existing structure. As possibly a pre-1873 structure, very careful scrutiny should be used to determine if this demolition will damage the environs of the listed property.

E. **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends the Historic Resources Commission defer the proposed project to allow for additional documentation on the existing structure and for the applicant to work with the Architectural Review Committee on:

1. Setbacks
2. Roof shape for primary and accessory structures
3. Fenestration for the northwest area of the north elevation
4. Window sizes for the west elevation
5. Final siding form/type
DEMOlITION PERMIT APPLICATION

Date:  Feb 13, 2017

Site Address:  934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS

Legal Description:  86 on Connecticut St.

Block Lot Subdivision

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the information on this application and on documents submitted in support of this application are accurate. I understand that any demolition performed that is inconsistent or in conflict with this application, the supporting documents, or the provisions of Chapter V, Article 12 of the City of Lawrence Code, Demolition of Structures is a violation of the City Code. I also understand that no demolition work shall take place until a permit has been approved by the City. I further understand that the discovery that the building or structure contains friable asbestos or materials containing friable asbestos shall be cause for the immediate revocation of a demolition permit.

Applicant Signature:  Linda Gwaltney       Date:  2-13-17
Applicant Name (Print):  Linda Gwaltney       Phone:  785-554-6438
Email:  lgwaltney@yahoo.com

Property Owner Signature:  Linda Gwaltney       Date:  2-13-17
Property Owner Name (Print):  Linda Gwaltney       Phone:  785-554-6438
Email:  lgwaltney@yahoo.com

Person, Firm, or Corporation responsible for the building, if is someone other than the owner:
Name (please print):  N/A
Address:  
Email:  

Brief Description of Structure:
Two-story single family home

Contractor Company Name:  Glen Bowman / Terry Pentacost Gen. Contacte
Contact Name:  Glen Bowman (demolition)
Address:  
Email:  Phone: 785-841-6767
785-423-0852

There is a 30-day public comment period before any demolition work can begin. Expiration of the public comment period, along with verification from gas, electric, and water utility providers that services have been retired is necessary before a permit will be issued. This application must be signed by the record owner(s) and any contract purchaser(s).
# 934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
## Cost to fix existing structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation (north, west, east)</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace front porch (no stairs)</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace siding (entire house)</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat for mold (inside and out)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gut house to studs</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-wire entire house</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-plumb entire house:</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace missing windows</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix floor joists and framing</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install new heating unit</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attach downstairs bedroom to house</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove brick stove surround</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodel kitchen (including appliances)</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurnish all floors</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-roof</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remode 2 bathrooms</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodel pantry</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair damage to walls (sheetrock, paint)</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace door in stairwell</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace insulation</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$154,100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
Rough floor plan

First floor
- Bedroom
- Pantry
- Kitchen
- Livingroom
- Deck
- Porch
- Back entry
- Side entry
- Stairs

Second floor
- Bedroom
- Livingroom
- Kitchen
- Bathroom
- Porch
- Stairs
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
Front of house (west side)

House front (West), camera view facing east.

House front (West) Porch.
- Room on left detaching from house.
- Brick foundation under room on left deteriorated.
- Mold on siding on room on right.
- Porch broken rails.
- Rotted and bent floor boards.
- Stair that is not usable.
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
North side of house

- Foundation leaning.
- Mold on siding.
- Siding not in alignment.
- Wiring not up to code.
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
Back of house (east side)

- Mix of siding.
- Electrical upgrade needed.
- Broken, rotting eaves.
- Windows with different treatments, some worn and rotting.
- Bad foundation.
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
South side of house

- Foundation not level.
- Siding missing.
- Structure rotting.
- Holes in walls.
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
First Floor Livingroom

Facing west (top left), north (middle left), east (bottom left), south (bottom right).

• Springy floor (bad joists)
• Holes in wall.
• Heating unit not installed.
• Windows missing.
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
First Floor Bedroom

- Hole in walls.
- Mold on walls.
- Floor separating from structure.
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
First Floor Kitchen

- Stove, sink, cabinets have been removed.
- Sliding door not level.
- Mold on wall.
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
First Floor Kitchen Back Entry

- Floor caved in.
- Knob and tube wiring.
- Water damage on ceiling.
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
First Floor Bathroom

- Toilet missing.
- Water heater possibly damaged.
- Soft floor.
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
First Floor Pantry

- Hole in floor to crawl space.
- Floor compromised.
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
Stairs between floors

- Exposed wiring.
- Exposed lathing.
- Rotting door to exterior.
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
Second Floor Livingroom

- Insulation needs replacing.
- Floors need to be refinished.
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
Second Floor Bedroom

- Floors in need of repair.
- Windows missing.
- Mold in walls.
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
Second Floor Kitchen

- Remove gas/water lines.
- Convert to closet or second bedroom.
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
Second Floor Bathroom

- Remodel Bathroom.
### Cost to replace existing structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolish existing structure</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawlspace</td>
<td>$23,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build new home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online estimate = $130,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for 1,582 SF. $82.17/SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 SF x $82.17/SF</td>
<td>$82,174.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits, fees, architecture drawings, etc.</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                              | **$119,174.46**
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
Cost to Replace, estimate
From Concepthome.com, Plan: CH92

2 story
3 bedroom
2 bath
Approximately 1,000 SF

2 story
3 bedroom
2 bath
Approximately 1,500 SF
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
Cost to Replace, estimate
CURRENT STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Estimated Width</th>
<th>Estimated SQFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First floor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living room</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den/Bedroom</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back porch</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second floor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom/kitchen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
934 Connecticut, Lawrence KS
Cost to Replace, estimate
From Concepthome.com, Plan: CH92

First floor

Second floor

Floor area: 1582 sq ft
Building area: 1141 sq ft
Bedrooms: 3
Bathrooms: 2
Floors: 2
Height: 23’ 4”
Width: 33’ 6”
Depth: 45’ 5”
Cost to Build: from $ 130 000
**DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION**

**PROPERTY INFORMATION**
- Address of Property: 934 Connecticut Street, Lawrence, Kansas 66044
- Legal Description (may be attached): Connecticut Street Lot 80, City of Lawrence, Douglas County, Kansas

**OWNER INFORMATION**
- Name(s): Paula Schumacher and Linda Gwaltney
- Contact: Paula Schumacher
- Address: 210 4th Parker Avenue
- City: Lawrence
- State: Kansas
- ZIP: 66044
- Phone: (____) __________ Fax: (____)
- E-mail: paulaschumacher@gmail.com
- Cell Phone: (785) 550-2109

**APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION**
- Contact: Stephen Lane
- Company: J. Stephen Lane Architect
- Address: 111 West 8th Street
- City: Lawrence
- State: Kansas
- ZIP: 66044
- Phone: (785) 842-1248
- Fax: (785) 842-1248
- E-mail: js@architectksbcglobal.net
- Cell Phone: (785) 760-6809

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed Land Use</th>
<th># of Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R5S</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total site area</th>
<th>Existing Building Footprint</th>
<th>Proposed Building Footprint</th>
<th>Open Space Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5850 SF</td>
<td>1185 SF</td>
<td>2491 SF</td>
<td>3359 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Pavement Coverage</th>
<th>Proposed Pavement Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>750 SF</td>
<td>600 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you also submitting any of the following applications?
- Building Permit
- Site Plan
- Special Use Permit
- Variance
- State or Federal Tax Credit Application
- Zoning Change
- Other (specify)
Detailed Description of Proposed Project:
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

1. Remove existing deteriorated and unsafe residential structure.
2. Construct new single-story, three-bedroom residential structure with detached two-car garage.

Reason for Request:
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

Paula Schumacher and Linda Gwaltney, the property owners, desire to construct a new single-story, three-bedroom residence with a detached two-car garage. Their new energy-efficient home will be built with high-quality, durable materials, and will be an asset to the East Lawrence Neighborhood. It will replace the existing unsafe structure currently located on the property.
Architect/Engineer/Contractor Information: Please provide name and phone number of any persons associated with the project.

Contact: Terry Pentecost
Company: Terry Pentecost Construction
Address: 2907 Gill Avenue
City: Lawrence State: Kansas ZIP: 66047
Phone: Fax: ( )
E-mail: Cell: (785) 865 - 8459

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS:

☐ Photographs of existing structure and site
☐ Scaled or dimensioned site plan with a graphic/bar scale
☐ Scaled elevation drawings with a graphic/bar scale
☐ Scaled or dimensioned floor plans with a graphic/bar scale
☐ Materials list
☐ Digital copy of application materials

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION MAY BE REQUIRED BASED ON THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

SIGNATURE

I/We, the undersigned am/are the (owner(s)), (duly authorized agent), (Circle One) of the aforementioned property. By execution of my/our signature, I/we do hereby officially apply for design review approval as indicated above.

Signature(s): __________________________ Date: 3-6-17

Date: __________________________

Date: __________________________

Note: If signing by agent submit Owner Authorization Form
OWNER AUTHORIZATION

I/WE Linda Gwaltney AND Paula Schumacher, hereby referred to as the "Undersigned", being of lawful age, do hereby on this ___ day of March, 2017, make the following statements to wit:

1. I/We the Undersigned, on the date first above written, am/are the lawful owner(s) in fee simple absolute of the following described real property:

   934 Connecticut: Lot 86, Lawrence KS

   See "Exhibit A, Legal Description" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

2. I/We the undersigned, have previously authorized and hereby authorize [Signature] (Herein referred to as "Applicant"), to act on my/our behalf for the purpose of making application with the Planning Office of Lawrence/Douglas County, Kansas, regarding 934 Connecticut (Lot 86) Lawrence KS (common address), the subject property, or portion thereof. Such authorization includes, but is not limited to, all acts or things whatsoever necessarily required of Applicant in the application process.

3. It is understood that in the event the Undersigned is a corporation or partnership then the individual whose signature appears below for and on behalf of the corporation or partnership has in fact the authority to so bind the corporation or partnership to the terms and statements contained within this instrument.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I, the Undersigned, have set my hand and seal below.

[Signature] [Signature]
Owner Owner

STATE OF KANSAS
COUNTY OF DOUGLAS

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on this ___ day of March, 2017 by [Signature]

My Commission Expires: 6/19/2017

Notary Public

Owner Authorization Form
12/2009
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Design Review Application
MATERIALS LIST

= Single-story, wood-frame house on an insulated concrete floor slab and footings with a detached two-car wood-frame garage on concrete floor slab and footings.

= HardiePanel vertical exterior siding, Both structures will have painted fiber-cement siding and trim materials by James Hardie Building Products, or equivalent. Please see attached architectural drawings.

= All exterior windows and entry doors on the house structure will be aluminum-clad, wood-frame, insulated glass units by Pella Corporation, or equivalent. Entry and overhead doors on the garage structure will be insulated steel units.

= All roofing materials on both structures will be Architectural Grade, asphalt-composition shingles by Owens-Corning, Tamko, or equivalent.
Examples of **SLAB HOMES** around 923 Connecticut, Lawrence KS

830 Connecticut

832, 834 Connecticut

829 Connecticut
Examples of **SLAB HOMES** around 923 Connecticut, Lawrence KS

1005 Connecticut

923 Connecticut

300 11th Street
Examples of **SLAB HOMES** around 923 Connecticut, Lawrence KS

1023 New York

1022 New York

1041 New York
Examples of CONTEMPORARY HOMES around 923 Connecticut, Lawrence KS

745 Connecticut

737 Connecticut

743 New York
Examples of **CONTEMPORARY HOMES** around 923 Connecticut, Lawrence KS

1301 New York

1304 New York

1324 New York
Examples of **CONTEMPORARY HOMES** around 923 Connecticut, Lawrence KS

1245 New Jersey

824 New Jersey

813 New Jersey
Examples of **CONTEMPORARY HOMES** around 923 Connecticut, Lawrence KS

904 Pennsylvania

933 Pennsylvania

12th & Pennsylvania
Examples of **CONTEMPORARY HOMES** around 923 Connecticut, Lawrence KS

13\textsuperscript{th} & Pennsylvania

1218 Pennsylvania

1001 Delaware
Examples of CONTEMPORARY HOMES around 923 Connecticut, Lawrence KS

929 Delaware?

927 Delaware
March 6, 2017

Historic Resources Commission
Lawrence, KS 66044

Dear HRC,

We have purchased 934 Connecticut. We would like to demolish the existing structure and build a new one-story house and garage on the lot.

Enclosed are:

- Demolition permit
- HRC application
- Photographs of the current structure
  - Cost to fix the structure
  - Cost to replace the current structure
  - Examples of slab and modern homes in the area
- Site plan for the new house
- Elevation drawings for the new house
- Dimensioned floor plans for the new house
- Materials list
- A thumb drive with all the printed materials in PDF files.

We ask that you immediately approve our demolition permit. The current structure is unsafe (mold inside and out, crumbling foundation on three sides, unsafe electrical, etc.). Also, we have been contacted by the Lawrence Fire Department for permission to use the structure for training before it is torn down. We have agreed to their request pending demolition approval. We would like to optimize their training time by letting them use the facility as soon as we know it can be demolished.

Our builder is Terry Pentecost (license: 22827).
Our architect is J. Stephen Lane (license: 3558).

Regarding the approval of our house plans:

- We have designed a single story three-bedroom house that will allow us to live in the house as we advance in age. When we move on, the house will be suitable for a family of any composition (old, young, etc.).

- We’ve spoken with neighbors. Their feeling is that any improvement will be welcome. According to them, the previous owner didn’t take care of the house at all, and he ran drugs and “and worse” out of the house. We did not find any positive sentiments from the neighbors for the current structure. We are looking forward to taking this blighted house with a bad history and turning it into a happy story.
We realize our design is contemporary and on a slab. We have included examples of homes in the neighborhood that are contemporary and/or slab construction. We feel our design fits in well with the overall East Lawrence vibe and is a definite improvement on the current structure.

We really want to build our home as designed. We feel it fits in with the neighborhood. We realize, though, that the HRC has a responsibility to the neighborhood and city that may come from a different point of view. Because of this, we are including two draft ideas for adding a porch to the front of our home. For us, a porch is an added expense and not something useful. We are willing to add one, if needed, to compromise and fit the higher needs of the neighborhood.

We do ask that you allow us to keep our roofline, as it is a major source of natural light into the house. Changing the roof line would require us to redesign much of the interior.

We appreciate the work of the HRC to keep Lawrence neighborhoods desirable places to live. We look forward to moving from our current home (2104 Barker) to 934 Connecticut.

Sincerely,

Linda Gwaltney & Paula Schumacher
2104 Barker Ave
Lawrence KS 66046
A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00069  639 Mississippi Street; New Addition; Certificate of Appropriateness. The parcel is located in the environs of the Wilder-Clark House (643 Indiana Street). Submitted by Adams Architects, LLC on behalf of Travis & Melissa Narum, property owners of record.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant is requesting to add an addition on the west elevation the primary structure located at 639 Mississippi Street and to alter the existing garage to allow for two car parking.

The new addition will be approximately 21’ X 32’ and will be 770 square feet. Materials for the addition include: smooth fiber cement lap siding with 4½” exposure to match the wood lap siding of the existing structure; and wood windows of various sizes and placement to match the existing structure including the surround profile. The roof on the addition will be a cross gable with asphalt shingles. The new addition will contain part of a new/remodeled kitchen, a mud room, office, family room and bathroom on the first floor. The second floor of the addition will contain a full master suite. The new addition will have a basement living space, a bathroom and a storage area.

The primary alteration to the garage will be the removal of the alley wall to allow for a new garage door. This exterior alteration will allow for the use of the existing workshop as a garage for parking.
C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Chapter 22 of the Code of the City of Lawrence (Certificate of Appropriateness)

(A) An application for a certificate of appropriateness shall be evaluated on a sliding scale, depending upon the designation of the building, structure, site or object in question. The certificate shall be evaluated on the following criteria:

1. Most careful scrutiny and consideration shall be given to applications for designated landmarks;

2. Slightly less scrutiny shall be applied to properties designated as key contributory within an historic district;

3. Properties designated contributory or non-contributory within an historic district shall receive a decreasing scale of evaluation upon application;

4. The least stringent evaluation is applied to noncontributory properties and the environs area of a landmark or historic district. There shall be a presumption that a certificate of appropriateness shall be approved in this category unless the proposed construction or demolition would significantly encroach on, damage, or destroy the landmark or historic district. If the Commission denies a certificate of appropriateness in this category, and the owner(s) appeals to the City Commission, the burden to affirm the denial shall be upon the commission, the City or other interested persons.

(B) In considering an application for a certificate of appropriateness, the Commission shall be guided by the following general standards in addition to any design criteria in this Chapter and in the ordinance designating the landmark or historic district:

1. Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property that requires minimal alteration of the building, structure, site or object and its environment, or to use a property for its originally intended purpose;

2. The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural feature should be avoided when possible;

3. All buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and that seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged;

4. Changes that may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure, or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected;
5. Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize a building, structure or site shall be treated with sensitivity;

6. Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, whenever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new materials should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplication of features, substantiated by historic, physical, or pictorial evidence, rather than on conceptual designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures;

7. The surface cleaning of structures shall be undertaken with the gentlest means possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building material shall not be undertaken;

8. Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archaeological resources affected by, or adjacent to, and project;

9. Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alteration and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural, or cultural material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, or environs.

The Environ for 643 Indiana Street, the Wilder-Clark House, should be reviewed in the following manner.

Maintaining the existing structures and visual appearance of the environs is the primary focus of review. Main structure demolitions would be approved only if documentation was provided that indicated that the structure was unsound and/or a certificate of economic hardship was approved.

Minor projects (minor additions, porch remodeling, window and door changes, demolition of outbuildings, etc.) will be approved administratively by the Historic Resources Administrator if the project meets the intent of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the Criteria set forth in 22-505, 22-506, and 22-506.1. All design elements are important.

Major projects (major additions, new infill construction, major alterations, roof changes, etc.) will be reviewed by the Historic Resources Commission. All design elements are important. The proposed alteration or construction should meet the intent of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the Criteria set forth in 22-505, 22-506, and 22-506.1.
D. STAFF ANALYSIS

Environ review for a Certificate of Appropriateness begins with a presumption that a Certificate of Appropriateness will be approved unless the proposed construction or demolition would significantly encroach on, damage, or destroy the landmark or historic district.

In addition to review by 22-505, the proposed new construction should be reviewed using the design criteria in 22-506 and 22-506.1. These design criteria help to promote the standards set forth in 22-505. Specifically, 22-506(c)(2) provides review criteria for new construction. Identified criteria for new construction includes but is not limited to building scale, height, orientation, site coverage, spatial separation from other buildings, facade and window patterns, entrance and porch size and general design, materials, textures, color, architectural details, roof forms, emphasis on horizontal or vertical elements, walls, fences, landscaping, and other features deemed appropriate by the Commission.

The proposed project is located in the environs of the Wilder-Clark House. The new addition will not be visible from the listed property or the primary views from the public right of way. Both the subject property and the listed property are on the west side of Mississippi Street and Indiana Street, respectively, and face east.

The identification of key features, including architectural elements and setting, are the beginning bases for project review. Careful consideration of the context and the reasons for the significance of the property should be included in the overall determination of character-defining elements. Character-defining elements include the overall shapes of buildings, materials, craftsmanship,
decorative details, and spacial relationships of the environs.

Standard 9 applies to this project.

The placement of the addition is appropriate for an addition in the environs of a listed property. The proposed materials, overall scale, and shape of the addition are also appropriate for the environs. The removal of the porch and the use of a new porch area to separate the existing structure from the new construction differentiates the existing from the new.

The Douglas County Appraiser’s Office lists the existing footprint of the structure without the wrap-around porch as 936 square feet. The proposed addition is 770 square feet which is over 80% of the size of the existing structure. The size of the addition is large for the house. The size and design of the addition creates an addition with a mirror element that is wider east to west than the historic portion of the structure. The roof on this portion of the addition is also taller than the peak of the roof on the existing house. The addition also covers a large portion of the rear yard space. The loss of this space does somewhat alter the character-defining rear yard space for the environs, but the large side yard somewhat mitigates the affect. The design of the addition does, however, retain a significant portion of the historic materials of the structure.

While the size of the addition is large for the existing structure, the property is not listed in any register. This is an environs review only. The loss of the character-defining rear yard is a concern for staff, but the location of the property in the outer portion of the environs and the large side yard help to reduce the amount of possible encroachment on the environs of the listed property.

The existing accessory structure was constructed in 2007. At the time of construction, a significant portion of the garage was to be used as a workshop area. This project includes the conversion of the workshop area into additional parking. This alteration will have no effect on the environs.

Staff is of the opinion that the project will not significantly encroach on, damage, or destroy the landmark or its environs based on the standards in Chapter 22. However, it should be noted that the size of the addition and lack of a true inset or hyphen for the addition might not be appropriate if the property were listed.

E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

In accordance with Chapter 22 of the Code of the City of Lawrence, the standards of evaluation, staff recommends the Commission find that the proposed project will not significantly encroach on, damage, or destroy the landmark or its environs and issue the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed project.

Additional Recommendation
Staff also recommends the commission direct staff to review any minor alterations to the project that meet the applicable standards and guidelines administratively. Any other revisions or modifications to the project should be forwarded to the Historic Resources Commission for review.
# City of Lawrence Douglas County

**Planning & Development Services**

6 East 6th St.
P.O. Box 708
Lawrence, KS 66044

[Website: www.lawrenceks.org/pds]

**Contact Information**

**Phone:** 785-832-3150  
**Tdd:** 785-832-3205  
**Fax:** 785-832-3160

---

## DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

### PROPERTY INFORMATION

- **Address of Property:** 639 Mississippi St.
- **Legal Description:** Mississippi Street Lots 161 & 163

### OWNER INFORMATION

- **Name(s):** Travis Narum & Melissa Narum
- **Contact:** Travis Narum
- **Address:** 639 Mississippi St.
- **City:** Lawrence  
  **State:** KS  
  **ZIP:** 66044
- **Phone:** 785-560-3388  
  **Cell Phone:** (___)
- **E-mail:** tnarum@tradewindenergy.com

### APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION

- **Contact:** Lance Adams
- **Company:** Adams Architects, LLC
- **Address:** 700 Massachusetts St. Suite 202
- **City:** Lawrence  
  **State:** KS  
  **ZIP:** 66044
- **Phone:** 785-218-3980  
  **Fax:** (___)
- **E-mail:** lance.adams@adamsarchs.com

### Table Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed Land Use</th>
<th># of Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS 5</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total site area:** 2.69 Acres
- **Existing Building Footprint:** 940-H 996-G 117-S
- **Proposed Building Footprint:** 1,710-H 996-G 127-S
- **Open Space Area:** 8,867 SF

### Pavement Coverage

- **Existing Pavement Coverage:** NA
- **Proposed Pavement Coverage:** NA

### Are you also submitting any of the following applications?

- Building Permit: X
- Site Plan
- Special Use Permit
- Zoning Change
- Variance
- State or Federal Tax Credit Application
- Other (specify)

---

Application Form  
06/2016  
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Design Review Application
Property
Address: 639 Mississippi

Detailed Description of Proposed Project:
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

The project consists of the remodel of the existing kitchen area and an addition with a footprint of 770 sq. ft. The addition will consist of a family room and master suite with supporting spaces. The existing garage will be remodeled to support parking for two cars.

Reason for Request:
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

The front portion of the property is located in the historic environs of the Wilder-Clark House.
Architect/Engineer/Contractor Information: Please provide name and phone number of any persons associated with the project.
Contact: Lance Adams
Company: Adams Architects, LLC
Address: 700 Massachusetts St. Suite 202
City: Lawrence
State: KS
ZIP: 66044
Phone: (785) 219-3980
Fax: (___)
E-mail: lance.adams@adamsarchs.com
Cell: (___)

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS:
☐ Photographs of existing structure and site
☐ Scaled or dimensioned site plan with a graphic/bar scale
☐ Scaled elevation drawings with a graphic/bar scale
☐ Scaled or dimensioned floor plans with a graphic/bar scale
☐ Materials list
☐ Digital copy of application materials

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION MAY BE REQUIRED BASED ON THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

SIGNATURE
I/We, the undersigned am/are the (owner(s)), (duly authorized agent), (Circle One) of the aforementioned property. By execution of my/our signature, I/we do hereby officially apply for design review approval as indicated above.

Signature(s): ___________________________ Date: 2/18/17

_______________________________ Date: 2/13/2017

Note: If signing by agent submit Owner Authorization Form
GARAGE - DEVELOPMENT 3.3

GARAGE - LOFT 3.3
GENERAL ELEVATION NOTES:

1. Existing smooth lap siding with 4 1/2" exposure
2. New wood windows to match existing frame material and surround profile.
3. New siding to be fiber cement with a smooth texture and 4 1/2" exposure.
4. Eave trim material and profile to match existing.
5. Corner trim material and profile to match existing.

NORTH ELEVATION - EXIST. B

NORTH ELEVATION - 4.2 A
GENERAL ELEVATION NOTES:

1. Existing smooth lap siding with 4 1/2" exposure
2. New wood windows to match existing frame material and surround profile.
3. New siding to be fiber cement with a smooth texture and 4 1/2" exposure.
4. Eave trim material and profile to match existing.
5. Corner trim material and profile to match existing.

WEST ELEVATION - EXIST.  B
1/8"=1'-0"  

WEST ELEVATION - 4.2  A
1/8"=1'-0"
GENERAL ELEVATION NOTES:

1. **Existing Smooth Lap Siding with 4 1/2" Exposure**
2. **New Wood Windows to Match Existing Frame Material and Surround Profile**
3. **New Siding to be Fiber Cement with a Smooth Texture and 4 1/2" Exposure**
4. **Eave Trim Material and Profile to Match Existing**
5. **Corner Trim Material and Profile to Match Existing**

SOUTH ELEVATION - EXIST.  B

SOUTH ELEVATION - 4.2  A
GENERAL ELEVATION NOTES:

1. Existing smooth lap siding with 4 1/2" exposure
2. New wood window to match existing frame material and surround profile.
3. New siding to be fiber cement with a smooth texture and 4 1/2" exposure.
4. Eave trim material and profile to match existing.
5. Corner trim material and profile to match existing.

EAST ELEVATION - EXIST. B

EAST ELEVATION - 4.2 A
A. SUMMARY
DR-17-00112  607 Louisiana Street; New Addition; State Law Review. The property is listed in the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing structure to the Old West Lawrence Historic District. Submitted by Adams Architects, LLC on behalf of Andrea Albright & Lance Adams, property owners of record.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The applicant is requesting to remove a rear closed in porch addition and add a new two story addition with a basement. The new addition will house a new kitchen and family area on the first floor and a master suite on the second floor. A bedroom suite will be located in the new basement of the addition. The addition will be recessed on the south but will basically be in plane with the north elevation. Interior alterations are also included in this review.
The addition will be approximately 27’ X 16’ with the new family dining area extending an additional 2’6” along the south side of the new addition. Materials for the addition include: smooth stucco; cedar planking; a complex roof with asphalt shingles; windows of various sizes and placement (some identified as wood); cedar shingles in the gable end; and cedar trim. No alterations are proposed for the primary façade.

The north elevation of the addition will be two stories with the only fenestration a pair of six light stationary windows on both the first and second floor. A portion of the basement will also be visible on this elevation.

The south elevation of the addition will have a shed roof dormer and a triple window on both the first and second floor. The first floor will also have a double leaf door. A wood deck is also proposed for this elevation.

The west elevation of the structure will have a slider window in the basement for egress, a triple window on the first floor and a small triple window above a section of horizontal cedar board. The gable roof of this elevation will have decorative cedar shingles in the gable end.

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Review under K.S.A. 75-2724 (State Preservation Law Review)

For State Preservation Law Review of projects involving listed properties, the Historic Resources Commission uses the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to evaluate the proposed project. Therefore, the following standards apply to the proposed project:

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.

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

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.

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

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

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.

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.

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

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.

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 historical property and its environment would be unimpaired.

D. STAFF ANALYSIS

The structure located at 607 Louisiana Street was constructed c. 1913 for Max Wilhelmi. The property was recorded as unimproved in the 1873 Atlas of Douglas County. A significant increase in property tax valuation occurred in 1913 when Max Wilhelmi was the owner of record. In 1914 Max Wilhelmi Jr. was the owner or record. Max F. Wilhelmi Jr. and his wife Dora B. were listed as residents in 1913/14, 1915, 1917, 1919, 1923, 1925/26, 1927/28, and 1929/30. Max Wilhelmi Jr. was the son of Max Wilhelmi Sr. (vice-pres., Barteldes Seed Co.) and later became the secretary of Barteldes Seed Co. The dwelling was recorded on the 1927 Sanborn Map.

When the Old West Lawrence Historic District was listed in the National Register in 1972, it did not include a list of contributing and non-contributing structures. The district was resurveyed in 1991, and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) generated a list of contributing and non-contributing structures based on this survey to determine the eligibility of structures for the Kansas Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit program. (This list was never approved by the National Park Service as an official list of contributing and non-contributing structures.) Staff is of the opinion that the structure is contributing to the Old West Lawrence Historic District.

The subject property is located adjacent to the “T” portion of the alley system of this area of Old West Lawrence. The location of the property allows views to the south side of the structure not only from the alley, but also from the public right-of-way of Louisiana Street.

The identification of key features, including architectural elements and setting, are the beginning bases for project review of historic structures whether they are listed individually or as part of a district. Careful consideration of the context and the reasons for the significance of the property should be included in the overall determination of character-defining elements. Character-defining elements include the overall shape of the building, its materials, craftsmanship, decorative details, interior spaces and features, as well as the various aspects of its site and environment. Once the
character-defining features have been identified, the project can be reviewed using the guidelines to determine if the proposed project meets the guidelines and if the project will damage or destroy the listed property.

The construction of an exterior addition to a historic building may seem to be essential for a new or expanded use, but the Secretary of the Interior’s guidelines emphasize that new additions should be avoided, if possible, and considered only after it is determined that the proposed need cannot be met by altering secondary, non-character defining interior spaces. After a thorough evaluation of interior solutions, if an exterior addition is still judged to be the only viable alternative, the addition should be designed and constructed to be clearly differentiated from the historic building and so that the character-defining features of the structure are not radically changed, obscured, damaged, or destroyed. New additions should be constructed so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials, located at the rear or on an inconspicuous side of a historic building, and limited in size and scale in relationship to the historic building. Design for the new work may be contemporary, but it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.

Standards 9 and 10 apply to this project.

The proposed project will remove the existing porch on the northwest corner of the structure. The location and approximate size of the porch are part of the historic footprint of the house. Rear porches that are located on the rear of a historic structure require a case by case project review due to the uniqueness of each lot, building footprint, and spacial relationships on the property. While the porch location may be historic, it is necessary to determine if the porch is a character defining element of the listed structure.

Like most porches on the rear of structures, the existing porch was a utilitarian porch and not a design feature of the house. It is typical for historic structures to have porches on the rear of structures enclosed. The removal of this non-character defining porch on the rear/west elevation will not have an adverse effect on the listed property.

The new addition has been designed to reduce the loss of historic material. The new addition is placed to the rear of the historic structure; an appropriate location for new additions. Most of the interior walls will be maintained. The addition is compatible with the scale, massing, materials, and design of the existing structure. The height at the roof peak of the addition will be slightly lower than the north/south roof peak of the existing structure. The overall size of the addition is not too large for the existing structure, but the east/west gable roof that intersects the primary gable roof creates a visual effect that can be interpreted to create an addition that is actually larger than the proposed addition. The height of this roofline is to accommodate the floor height of the addition.

The new addition will have no visual effect on the primary/east elevation of the existing structure. A slight view of the addition will exist from the Louisiana Street right-of-way when traveling south on Louisiana Street. The addition will be visible from the south and west.

The property will be used for its historic purpose and the character of the property will be retained and preserved. No historic or character defining feature will be removed or altered on all elevations.
with the exception of the west elevation. While the removal of the porch that has existed in this configuration and location since at least 1927 will alter a feature and space of the historic structure, staff is of the opinion that the removal of the porch will not significantly damage the historic structure.

Most of the historic west elevation of the structure will be maintained. The existing second story dormer will be removed to provide access to the second level of the addition. While the existing roof of the dormer will be removed, the existing change in the plane of this area of the west elevation will be maintained on the interior of the structure with a new door installed where the existing window is located. The window to the north of this dormer will also be covered by the new addition. The opening of the window will be maintained on the interior of the addition either by leaving the indication of the window with the existing trim or leaving the existing opening.

The proposed addition does an excellent job in not destroying historic fabric both on the exterior and interior of the structure. While the new work is differentiated from the old, it is compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the historic structure. It is not likely that the addition will be removed in the future, but the design of the addition that maintains the majority of the historic structure would allow for the removal to reveal the essential form and integrity of the historic suture.

E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

In accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the standards of evaluation, staff recommends the Commission approve the proposed project and make the determination that the proposed project does not damage or destroy any historic property included in the National Register of Historic Places or the State Register of Historic Places (Register of Historic Kansas Places).

Staff also recommends the Commission direct staff to administratively review any minor alterations to the project such as materials, slight changes in roof slope, and fenestration that meet the standards. Any other revisions or modifications to the project shall be forwarded to the Historic Resources Commission for review.
DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

PROPERTY INFORMATION
Address of Property 607 Louisiana St.
Legal Description (may be attached) South half of lots 22,24,26 and the east 13 ft of the south half of lot 28

OWNER INFORMATION
Name(s) Andrea Albright / Lance Adams
Contact Lance Adams
Address 607 Louisiana St.
City Lawrence State KS ZIP 66044
Phone (785) 218-3980 Fax (___)
E-mail lance.adams@adamsarchs.com Cell Phone (___)

APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION
Contact Lance Adams
Company Adams Architects, LLC
Address 700 Massachusetts St., Ste 202
City Lawrence State KS ZIP 66044
Phone (785) 218-3980 Fax (___)
E-mail lance.adams@adamsarchs.com Cell Phone (___)

Existing Zoning
RS5

Existing Land Use
Single Family

Proposed Land Use
Single Family

# of Buildings
2

Total site area 10,921 sqft
Existing Building Footprint 1,000 sq ft & 309 sq ft
Proposed Building Footprint 1,463 sq ft & 309 sq ft
Open Space Area 9,149 sq ft

Existing Pavement Coverage 520 sq ft
Proposed Pavement Coverage 520 sq ft

Are you also submitting any of the following applications?
• Building Permit X
• Site Plan
• Special Use Permit
• Zoning Change
• Variance
• State or Federal Tax Credit Application
Other (specify)

Application Form 06/2016
Detailed Description of Proposed Project:
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

Proposed project is construction of a two-story addition with full basement. The addition will consist of a family kitchen on the main level and master suite on the second level.

Reason for Request:
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

During 16 years of ownership and growth of the family from two to five individuals, it has become evident that improvements to the home would enable the residents to live much more comfortably now and well into the future.
Architect/Engineer/Contractor Information: Please provide name and phone number of any persons associated with the project.

Contact: Lance Adams

Company: Adams Architects, LLC

Address: 700 Massachusetts St., Ste 202

City: Lawrence State: KS ZIP: 66044

Phone: (785) 218-3980 Fax: (___)

E-mail: lance.adams@adamsarchs.com Cell: (___)

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS:

☑ Photographs of existing structure and site
☑ Scaled or dimensioned site plan with a graphic/bar scale
☑ Scaled elevation drawings with a graphic/bar scale
☑ Scaled or dimensioned floor plans with a graphic/bar scale
☑ Materials list
☑ Digital copy of application materials

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION MAY BE REQUIRED BASED ON THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

SIGNATURE

I/We, the undersigned am/are the (owner(s)), (duly authorized agent), (Circle One) of the aforementioned property. By execution of my/our signature, I/we do hereby officially apply for design review approval as indicated above.

Signature(s): __________________________ Date: 3/3/17

______________________________ Date: __________________

______________________________ Date: __________________

Note: If signing by agent submit Owner Authorization Form