LAWRENCE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION
AGENDA FOR JULY 20, 2017
CITY HALL, 6 E 6TH STREET
6:30 PM

SPECIAL NOTICE: THE CITY OF LAWRENCE HAS EXECUTED AN AGREEMENT WITH THE STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER TO CONDUCT STATE PRESERVATION LAW REVIEWS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL. THEREFORE, THE LAWRENCE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION WILL MAKE ALL DETERMINATIONS REGARDING PROJECTS THAT REQUIRE REVIEW UNDER K.S.A. 75-2724, AS AMENDED.

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
A. Action Summary June 15, 2017
B. Administrative Approvals
   1. DR-17-00248 1942 Learnard Avenue; Pool; Certificate of Appropriateness
   2. DR-17-00255 729-731 Massachusetts Street; Exterior Staircase; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness, and Downtown Design Guidelines Review
   3. DR-17-00257 888 New Hampshire Street; Sign Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review
   4. DR-17-00258 1005 Pennsylvania Street; Mechanical Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness
   5. DR-17-00259 100 E 9th Street; ATM; Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review
   6. DR-17-00274 2401 Massachusetts Street; Residential Photovoltaic; State Law Review
   7. DR-17-00287 1625 Edgehill Road; Commercial Remodel; Certificate of Appropriateness
   8. DR-17-00289 1420 Crescent Road; Parking Variance; Certificate of Appropriateness
   9. DR-17-00291 800 Indiana Street; Plumbing Permit; State Law Review
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-17-00223  Public Hearing for consideration of placing the property located at 2110 Harper Street, the James and Mary (Smith) Means Stone House, on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Douglas County, property owner of record.


ITEM NO. 6: DR-17-00288 and DR-17-00292  745 Vermont Street/746 Kentucky Street; Variance, Rehabilitation, and Addition; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness, and Downtown Design Guidelines Review. The property is a contributing structure to Lawrence’s Downtown Historic District, National Register of Historic Places; is a Landmark on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places, and is located in the Downtown Conservation Overlay District. Submitted by Zimmerschied Architecture on behalf of City of Lawrence, property owner of record.

ITEM NO. 7: DR-17-00295  1101 Massachusetts Street; Rehabilitation; State Law Review and Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is a contributing structure to Lawrence’s Downtown Historic District, National Register of Historic Places, and is located in the environs of South Park (1140-1141 Massachusetts Street), Watkins Bank Building (1047 Massachusetts Street) and the Douglas County Courthouse (1100 Massachusetts Street), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the Downtown Conservation Overlay District. Submitted by TreanorHL on behalf of 1101 Mass LLC, property owner of record.

ITEM NO. 8: DR-17-00293  1208 Mississippi Street; Rehabilitation; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness, and Oread Design Guidelines. The property is a contributing structure to the Hancock Historic District, National Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the environs of the Jane A Snow Residence (706 W 12th Street), and is located in the Conservation Overlay District – Hancock Historic District – UC4. Submitted by TreanorHL on behalf of Classical Developments LLC, property owner of record.
ITEM NO. 9: DR-17-00296 1218 Mississippi Street; New Multi-Family; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness, and Oread Design Guidelines Review. The property is located in the environs of the Jane A Snow Residence (706 W 12th Street), and is located in the Conservation Overlay District - Hancock Historic District - UC4. Submitted by TreanorHL on behalf of Classical Developments LLC, property owner of record.

ITEM NO. 10: DR-17-00300 and DR-17-00308 524 Ohio Street; Residential Remodel and Variance; State Law Review and Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located in the Pinckney II Historic District, National Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the environs of the Griffith House (511 Ohio Street), and the Dillard House (520 Louisiana Street), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Rockhill & Associates on behalf of Kami Day and Michele A Eodice, property owners of record.

ITEM NO. 11: DR-17-00311 644 Mississippi Street; New Accessory Structure; Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located in the environs of the Wilder Clark House (643 Indiana Street), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Lance Adams of Adams Architects, LLC on behalf of Gregory Rupp and Jennifer Roth, property owners of record.

ITEM NO. 12: MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

A. Provide comment on Zoning Amendments, Special Use Permits, and Zoning Variances received since June 15, 2017.

B. Review of any demolition permits received since June 15, 2017.

C. Miscellaneous matters from City staff and Commission members.
ITEM NO. 1: COMMUNICATIONS
A. No communications from other commissions, State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the general public.
B. No ex-parte communications
C. No abstentions
D. No Committee Reports

ITEM NO. 2: CONSENT AGENDA
A. Action Summaries
B. Administrative Approvals
   1. DR-17-00088  1340 Ohio Street; Exterior Door Addition; Oread Design Guidelines Review
   2. DR-17-00120  100 E. 9th Street; ATM Installation; Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review
   3. DR-17-00121  1645 Tennessee Street; New Gazebo; Certificate of Appropriateness
   4. DR-17-00200  331 Indiana Street; Selective Interior Demolition for Architectural Investigation; State Law Review
   5. DR-17-00226  331 Indiana Street; Rezoning; State Law Review
   6. DR-17-00225  115 W. 11th Street; Mechanical Permit; State Law Review and Certificate of Appropriateness

ACTION TAKEN
Motioned by Commissioner Bailey, seconded by Commissioner Buchanan, to approve the February, March, and May Action Summaries.

Motion carried 5-0-2.

Motioned by Commissioner Bailey, seconded by Commissioner Buchanan, to approve the April Action Summary

Motion carried 6-0-1.

Motioned by Commissioner Bailey, seconded by Commissioner Buchanan, to confirm the Administrative Approvals,

Unanimously approved 7-0.

ITEM NO. 3: PUBLIC COMMENT
Ms. KT Walsh welcomed Commissioner Veatch and mentioned that the 1879 Vinland Presbyterian Church and attached home is for sale for $250,000.
ITEM NO. 4:  L-17-00036  Public Hearing for consideration of placing the property located at 200 Nebraska Street, the Lee Zimmerman House, on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by The Lawrence Preservation Alliance on behalf of Heidi Lynn Gluck and Robert Raymond Hurst, property owners of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Zollner presented the item.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION
Mr. Dennis Brown, Lawrence Preservation Alliance (LPA), explained their process and efforts in getting properties listed locally, including the subject property.

Commissioner Veatch asked if this property would be eligible for State or National listing.

Mr. Brown said this project is as much about establishing planning practices as it is about nominating properties. If a nomination is approved, it immediately goes to the SHPO and they will come back with a Preliminary Site Information Questionnaire (PSIQ).

No public comment

BOARD DISCUSSION
Commissioner Evans said he has reservations about the nomination and questions its value to the community. He doesn’t feel identification with a person should be considered criteria if the property itself is not an embodiment of a design. He suggested they explore a mechanism to identify those structures but not list them.

Commissioner Veatch said it’s being nominated under Criteria 6, so that should be their focus.

Commissioner Evans does not feel it embodies the design or quality.

Commissioner Buchanan asked if he feels it doesn’t represent design & quality locally or nationally.

Commissioner Evans said he assumes Criteria 6 is relative to Lawrence.

Commissioner Bailey said he thought that was the purpose of adding additional criteria, and things over time become significant.

Commissioner Evans said it’s not an issue of age.

Commissioner Veatch asked him to be more specific.

Commissioner Evans said he doesn’t feel it’s a good architectural example- it doesn’t have the scale or finesse to be an embodiment of a particular period of time.

Commissioner Buchanan agreed but doesn’t feel it’s to an extent that it shouldn’t be listed. She said additional information could be added to the listing later.

Commissioner Bailey felt that some of it is subjective to personal opinion.
Commissioner Fry asked if this home is ranked in the top 15 homes considered to be of similar design.

Mr. Brown said it’s in the Lawrence Modern Baker’s Dozen- number eight, he believes.

Commissioner Hernly went back to Criteria 6. It’s not a high style example of midcentury modern design, but it has elements of design, detailing, materials, and craftsmanship that are architecturally significant for Lawrence. The Zimmerman Steel tie makes it significant even though it’s not nominated for that reason.

Commissioner Bailey asked for clarification of the process for adding information after a property is listed.

Ms. Zollner explained the process.

Commissioner Evans said he applauds what they’re doing, but is just slightly bothered by this nomination and thinks the register should have prime examples.

Mr. Brown said the Beal House is #1 on their list. The Zimmerman House is #4 and the Chewning House is #7. He said they’re mostly interested in the interior as opposed to the exterior and those rankings aren’t taken lightly.

Commissioner Hernly asked if anyone from SHPO has seen the house.

Ms. Zollner said no- they haven’t had a request from the owner or the applicant.

Ms. Zollner said they can apply for State and National listing if the local listing is denied.

Commissioner Bailey said he feels other commissioners make valid points, and every nomination should be considered individually, but perhaps there is a concern of watering down the register.

**ACTION TAKEN**
Motioned by Commissioner Bailey, seconded by Commissioner Buchanan, to adopt Resolution 2017-05 recommending the property for inclusion in the Lawrence Register of Historic Places.

Motion carried 5-2, with Commissioner Evans and Commissioner Fry dissenting.

Motioned by Commissioner Bailey, seconded by Commissioner Buchanan, to adopt the environs definition as outlined in the staff report.

Motion carried 5-2, with Commissioner Evans and Commissioner Fry dissenting.

**ITEM NO. 5:** DR-17-00227  331 Indiana Street; Remodel and New Addition; Demolition and New Construction of Accessory Structure; State Law Review and Certificate of Appropriateness. The existing primary structure, the J. C. Bare Residence, is listed as a contributing structure to the Pinckney II Historic District, National Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Nathan and Summer Wedermyer, property owners of record.

**STAFF PRESENTATION**
Ms. Zollner presented the item.
Commissioner Bailey asked how many doors they plan to have.

Ms. Zollner explained that one will be sealed in place and the other will remain.

Commissioner Bailey asked about the easement.

Ms. Zollner said it’s a utility easement.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Dennis Brown, LPA, said they've had concerns about construction work taking place on the property. They hoped the administrative reviews would come before the HRC for discussion. They don't quite understand the curved driveway, and wonder if they intend to save the historic curb cut. They feel a new curb cut and straight driveway is a better solution.

Commissioner Bailey agreed with Mr. Brown’s concerns and asked about the driveway plan.

Ms. Summer Wedermyer, applicant, said it was part of the original design but they don't have a preference either way about the driveway.

Commissioner Buchanan asked how many trees would need to be removed.

Ms. Wedermyer said probably just one.

Commissioner Buchanan asked if the curb is limestone.

Ms. Wedermyer said no.

Commissioner Evans said they could make the driveway straight and keep the tree.

Ms. Wedermyer said they have no problem doing that.

Commissioner Buchanan said she’s more concerned about the work that was already completed versus the driveway.

Commissioner Bailey asked why the work wasn't caught.

Ms. Zollner said it should have all been reviewed by the Commission.

Commissioner Buchanan asked if a permit wasn’t pulled.

Ms. Zollner said yes.

Commissioner Buchanan asked if there are any consequences.

Ms. Zollner said under State Law Review there is a penalty but she doesn’t believe it has ever been used.

Commissioner Bailey said it’s amazing that they’re able to save the home given its condition.
Ms. Wedermyer explained the work they did to make the property safe. She said the neighbors have been amazing about everything.

Commissioner Hernly said the historic photo shows a smaller porch and the new porch looks like the size of the replacement porch. He asked if there’s been discussion with SHPO on that.

Ms. Zollner said the porch was still there when they met with the SHPO and it had not been rehabilitated or removed so that discussion has not happened.

Commissioner Hernly asked if it will be discussed.

Ms. Zollner said it’s up to the applicant if they wish to pursue tax credits.

They talked about details and materials for the porch.

Ms. Wedermyer said they have limestone on site and were going to try to reuse it but brick is also fine.

Commissioner Bailey asked if they know when the new porch was added.

Ms. Zollner said she does not.

Commissioner Hernly said the skinny porches aren’t useful.

Ms. Zollner pulled up the original listing and noted it had the larger porch. The photo was taken in 1991.

Commissioner Hernly said he’s not opposed to a larger porch but he suggested the property owner check with the SHPO.

Commissioner Buchanan asked the applicant, Summer Wedermyer, if she will accept an amendment to the project at 331 Indiana Street to straighten the driveway.

Ms. Wedermyer agreed to the proposed amendment.

**ACTION TAKEN**
Motioned by Commissioner Buchanan, seconded by Commissioner Fry, to approve the amended project and make the determination that it does not encroach upon, damage, or destroy the environs of one or more listed historic properties.

Unanimously approved 7-0.

Motioned by Commissioner Buchanan, seconded by Commissioner Fry, to issue the Certificate of Appropriateness and find that the amended project will not significantly encroach on, damage, or destroy the landmark or its environs.

Unanimously approved 7-0.

Motioned by Commissioner Buchanan, seconded by Commissioner Fry, to direct staff to administratively review any minor alterations to the amended project.
Unanimously approved 7-0.

ITEM NO. 6: MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

A. No comment on Zoning Amendments, Special Use Permits, and Zoning Variances received since May 18, 2017.

B. No demolition permits received since May 18, 2017.

C. Miscellaneous matters from City staff and Commission members.

Ms. Zollner said the Chapter 22 draft will be available in July.

Commissioner Buchanan asked if this is the appropriate time to evaluate whether non-contributing structures can be added to the local register.

Ms. Zollner feels that would get incredibly confusing. She explained that one of the purposes of the local register is to include properties that don’t meet criteria for the State and National registers.

ADJOURN 7:48 pm
A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00120 100 E. 9th Street; Automatic Teller Machine Kiosk; Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Commercial Remodel Permit – Automatic Teller Machine Kiosk

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-17-00248 1942 Learnard Street; Pool; Certificate of Appropriateness

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Inground Residential pool 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.
LAWRENCE HISTORIC RESOURCES
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW
STAFF REPORT

A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00255 729-731 Massachusetts Street; Exterior Staircase; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Installation of new exterior egress staircase.

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (State Preservation Law 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.

In accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the standards of evaluation, staff approved the project and made the determination that the 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).
LAWRENCE HISTORIC RESOURCES
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW
STAFF REPORT

A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00257 888 New Hampshire Street; Mural; Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Sign Permit - Mural

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
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW
STAFF REPORT

A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00258 1005 Pennsylvania Street; Mechanical Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Mechanical Permit – AC Unit Replacement.

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-17-00274 2401 Massachusetts Street; Residential photovoltaic; State Law Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Solar Installation Permit - Residential

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (State Preservation Law Review)

D. STAFF DETERMINATION

In accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the standards of evaluation, staff approved the project and made the determination that the 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).
A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00287 1625 Edgehill Road; Commercial Remodel Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Commercial Remodel Permit – Exterior glass block window installation

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-17-00289 1420 Crescent Road; Parking Variance; Certificate of Appropriateness

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Request for parking variance associated with a commercial remodel and use.

Board of Zoning Appeals approved the variance request on July 6, 2017.

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.
LAWRENCE HISTORIC RESOURCES
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW
STAFF REPORT

A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00291 800 Indiana Street; Inflow/Infiltration permit; State Law Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Inflow/Infiltration Abatement Permit – install sump pump and electrical panel

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (State Preservation Law Review)

D. STAFF DETERMINATION

In accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the standards of evaluation, staff approved the project and made the determination that the 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).
A. SUMMARY

Public hearing for consideration of placing the structure known as the James and Mary (Smith) Means House on the property located at 2110 Harper Street on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Douglas County, the property owner of record.

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.

This report includes the proposed environ definition for the structure known as the James and Mary (Smith) Means House on the property located at 2110 Harper Street.
B. **HISTORIC REGISTER STATUS**

The structure known as the James and Mary (Smith) Means House on the property located at 2110 Harper Street is not listed on any historic register.

C. **REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS**

1) History Summary

According to the nomination, the stone structure located on the map below and known as the James and Mary (Smith) Means House was constructed c. 1870.

In 1855, 160 acres of the SE1/4 Section 5 Township 13 in Douglas County was granted to the descendants of John Downs. In 1870, James and Mary W. Means of Ironton, Ohio, purchased forty acres of this property from John Jacob and Olivia Gillespie McGee. The Means built a sandstone home (the material may have been quarried from nearby sandstone bluffs). The stone portion of the home, the subject of this nomination was approximately 26’ x 26’.

According to the nomination, historically the Means family members were well-known abolitionists.

In 1871 Hugh Means was born in the house. In 1875, the U.S. Census lists the below as living on
the property:

James Means - age 27
Mary Ward Means - age 27
Hugh Means - age 3
Lucy Means - age 1
Anna Lawrence - 14 - Helps in House
Charles Anderson - 25 - Hired Man (Immigrant from Sweden)
Andrew Warner - 25 - Hired Man (Immigrant from England)
Ella Moore -18-General Housework

In 1895, Hugh Means inherited the property from his parents upon the death of his father. Hugh Means became a prominent lawyer, serving as Douglas County Probate Judge for three terms and as District Judge for Douglas, Franklin, and Anderson Counties. In 1951, Hugh Means sold the house and forty acres to Douglas County for use by the Douglas County 4-H Club likely to be used as the county fairgrounds. The property and the house continue to be used as part of the Douglas County Fairgrounds.

The house is the only remaining structure on the original Means farm.

This area of Lawrence was not included in the city limits at the time of construction and is not covered in the Historic Resources of Lawrence, Douglas County, Kansas Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF).

2) Architectural Integrity Summary

The structure known as the James and Mary (Smith) Means House on the property located at 2110 Harper Street is a small, 26' X 26', sandstone structure with minimal detailing. What appear to be original openings have darker stone lintels and the stone is patterned on the corners of the structure to create faux quoins. Remnants of a limestone foundation indicate there may have been a timber section on the west end. Stone carvers’ marks indicate there was a wooden porch on the east end at the home’s main entry.

A rehabilitation statement by Treanor HL indicates that the structure is in need of rehabilitation. The roof has been altered and a non-compatible addition has been added to the west of the structure. While the alterations have had an impact on the architectural integrity of the structure, it continues to convey its original form, design, and fenestration patterns in its original location.

3) Historic and Current Context Description and Environs Definition

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). Existing context is based on personal
observation, city zoning maps, and recent aerial photographs.

When the Means House was constructed, it was located outside of the Lawrence city limits on a rural farmstead. The historic uses in the area for miles were agriculturally related and there were few structures in this area of the county. The structures that did exist were typically houses and accessory structures that were associated with family farms. Structures were simple in vernacular designs and utilized local materials for construction. The land was relatively flat and the vegetation was consistent with open fields and farmland. The property boundaries were consistent with farm sizes and not limited to small properties for single structures. There was no zoning or public amenities. The views were vast due to the open landscape of the rural area.

While the historic uses of the area were agricultural with associated residential, the modern context is quite different. There is no longer an agriculture use pattern. The property was not platted until 1960. Residential subdivisions around the property were also being platted in the 1960s. The properties surrounding the house include a combination of the fairgrounds, a school, a public facility – fire station – and residential subdivisions. The natural features of the area continue to be relatively flat, but the property boundaries, vegetation types, and views are not related to the historic use and are clearly defined by modern development patterns for residential uses. The exception is the large amount of space devoted to the fairgrounds. While there continues to be some open space for this area, the openness is constantly eroding and new buildings associated with a modern fairground use have been constructed.

Environ Definition Based on the Historic and Current Context Description

The Means House is located on a large parcel owned by Douglas County that is currently used as a county fairgrounds. Because the environs have changed so significantly and because the original property associated with the house is not identifiable, staff is of the opinion the environs definition should start with the location of the Means House and extend 250’ rather than starting with the entire property owned by the county.

The environ of the Means House have changed significantly and should be reviewed as two areas in the following manner:

Area 1
The area primarily consists of structures used in conjunction with the Douglas County Fairgrounds. A portion of the area to the south of the Means Stone House contains City of Lawrence property for Fire Station #2. The following should apply to this area:

The proposed alteration or construction should meet the intent of the Criteria set forth in 22-505. Design elements to consider include scale, massing, site placement, height, directional expression, percentage of building coverage to site, setback, roof shapes, rhythm of openings, and sense of entry.

All projects 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 issue in the review is the impact of the project on the Means House. If the project...
does not meet the intent of the Criteria set forth in 22-505, the project will be forwarded to the Historic Resources Commission for review.

Area 2
The area consists of residential structures. 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. Maintaining views to the listed property is the primary focus of review.

All projects 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.
4) Planning and Zoning Considerations

The property on which the Means House is located is zoned GPI, General Public and Institutional Use District. The GPI District is a Special Purpose Base District primarily intended to accommodate Institutional Uses occupying significant land areas. The district regulations are designed to offer the institution maximum flexibility for patterns of uses within the district while ensuring that uses and development patterns along the edges of the district are compatible with adjoining land uses.

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;
The Means House is significant for its association with the growth of the city into the county to capture rural farmsteads for development. It is also significant for the establishment of a permanent home for the 4H now Douglas County fairgrounds rather than this suburban type of development.

(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;
The property is associated with the Means family, specifically Judge Hugh Means. Means served Douglas County and Lawrence for over 32 years in public service. He is also significant for selling the land to the 4H Club at a significantly lower than market rate to ensure the use of the area as a fairgrounds.

(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;

(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.

(D) In the case of a nominated historic district found to meet the criteria for designation:

(1) The types of significant exterior architectural features of the structures within the nominated historic district that should be protected;

(2) 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.

(3) A list of all key contributing, contributing and noncontributing sites, structures and objects within the historic district.

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

(G) A map showing the location of the nominated landmark or the boundaries of the nominated historic district.

E. RECOMMENDATION:

Staff is of the opinion the James and Mary (Smith) Means House qualifies for designation as a Landmark on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places pursuant to Criterion #1 and #3, as described in Section 22-403.

Staff recommends the James and Mary (Smith) Means House located on the property known as 2110 Harper Street for designation as a Landmark on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places pursuant to Criteria #1 and #3 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 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 Means House is significant for its association with the growth of the city into the county to capture rural farmsteads for development. It is also significant for the establishment of a permanent home for the 4H now Douglas County fairgrounds rather than this suburban type of development.

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

   While the structure has been altered, it maintains sufficient integrity of location and design that make it 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, the historic form of the structure, sandstone, red sandstone lintels, and the faux stone quoins.

   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 fenestration pattern and window and door openings, the historic form of the structure, sandstone, red sandstone lintels, and the faux stone quoins 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 Environ Definition for the Means House 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)
PLEAS 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: James and Mary Means Stone House
Address of Property: Douglas County Fairgrounds, 2110 Harper Street, Lawrence, KS
Legal Description of Property: SE ¼ of Section 5, Township 13, Range 20.

OWNER INFORMATION
Name(s): Douglas County
Contact: Sarah Plinsky, Asst. County Administrator
Address: 1100 Massachusetts Street
City: Lawrence State: KS ZIP: 66644
Phone (785) 832-5329 E-mail: splinsky@douglas-county.com

Is this an owner initiated nomination? Yes □ No
If not, has the owner been notified of this nomination? □ Yes □ No

APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION
Contact: Jan Shupert-Arick, Heritage Coordinator
Company: Douglas County
Address: 1100 Massachusetts Street
City: Lawrence State: KS ZIP: 66644
Phone (785) 832-2878 E-mail: jshupert-arick@douglas-county.com
DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

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

Historic Use(s) farmhouse ______________________________________________________________

Present Use(s) Serves as a restroom/shower room for Douglas County Fairgrounds

Date of Original Construction 1869 - 1870 Fairgrounds

Architect and/or Builder (if known) unknown ____________________________________________

Date(s) of Known Alterations 1950s -

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

1950s - basement filled in; concrete block portion added to west end of structure; when house was converted to a fairgrounds restroom. Windows were removed and in-filled.

2016 - old well/cistern was filled in outside the kitchen doors.

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 Hugh Means was born in this house (1871)

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

☒ Other This is an early sandstone farmhouse.
HISTORY OF THE PROPERTY (Add additional sheets if needed)

(See attached documents)

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

What year was the property platted? October 25, 1960
What is the name of the subdivision? 4-H Fairgrounds Addition
What was the zoning? Farm and then it became the Douglas County Fairgrounds
What were the land uses? Aerials indicate other agricultural buildings.
What size and types of buildings existed in the area? This area was developed in the 1950s and 1960s.
Did the area have paved streets, sidewalks, gas service or electrical service? Please describe.
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 4/12/17

______________________________  Date 4/12/17

______________________________  Date 4/12/17

[Signature]

[Signature]
OWNER AUTHORIZATION

I/WE __________________________________________, hereby referred
to as the “Undersigned”, being of lawful age, do hereby on this __________ day of __________, 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:

   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 of 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

[Signature]

Owner

STATE OF KANSAS
COUNTY OF DOUGLAS

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on this __________ day of __________, 2017,
by ____________________________, Chair

My Commission Expires: __________

[Signature]

Notary Public

[Signature]

Douglas County Clerk

Owner Authorization Form
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Landmark Application
REQUIRED INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED WITH AN APPLICATION 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))
March 2, 2017

Scope of Work Letter for the Judge Means House / Shower & RR house at the Douglas County Fairgrounds – Lawrence, KS (see masonry scope for exterior photos)

- Rehabilitate and point masonry – see Masonry scope document

- Remove concrete blocks at basement window well on North side and install new window well and grate (provided by owner)

- Old window openings - remove brick infill (3 openings), remove existing siding infill (3 openings) and infill with framing as needed and install new smooth face cut stone veneer panels (6 openings).
  - Deduct option: Infill openings with painted Hardie-Board (smooth face sheets) with brick mold trim

- Remove existing metal roofing and skip sheathing. Provide new roof decking, underlayment, and new asphalt shingle roof on gable portion of roof (match existing facilities wood shake color/appearance)

- New galvanized flashings, drip, gutters and downspouts throughout (galvanized half-round with round downspouts). Drain to splashblocks on surface

- New EPDM roll roofing on low slope portion to the West

- Remove existing siding at gables (East and West) and replace with board and batten look siding – sheet Hardie-Board with applied bats (12” o.c.)

- New attic louvers / vents at gable peaks

- Paint – all existing doors, windows, soffits, exposed fascia, exposed wood trim and cmu addition on West side

- Install new 4 sided HM frame with hollow metal attic access door in west gable end (accessed from flat roof)

- Replace / repair rock foundation beds and provide landscape allowance ($2,000)

- Replace exterior lighting at entry doors.

- Replace exterior security lighting (under eaves).

- Provide signage allowance ($2,500)
Birthplace of Judge Hugh Means

View of the home from the north.

Historical Timeline

1855 - 160 acres SE1/4 Section 5 Township 13 in Douglas County is granted to the descendants of John Downs who served in the Delaware Militia during the War of 1812.
1870 James and Mary W. Means of Ironton, Ohio, arrive in Douglas County. They purchase forty acres from John Jacob and Olivia Gillespie McGee family north of the Oregon Trail. They build a sandstone home with material was most likely quarried from nearby sandstone bluffs located along the old Oregon Trail between Lawrence and Eudora. The stone portion of the home (approximately 26x26) is remaining. Remnants of a limestone foundation indicate there may have been a timber section, perhaps a summer kitchen type part of the home on the west end. Stone carvers marks indicate there was a wooden porch on the east end at the home’s main entry.

Background: James Means was the great grandson of John W. Means who left a farm in South Carolina in 1819 in order to bring his 24 slaves out of the South and set them free. The Means family members were well-known abolitionists and were engaged in the iron making industry at Hanging Rock along the Ohio River creating significant wealth. (Excerpt from Miles, Shute & Kouns family history.)

1871 – Hugh Means is born in the Means home. He becomes a prominent lawyer, serving as Douglas County Probate Judge for three terms and as District Judge for Douglas, Franklin, and
Anderson Counties (serving in this position for thirty-two years).

1875 - U.S. Census lists the following persons living at the property:
   James Means – age 27
   Mary Ward Means – age 27
   Hugh Means – age 3
   Lucy Means – age 1
   Anna Lawrence – 14 – Helps in House
   Charles Anderson – 25 - Hired Man (Immigrant from Sweden)
   Andrew Warner – 25 – Hired Man (Immigrant from England)
   Ella Moore -18-General Housework

1877 – James Williamson Means is born.
1879 – Infant Thomas C.B. Means dies from diphtheria. His burial site is unknown. The Lawrence Daily Journal lists two other children as sick but their fate is unknown. (An additional reference indicates the death of two children – a son and a daughter.)
1880 – U.S. Census lists Mary Means as “traveling” and lists James as “a capitalist.”
1893-1895-Hugh Means is the manager of the baseball team at the University of Kansas.
1895 – Hugh Means graduates from Kansas Law School at Lawrence and begins practicing law.
1895 – James Means, age 47, dies of consumption, at Lawrence and is buried in Woodland Cemetery in Ironton, Ohio, in the family vault. Only his wife and two grown sons survive him.
1895 - Hugh Means inherits the property from his parents upon the death of his father.
1898-Hugh Means elected a Companion of the Kansas Commandery and assigned Insignia No. 12079. (He later became a Commander.)
1902-Hugh Means marries Marie Barker (daughter of George Barker, Lawrence attorney) at the home of Dr. and Mrs. George Barker in West Lawrence, by Rev. Cordley.
1907-Hugh Means is elected Probate Judge and serves three terms.
1909-James W. Means (brother to Hugh Means) is listed in the Lawrence City Directory as president of KV Canning.
1913 – Lawrence Directory lists Hugh Means as Secretary of The Journal-World.
1919-Lawrence City Director lists Hugh Means as Vice President of the World Co. (The Journal-World) and practicing law at Means & Rice law firm at 900 Mass Street over the People’s State Bank.
1927-Lawrence City Directory lists law firm of Barker & Means at the Opera House Building.
1929- Hugh Means elected District Court Judge for Douglas, Franklin, and Anderson Counties and serves until his retirement in 1953 (32 years of service).
1951 – The property remains in the family until Judge Hugh Means sells the house and forty acres to Douglas County for use by the Douglas County 4-H Club (to be used as the county fairgrounds). Purchase price is below market value.
1964-Judge Hugh Means dies January 2, 1964 and is buried at Oak Hill in the family plot. Members of the Douglas County Bar Association compose a Memorial Resolution in Judge Means’ honor.

The house is the only remaining structure on the original Means farm. The home itself is significant in that:

1) It is the birthplace of Hugh Means and reflects an important migration story to eastern Kansas.
2) The house is an important example of sandstone construction in Douglas County.
3) The house represents farm life in the mid-late 19th century in Douglas County.
4) The house and site will be incorporated into the Douglas County Fairgrounds Master Plan to be used as a place to interpret the early agricultural history of Douglas County.

Citations:

1. August 18, 1952 Lawrence Daily Journal – Bird’s Eye View of new Fairgrounds showing the location of the Means house.
2. David Sparkes, Director Building and Grounds, Douglas County, reports that an interview with a person who lived on the fairgrounds in the 1960s stated that the home had a full basement at one time and the access to the basement on the south side of the house was filled in when the building was converted to a restroom in the 1960s.
3. A written tribute to Judge Means upon his death in 1964 states that “The town of Lawrence was founded by New England emigrants only 17 years before Hugh Means was born in a pioneer’s house on a shady knoll in Wakarusa Township, just southeast of town, on July 27, 1871. His parents had married in Ohio in 1869 and started out for the west to find the ideal home. They first saw Lawrence in October, and almost decided to stay, but went on to look at other locations. They went on for awhile, returning the following May. Mrs. Means once told a friend, “You know how Lawrence is in May, with the redbud and wild plum everywhere. The search ended right there.”
4. Letter to Steven Jansen, Director of the Watkins Community Museum from Adrienne H. Mitchell of Hillsborough, California, dated December 30, 1992:
   “Mary W. S. Means was born on November 18, 1848, in Marietta, Ohio, and died in Siena, Italy, on December 14, 1916. However, she and her husband lived in Lawrence, Kansas, in the stone house which is now part of the 4H grounds. Both Hugh and James Means were born there.”
5. Lawrence Daily Journal, July 11, 1908:
   “Franklin. Mr. and Mrs. Means and friends spent Saturday evening at the old Means place east of town. They celebrated the Fourth in an appropriate manner…”
6. The Judge Hugh Means American Inn of Court statement – “The local organizing committee has chosen the name The Judge Hugh Means American Inn of Court to
honor the late Judge Hugh Means who served with distinction for 32 years as District Court Judge for the Fourth Judicial District. This was one of five original judicial districts of the state, and included Douglas County.” The document also adds: “Hugh Means was an austere yet kindly judge. He presided over his court with firmness and dignity; he was unrelenting in his search for justice and intelligent interpretation and application of the appropriate principles of law; he commanded and received the respect of the bar and the public at large. Judge Means was one of the most admired and respected trial judges in the state. Judge Means inspired a generation of Douglas County lawyers to do their professional best.

This plaque that honored Judge Means upon the establishment of the Douglas County Fairgrounds was recently discovered behind a wall. The Fairgrounds Master Plan Committee plans to restore the plaque and place it on public display. The brass plaque inscription below Judge Means’ photo reads as follows: “This tablet is dedicated to Hugh Means who was born on this site. A distinguished Jurist and Friend to Young People.”

7. A scrap paper note at the Watkins Museum of History in the Judge Means Collection includes an agreement between Hugh Means and J.J. Smith to plough and plant wheat on 40 acres of a 50 acres lot owned by Hugh Means on the Old Franklin Road. (1924)
8. News clipping from Hugh Means Collection at the Watkins Museum of History includes information about a meeting of the Lawrence Rotary to meet at the Douglas County Fairgrounds to honor Hugh Means who provided 40 acres of land and a house on the site so the county could have such a facility. Dated March 26, 1955.


10. The Douglas County Register of Deeds Office provided the legal description of the Means farm: 
   The farm was located in the SE ¼ of section 5 township 13 range 20.

The South Façade showing location of “Kitchen Door” near an outside well.

The north façade showing modern addition where wood framed portion of the house is believed to have been located.
Means Home - West façade with attic access door open for inspection.

Means House east façade – The home’s main entrance was in the center of the building.
The local organizing committee has chosen the name The Judge Hugh Means American Inn of Court to honor the late Judge Hugh Means who served with distinction for 32 years as District Court Judge for the Fourth Judicial District. This was one of the five original judicial districts of the state, and included Douglas County.

Judge Means, in the 1930s, became concerned with the animosity that existed among members of the local bar. He perceived that regular meetings of the members of the bar might serve to alleviate the hostility between lawyers, and promote professionalism. Thus came into being the Douglas County Bar Association, organized to address the same problems that beset the profession today. Originally, the monthly dinner meetings (without liquor) featured speakers who discussed legal issues.

Judge Means was born in Douglas County on July 27, 1871, died in Lawrence, Kansas on January 1, 1964. The Memorial Resolution respecting him and his career, filed in the records of the Douglas County District Court, includes the following remarks:

"Hugh Means was an austere yet kindly judge. He presided over his court with firmness and dignity; he was unrelenting in his search for justice and intelligent interpretation and application of the appropriate principles of law; he commanded and received the respect of the bar and the public at large. Judge Means was one of the most admired and respected trial judges in the state."

Judge Means inspired a generation of Douglas County lawyers to do their professional best.
Advertisement for Barker & Means 1906

Clipped By:

jshupertarick
Tue, Feb 28, 2017
September 1, 1917
Hugh Means enters into an agreement with J.J. Smith the first day of September 1917. Means owns 50 acres on the Old Franklin Road in Douglas County, Kansas, and Smith desires to put about 40 acres of the same into wheat.

January 19, 1927
Load of timothy (hay) was sold and divided.

March 4, 1937
Tom Jones bought Means’ alfalfa $85.

May 15, 1937
Judge Means buys cream from Jones who paid him for the balance of the alfalfa crop. $35.

June 28, 1937
Jones cut wheat, alfalfa is in stock.

August 28, 1937
After supper out to tour Jones. Settled for wheat $102.

August 31, 1937
Check from Schrake for wheat. 107 bushels 40 lbs @99 cents. My share 1/3 of total 102 bushel 40 lbs.

March 22, 1943
$30 from Mrs. Davis a/c rent stone house.

June 30, 1944
Mrs. Conn in office. Wheat $220.05 1.39 per bushel said had to plow up alfalfa a/c drowned out.

July 19, 1944
Conn pays $20 cash rent. Also $15 for oats @78 11.70 33 ½ wheat @ 13g $46.

March 26, 1955
The Lawrence Rotary met at Fairgrounds to honor Judge Means, Elmer Ousdahl, Chair. Means provided 40 acres of land and a house at the fairgrounds site. This was the home he was born in and surrounding 40 acres. Dinner will be served in the Home Ec. Building, entertainment by the 4-H club members.
THE DEATH ROLL.

Saturday night at 10:30 James Means died at his home in Ohio street, after a prolonged illness. The immediate cause of his death was peritonitis, but he has been a victim of consumption for some time past, and has been gradually growing weaker. The funeral services were held this afternoon at 2 o'clock at the house, and were conducted by the Masons and Dr. R Cordley. The remains were taken to Ironton, Ohio, on the afternoon train for interment there. James Means was 47 years old. He was born at Hanging Rock, Ohio, July 26, 1848. He came to Lawrence in 1869, but since then has been away from here a great deal of the time, making a trip to Europe and remaining several years, and afterwards visiting in the neighborhood of Boston. He came back here two years ago, and has been in Lawrence continuously since that time. He leaves two boys who have been making their home with him. He owned considerable property about Lawrence.
WANT ALL LAWRENCE NOSSES COUNTED !

Crosbey Taking Appearances Behind "Robin Hood" Screen

Charles star in the May 28 step in Romeo Complex.

Admiral Knight Opens Historic Documents

AIRCRAFT TO FLY OVER NAVAL ACADEMIES

Sara Leyden Without Warning...Eqip Was Not

Dorothy Did Not Give the Board of American

admirals a chance to say the words...Eqip was not

Hear the words...Eqip was not

WASHINGTON, Jan. 29...Near Anacostia...a
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C. A. SMART.

people have almost forgotten that he has to elect, Douglas county has never had a more capable official than Judge Smart.

henry woodward.

Douglas county and the fact that Headquarters has not taken action. November speaks highly of his popularity. He is a valuable political asset and is well liked by every citizen.

C. O. Friendman will have the honor of succeeding himself in the office of county superintendent.

WHAT DO WE OWE THE FARMER?

What we owe the farmer is to give him a chance to make a dollar. If we do this, we fulfill our duty as his friends.

TWO YEARS MORE.

Henry A. Johnson.
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A dinner which was beautiful in all of its appointments was given last evening by Dr. and Mrs. George Esterly, in honor of Miss Frances Barker and Mr. Hugh Means, whose wedding will occur at 7 o'clock this evening. The table was set for ten guests and a color scheme of yellow was brought out in all of the details. Suspended from the chandelier hung a wedding bell made of yellow chrysanthemums, the center piece was a huge bunch of chrysanthemums and at each place one of these flowers was laid for a favor. Smilax was laid over the table, making a most effective back ground. An eight course dinner was served at 7:30 o'clock. Guests were: Mr. and Mrs. Robert Manley, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Spencer, of Iola; Miss Frances Barker, Miss Lucene Barker, Mr. Hugh Means, Mr. Luther Lewis

marriage of hugh means and frances barker lawrence
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and graduated with the class of 1895. There was then no State Board of
Returning to Lawrence, he entered the Law School of the University of Kansas.
a school in Quincy, Massachusetts, and for two years attended Harvard.
After the return of the family from abroad, Hugh was a student at

knowledge of three foreign languages.

his parents in Italy, France and Germany, where he acquired a speaking
were spent abroad, and between the 11th and 12th years, Hugh was with

the younger brother, James, left Kansas in 1881. Several succeeding years
the outbreak of the 70's, the means family, which then included Hugh and
did not survive their childhood. After contracting with the grocers and
Douglas County. Hugh was the oldest of their four children, two of whom
when in Ohio, James Means and his wife returned in May to settle in

the son of James and Mary W. (Smith) Means. His parents, shortly after
Hugh Means was born on a farm a few miles southeast of Lawrence.

presented

sketch of the varied interests and activities of a most eventful life can be
1964. In the time and space available, only an incomplete and inadequate
life span of more than 76 years exceeded from July 27, 1877, to January 1,
Hugh spent, and in the house in which he had lived for almost 60 years. His
the county where he was born, in the city where his active years were.
It was fitting that Judge Hugh Means should have passed away in
and memorial in respect to the late Judge Means, report as follows:
The committee, appointed by the court to prepare a resolution

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

To the Honorable Frank R. Gray, Judge of the District Court, and Members
of the Douglas County Bar:

185-18
The military career of Judge Means began as an enlistment in the
National Guard in 1891, and he had risen to the rank of Major of Infantry
when America entered the World War. He was then transferred to the
Chief of Staff under General Pope, and remained in the army after the close
of the Civil War. Later he was promoted to Brigadier General of Volunteers, was
promoted to Brigadier General of the First Ohio Volunteer Regiment.

C. H. Smith, had been Lieutenant Colonel of the First Ohio Cavalry in
the civil war, but was interrupted by the World War, which was to mark
the culmination of Judge Means' long military career. He came naturally
after a brief residence in Lawrence, Kansas, Means returned to Lawrence
where a brief residence in Lawrence, Kansas, Means returned to Lawrence
the niece of his brother, Mrs. Lucena Mayes, of Lawrence, Kansas, Means
and the grandson of the brother, James Means, of Topeka, Kansas, Means
lived. Mrs. Mayes returned to Lawrence, Kansas, Means
means died on October 11, 1949. There were no children, and Judge Means
meant. The registration and the city mayor, after a married life of 45 years, Mrs.
left the only surviving relative, the Grandmother, Mrs. Arthur N. Means,
who served in one of the outstanding early-day Lawrence lawyers, who also served in
the law. Means was a member of the firm of Means and Means on November 2, 1902.

The newly admitted young lawyer entered the practice in Lawrence

the answer.

...What is stoppage in transit?" and he said, "It was lucky enough to know
...Judge Means recollected that he had been asked only a single question,
in an examining committee appointed by the Judge of the District Court,
...Law Examiners' and admission to the bar was on the recommendation of

"What is stoppage in transit?" and he said, "It was lucky enough to know
...Judge Means recollected that he had been asked only a single question,
in an examining committee appointed by the Judge of the District Court,
...Law Examiners' and admission to the bar was on the recommendation of
counties went forward smoothly under his expert guidance.

counties, as would be expected, the court business in the several
districts. Judge Means was punctual and expected and required everyone
district, whenever it might be within the three-county

judgments. The lawyers always knew when
辖区之间的审判法院，以及在七个法院，和在司法行政

in all overlapping or concurrent in the several counties, and a paramount

jurisdiction to this body and court work of the three counties so that there was

judgment in the business of the court. Judge Means carefully and meticulously

one rule, and the administration and conduct of all other judicial matters

into the trial of jury cases, as well as the trial of many court cases in the three

The Fourth Judicial District, over which Judge Means presided,

terms, and the record can be left to speak for itself.

The 25-year tenure of Judge Means far exceeded that of any of the precede-
districts of the State, but also by the character and ability of the judges

and lawyers of Kansas. The Fourth Judicial District was

close of the war on December 5, 1968.

and Ft. Sill, Oklahoma, where he received his honorable discharge at the

were keenly disappointed at not being assigned to go overseas with the

were keenly disappointed at not being assigned to go overseas with the
Around Cape Horn

Canal did not satisfy the adventurous spirit, and he always wanted to sail
which he had once made from the Atlantic to the Pacific through the Panama
map out many a voyage which he was never to make. The easy passage
Martin, he resolved to return home by sea. In later years he continued to
a second voyage, only to find the call of Kansas so strong that when he reached
be made his round of the world trip. On his completion, he even stayed up for
voyage on a pleasure to a cruise on a luxury liner. It was by fire that
never happier than when on shipboard. Here he much preferred a luxury
time for travel. Although himself an ardent man, he loved the sea and was
learn in the attendance at the monthly bar meetngs. Then, too, there was
he was not concerned without an office and his law books, and little no longer
saw the members of the bar in the court. He was more faithful than any of
say this. But that did not mean forgetting the law and the old associations.
the judge really deserved the 17 years which were left in him to use as he
undoubtedly more than one-third of the life to his judicial duties.

Kindness, of humanity, and sincere interest were most evident
of to observe one judge in his relations with little children, those qualities of
foresight and preceded the apparent necessity. To those who have had an opportunity
severity were qualities of kindness which tempered the strictness and the
was a severe man. However, underlining these outward appearances of
the point of being unimpeachable and perfect seem to some a reason that he
the beachcleans were given the impression that he was stern
To the uninitiated, to the casual observer, Judge Means, denier

Final Judge was, in the style of
Judge Means was one of the most admired and respected
public at large. Judge Means was one of the most admired and respected
of law, the command and the respect of the bar and the
justice and intelligent interpretation and application of the applicable law.
the court with firmness and dignity. He was unemotional in his search for
High means was an austere yet kindly judge. He presided over
He took a keen interest in the operations on the farm which he owned near Clinton. For sentimental reasons he kept until late in life the part of the family farm on which stood the old stone house in which he was born. Finally, however, he was happy to make it available, at far less than its value, for the youth of the County as a part of the 4-H Club Fairgrounds Project.

The Judge was affiliated with many local organizations. He was a member of Plymouth Congregational Church; Masonic Lodge No. 9, which he served as Master in 1897; the Elks; York Rite Masonry; the Knights Templar, which he served as State Grand Commander in 1924; and the Lawrence Rotary Club, of which he was an honorary member.

Judge Means was deeply patriotic and was active in a number of military organizations, including the American Legion, Sons of the American Revolution, and the Military Order of the Loyal Legion. He served as National Commander of the last-named Order, which was organized by a loyal group of Union soldiers on the day of the assassination of President Lincoln. His own reverence for Abraham Lincoln found expression in the Bar Association’s annual Lincoln memorial service, which he established and sponsored through the year.

Your committee offers this tribute to the life, attainments and achievements of Judge Hugh Means, and moves its adoption by resolution of this Bar, and respectfully requests the Court to order it printed in the Journal of the Court as a perpetual record and memorial, with the hope that these brief and imperfect words containing a dedication may provide some inspiration for dedicated men of bench and bar to carry on, with strength and purpose, the highest ideals of the legal profession, all as exemplified by the life of our beloved Judge.
Filed

Respectfully submitted,

[Signatures]

[Date]

[Name]

[Title]
A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00286 826 Connecticut Street; Residential Addition; Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located in the environs of the Edward Manter House (821 New York), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Adams Architects on behalf of Emma Davison and Eli Hoelschen, property owners of record.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to remove a small shed roof addition and construct a new, single-story, 415 sq. ft. addition on the west (rear) elevation of the structure located at 826 Connecticut Street. A step-back from the historical house will be maintained using a setback from the existing structure wall that currently exists close to the rear elevation of the house. New wood windows to match existing frame material and surround profiles will be utilized. The new addition will be further distinguished from the existing structure with new fiber cement siding with a smooth texture and 4 ½ inch exposure. The roofline will have a simple gable roofline that is of a slightly more shallow pitch than the existing 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 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.

Design Criteria 22-506
(C) In considering any application for a certificate of appropriateness and in reviewing and commenting on matters before other bodies, the Commission shall consider the standards for review listed above and the following:

(1) Alterations. Specific design criteria for exterior alterations of landmarks and key contributing and contributing properties within historic districts shall be based on the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, as published in Section 36, Code of Federal Regulation, Part 67, and as revised from time to time; and by further reference to such specific design criteria as the Commission may require for the designation of the landmark or historic district.

(2) New Construction and Additions to Existing Buildings.
   (a) The design for new construction shall be sensitive to and take into account the special characteristics that the district is established to protect. Such consideration may include, but should not be 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.
   (b) New buildings need not duplicate older styles of architecture but must be compatible with the architecture within the district. Styles of architecture will be controlled only to insure that their exterior design, materials, and color are in harmony with neighboring structures.
   (c) The following specific design criteria shall be used to review all applications for certificates of appropriateness for new construction or additions to existing buildings (See 22-506.1).

Environs for the Edward Manter House (821 New York), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. The Environs for the Edward Manter House is divided into two areas (see attached map) and the proposed project is located in Area 1. The following standards apply to this project:

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, the Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effect on Project on Environs, and the Criteria set forth in 22-205.

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, the Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effect on Project on Environs, and the Criteria set forth in 22-205.

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 alterations and 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. New buildings should not duplicate older styles of architecture but should be compatible with the architecture within the district and according to Chapter 22, the exterior design, materials, and color should be in “harmony” with neighboring structures.

The proposed project is located in the environs of the Manter House. The subject property is across the alley from the listed property.

Standards 1 and 9 apply to this project.

The proposed project is a very simple addition to the vernacular structure located at 826 Connecticut Street. The existing structure is located on a typical original townsit lot of 5850 sf. The existing structure is approximately 750 sq ft and is located approximately 5’ from the north
property line. The setbacks for the addition are compatible with the existing structure and the environs of the listed property. Currently the rear yard is approximately 3,420 sf. An existing 240 sf garage is located in this area.

The 415 sf addition is appropriate in size, mass, and scale. The height is over four feet lower from the peak of the gable roof of the addition to the peak of the gable roof on the existing structure. The addition is subordinate to the existing structure in size, mass, and height. The addition will allow for the continuation of the spacial relationships in the environs and will also leave a large rear yard.

The new addition will house an additional bedroom and dining area. The current bathroom is located in the existing addition and will also be located in the new addition. The addition will allow for the house to have two bedrooms and one bath.

The existing house is clad in Masonite-type siding. The new addition will be clad with a smaller lap exposure fiber cement siding. This change in material and lap exposure size will help to differentiate the existing structure from the new addition. The fiber cement siding is also more compatible with the environs than the existing Masonite-type siding.

The roof form is compatible with the existing structure and the environs of the listed property. The roof materials are also compatible.

The fenestration for the new addition is of a modern design and is not typical for historic structures in the environs. However, the size and location of the triple windows on the southeast corner of the structure reference typical enclosed porches on many historic structures in Lawrence. This detail does not mimic or create a false sense of history, but rather adds an interesting detail that creates additional compatibility for the addition.

The gable end on the east elevation of the new structure has cedar shingles. The shingles are an architectural detail of the original house. Like the triple window pattern, the shingles do not create a false sense of history, but rather add an interesting detail to the addition and will not be seen from the public right-of-way.

Staff is of the opinion the proposed addition meets the guidelines for review and embraces the patterns in the environs of the listed property. It is sensitive to the characteristic massing as seen from the public right-of-way, scale from the public right-of-way, roof shapes, materials, and directional expressions found in the environs.

E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Certificate of Appropriateness
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 landmarks or their environs and issue the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed project.
## Design Review Application

### Property Information
- Address of Property: 826 Connecticut St.
- Legal Description: Connecticut Street Lot 58

### Owner Information
- Name(s): Emma Davidson, Eli Hoelscher
- Address: 1201 Cread Ave, #8
- City: Lawrence
- State: KS
- ZIP: 66044
- Phone: (785) 764-3761
- Fax: ()
- E-mail: ebhoelscher@gmail.com
- Cell Phone: (785) 615-8608

### Applicant/Agent Information
- Name: Lance Adams
- Company: Adams Architects
- Address: 700 Mass Suite 202
- City: Lawrence
- State: KS
- ZIP: 66044
- Phone: (785) 218-3980
- Fax: ()
- E-mail: lance.adams@adamsarchs.com
- Cell Phone: ()

### Table
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed Land Use</th>
<th>Number of Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS5</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>Proposed Building Footprint</td>
<td>1,007 + 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Pavement Coverage</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Proposed Pavement Coverage</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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
Property Address: 826 Connecticut

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

Remove Converted Rear porch and replace with a 415 sq. ft. addition containing a bathroom, bedroom and dining room.

Reason for Request:
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

Structure is in the Historic Environs of the structure located at 821 New York.
Architect/Engineer/Contractor Information: Please provide name and phone number of any persons associated with the project.

Contact: Lance Adams
Company: Adams Architects
Address: 700 Mass Suite 202
City: Lawrence, State: KS, ZIP: 66044
Phone: (316) 218-3980, Fax: ( )
E-mail: lance.adams@adamsarchs.com

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: 5/31/2017

Note: If signing by agent submit Owner Authorization Form
GENERAL ELEVATION NOTES:

1. Existing Masonite lap siding with 17" 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.

B-3 SOUTH ELEVATION

B-3 NORTH ELEVATION

B-3 EAST ELEVATION

B-3 WEST ELEVATION
GENERAL ELEVATION NOTES:
1. EXISTING MASONITE LAP SIDING WITH 17° EXPOSURE
2. NEW ROOF WINDOWS TO MATCH EXISTING FRAME MATERIAL AND SURROUND PROFILE.
3. NEW SIDING TO BE FIBER CEMENT WITH A SMOOTH TEXTURE AND 1 1/2" EXPOSURE.
4. EAVE TRIM MATERIAL AND PROFILE TO MATCH EXISTING.
5. CORNER TRIM MATERIAL AND PROFILE TO MATCH EXISTING.

NORTH-SOUTH SECTION @ BEDROOM  B  1/8"=1'-0"

NORTH-SOUTH SECTION @ BATH  A  1/8"=1'-0"
A. SUMMARY
DR-17-00288 and DR-17-00292 745 Vermont Street/746 Kentucky Street; Variance, Rehabilitation, and Addition; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness, and Downtown Design Guidelines Review. The property is a contributing structure to Lawrence’s Downtown Historic District, National Register of Historic Places, is a Landmark on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places, and is located in the Downtown Conservation Overlay District. Submitted by Zimmerschied Architecture on behalf of City of Lawrence, property owner of record.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant is requesting to rehabilitate Fire Station #1 located at 745 Vermont Street / 746 Kentucky Street and to construct and addition to the west elevation of the structure. The rehabilitation will include interior and exterior alterations. While interior alterations are reviewed under the State Preservation Law, this review does not include the interior alterations as they are being reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Office in conjunction with the State Tax Credit program and are currently not in final plan stage.

All of the exterior of the structure will be repaired with appropriate like-kind materials including repointing the structure where needed.

The new addition will be on the west elevation of the structure. It will house a new shift office with required visibility to the apparatus bays and a new entry lobby area as well as a new required egress stair tower.
The new addition will be approximately 1,058 gross sf and will have a flat roof. The materials proposed for the project include burnished block, brick, glass block, sheet metal, and aluminum storefront components.

The southern portion of the addition, the shift office and lobby, will have a semicircular wall that is fenestrated by three windows and an entry door. The curved portion of the addition is set back from the south wall plane of the historic structure and will project approximately 28’ from the west elevation of the original building. The stair tower will be approximately 33’ from this plane. The height of the curved portion of the addition is approximately 18’. The height of the stair tower is approximately 28’ and the height of the elevator shaft is approximately 30’.

The variance requests associated with this project are to accommodate the existing setback encroachment of the building and the increase of this encroachment by the new addition.

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.

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.

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;

(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;

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.

Design Criteria 22-506
(C) In considering any application for a certificate of appropriateness and in reviewing and commenting on matters before other bodies, the Commission shall consider the standards for review listed above and the following:

1) Alterations. Specific design criteria for exterior alterations of landmarks and key contributing and contributing properties within historic districts shall be based on the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, as published in Section 36, Code of Federal Regulation, Part 67, and as revised from time to time; and by further reference to such specific design criteria as the Commission may require for the designation of the landmark or historic district.

2) New Construction and Additions to Existing Buildings.
   (a) The design for new construction shall be sensitive to and take into account the special characteristics that the district is established to protect. Such consideration may include, but should not be 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.
   (b) New buildings need not duplicate older styles of architecture but must be compatible with the architecture within the district. Styles of architecture will be controlled only to insure that their exterior design, materials, and color are in harmony with neighboring structures.
   (c) The following specific design criteria shall be used to review all applications for certificates of appropriateness for new construction or additions to existing buildings (See 22-506.1).

4) Signage Guidelines. The Commission will receive copies of any appeal or request for variance regarding a sign located, or to be located, on a landmark or within an historic district, or the environs thereof. The Commission may review and comment upon such appeals or requests for variances subject to the following guidelines:
   (a) Signs should be designed and placed so as to appear an integral part of the building design, in proportion to the structure and environment, and to respect neighboring properties within historic districts;
   (b) Obscuring or disrupting important design elements is discouraged. Signs should be designed with appropriateness relative to the services of the establishment served;
   (c) Signs should be maintained if they are determined to be an original part of the building or if they have acquired significance by virtue of their age, design, materials, craftsmanship, or historical significance;
   (d) Illumination of signs should be properly shielded or diffused so as to eliminate glare and be of a low enough wattage to not detract from or set apart the structure;
   (e) Descriptive signs as an integral part of the structure are encouraged. Such signs could include building dates, historic descriptions, commemorations, etc.;
(f) Free-standing signs may be considered, if appropriate and necessary to preserve the character of the landmark or historic district.

(5) Accessory Structures and Landscaping.
   (a) Existing characteristic features such as trees, walls, stairs, paving materials, fencing, walkways and other similar structures or site features that reflect the landmark or historic district's history and development shall be retained.
   (b) Landscaping should be appropriate to the scale and the unique features of the landmark or historic district.
HEIGHT
Consider - Relating the overall height of new construction to that of adjacent structures. As a general rule, construct new buildings to a height roughly equal to the average height of existing buildings from the historic period on and across the street.

Avoid - New construction that greatly varies in height (too high or too low) from older buildings in the vicinity.

SCALE
Consider - Relating the size and proportions of new structures to the scale of adjacent buildings. Although much larger than its neighbors in terms of square footage, the building shown maintains the same scale and rhythm as the existing buildings.

Avoid - Buildings that in height, width, or massing violate the existing scale of the area. The new building shown here disrupts the scale and rhythm of the streetscape, although it might be appropriate in a different location.

MASSING
Consider - Breaking up uninteresting boxlike forms into smaller, varied masses such as are common on most buildings from the historic period. Variety of form and massing are elements essential to the character of the streetscape in historic districts.

Avoid - Single, monolithic forms that are not relieved by variations in massing. Boxlike facades and forms are intrusive when placed in a streetscape of older buildings that have varied massing and facade articulation.

DIRECTIONAL EXPRESSION
Consider - Relating the vertical, horizontal, or nondirectional facade character of new buildings to the predominant directional expression of nearby buildings. Horizontal buildings can be made to relate to the more vertical adjacent structures by breaking the facade into smaller masses that conform to the primary expression of the streetscape.

Avoid - Strongly horizontal or vertical facade expressions unless compatible with the character of structures in the immediate area. The new building shown does not relate well to either its neighbors or to the rhythm of the streetscape because of its unbroken horizontal facade.
SETBACK
Consider - Maintaining the historic facade lines of streetscapes by locating front walls of new buildings in the same plane as the facades of adjacent buildings. If exceptions are made, buildings should be set back into the lot rather than closer to the street. If existing setbacks vary, new buildings should conform to historic siting patterns.

Avoid - Violating the existing setback pattern by placing new buildings in front of or behind the historic facade line. Avoid placing buildings at odd angles to the street, unless in an area where diverse siting already exists, even if proper setback is maintained.

PLATFORMS
Consider - The use of a raised platform is a traditional siting characteristic of some of the older buildings in Lawrence. This visual "pedestal" is created by retaining walls and stepped entries.

Avoid - Bringing walls of new buildings straight out of the ground without a sense of platform, i.e., without maintaining the same entry height as neighboring buildings. Such structures seem squat, visually incomplete, and do not relate well to their elevated neighbors. Also avoid leveling off terraced slopes or removing retained platforms.

SENSE OF ENTRY
Consider - Articulating the main entrances to the building with covered porches, porticos, and other pronounced architectural forms. Entries were historically raised a few stops above the grade of the property and were a prominent visual feature of the street elevation of the building.

Avoid - Facades with no strong sense of entry. Side entries or entries not defined by a porch or similar transitional element result in an incompatible "flat" first-floor facade.

ROOF SHAPES
Consider - Relating the roof forms of the new buildings to those found in the area. Although not entirely necessary, duplication of the existing or traditional roof shapes, pitches, and materials on new construction is one way of making new structures more visually compatible.

Avoid - Introducing roof shapes, pitches, or materials not traditionally used in the area.
D. STAFF ANALYSIS

History
See attached Lawrence Register nomination information.

Project Review
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, as part of a district, or in the case of a Certificate of Appropriateness, located in the environs of a listed property or 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.

Staff has worked with the architect for the City from the initial design concept to this proposed project. The State Historic Preservation Office has also worked with staff on the design of the addition, particularly the location. Because of the prominent location of the structure – by original design – the only non-character defining elevation of the structure is the north elevation. This elevation no longer has the opportunity for an addition due to the construction of the city parking garage. An addition to the east of the fire portion of the structure would completely obliterate the design of the original structure and would not address all of the requirements of the modern fire department needs.

**Height**
The structure is compatible with the height of the listed property and the historic district. Overall, it is subordinate to the listed property. The elevator shaft is the tallest point of the addition and it has been recessed as much as possible without harming the historic structure form. While taller than a portion of the original mainly two story structure, the new shaft is significantly shorter that the existing historic fire hose drying tower. The height of both the stair tower and elevator shaft have been minimized to the greatest extent possible while meeting the needs of the addition.

**Massing**
As designed, the structure is compatible with the massing of the listed property. The addition has been minimized in size and includes an irregular shape that creates an addition that is clearly subordinate to the historic structure.

**Scale**
Scale of a building is associated with the massing of a building and often architectural details and fenestration. The proposed addition creates a compatible scale for the historic structure utilizing the mass and architectural language of the historic structure. The scale is also created by the use of similar materials to the original structure and particularly the references to the glass block on the original tower. While the scale is predominantly compatible, staff does have a concern about the location of the windows and the new storefront entry on the west elevation. Because the top of the windows has been aligned with the bottom of the south side roof over the apparatus bay, the scale on the west elevation appears non-compatible with the remaining fenestration that is viewed on the historic structure. The simple solution to this may be to move the top of the windows down approximately two lap widths to be similar to the top pane of the bay doors. To keep the scale appropriate with this change, the cornice would need to be enlarged the same width. The opening for the door should also be altered by moving the opening down two lap siding widths. This alteration should create a massing that is appropriate for both the view from the corner and the affected elevations.

**Materials**
The materials proposed for the project are compatible with the listed property and the district. The applicant proposes to use true dimensional brick and no vinyl windows. While typically color is not the primary focus of review for materials, in an addition of this type it can have a significant impact.
on the success of the addition. Additional attention should be paid to the final materials in both color and product. This portion of the project can really only be evaluated at this point of the project by families of color. The final material colors should be approved by the Historic Resources Administrator based on the color families directed by the HRC.

**Roof shape**

The roof shape of the proposed structure is compatible with the historic structure and the majority of the structures in the district. The flat roof is appropriate. The re-introduction of the rooftop area on the east elevation of the fire portion of the building is appropriate. Adding a similar element to the new addition is also compatible.

**Directional Expression, Setback, Site Coverage, Spacial Relationships, Sense of Entry, Rhythm, and Platform**

All of these items are compatible with the environs. The rhythm is challenged by the size of the windows and storefront door of the addition, but the alteration to the placement of these elements should mitigate this. The continuation of the horizontal form of the structure by the addition of a similar form helps to create an addition that is compatible with the historic structure.

There are currently no alterations to the east elevation of the structure. The existing non-compatible canopy over the primary entrance on this elevation will be removed. The original "POLICE" sign will be cleaned and will once again be visible. At some point in the future, some type of canopy will be proposed to provide the shelter that is needed by the user of this portion of the structure. This will be a separate review.

The proposed project will allow for the continuation of the use of the structure as Fire Station #1. The impact to the historic structure is designed to be modern but compatible with the historic features of the structure. Design elements and architectural language from the historic building have been incorporated into the design of the new structure such as the curving features of the original structure and glass block and brick materials. The new addition is, however, clearly distinguishable from the original structure.

**State Law Review**

The City of Lawrence has an agreement with the State Historic Preservation Officer to conduct reviews required under K.S.A. 75-2724 using the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. The Historic Resources Commission is charged with determining whether or not projects will “damage or destroy” historic resources. While interior alterations are part of a State Law Review, staff has agreed with the SHPO for the interior of the project to be completed with the State Tax Credit project.

Standards 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 apply to this project.

Staff is of the opinion based on the above project review that the project, with the alteration of the location of the windows and storefront locations adjusted, meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

**Certificate of Appropriateness**
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 alterations and new construction should be reviewed using the design criteria in 22-506. These design criteria help to promote the standards set forth in 22-505. Specifically, 22-506(c)(2) provides review criteria for additions to existing buildings. Identified criteria for new additions 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.

Standards 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 apply to this project.

Staff is of the opinion based on the above project review that the project, with the modification of the location of the windows and storefront locations adjusted, meets the intent of the standards and guidelines in Chapter 22.

**Downtown Design Guidelines Review**

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 for unique stand-alone structures of a government nature and determined that the project, as proposed, meets these development and design standards.

**E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**State Law Review**

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) with the amendment that the location of the windows, the portion of siding above the door, and the change to the cornice on the curved portion of the addition be adjusted as described above.

**Certificate of Appropriateness**

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 landmarks or their environs with the amendment that the location of the windows, the portion of siding above the door, and the change to the cornice on the curved portion of the addition be adjusted as described above, and issue the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed project.
DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Address of Property: 746 Kentucky & 745 Vermont Streets, Lawrence KS 66044
Legal Description (may be attached): FIRE STATION NO 1 BLK LT 1 (REPLAT 2016)

OWNER INFORMATION

Name(s): City of Lawrence Kansas
Contact: Fire Chief Mark Bradford
Address: 1911 Stewart Avenue
City: Lawrence  State: KS  ZIP: 66044
Phone: (785) 830-7001  Fax: (___)
E-mail: mbradford@lawrenceks.org  Cell Phone: (___)

APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION

Contact: Jay E. Zimmerschied, A.I.A.
Company: Zimmerschied Architecture
Address: 901 Branchwood Drive
City: Lawrence  State: KS  ZIP: 66049
Phone: (785) 550-5743  Fax: (___)
E-mail: jay@zimmerschiedarchitecture.com  Cell Phone: (785) 550-5743

<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>GPI/GPI-UC</td>
<td>Fire Station No 1</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>1</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>49,028 sq.ft.</td>
<td>13,544 sq.ft.</td>
<td>1,172 sq.ft. - addition</td>
<td>GPI/GPI-UC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Pavement Coverage</th>
<th>Proposed Pavement Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35,711 sq.ft.</td>
<td>34,189 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you also submitting any of the following applications?

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

Application Form 06/2016
Property Address: 746 Kentucky & 745 Vermont Streets, Lawrence KS  660644

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

This project is for remodel and restoration of the property located at the address listed above. The property is owned by the City of Lawrence and they will pursue the use of tax credits to support project funding.

The project will provide for restoration of the existing building exterior facade and materials and provide for a gut interior remodel of both wings of the building to support the Lawrence Douglas County Fire-Medical Department in the West wing and Douglas County Senior Resource Center in the East wing.

There is a small addition planned on the West facade of the existing structure to house a Fire Department Shift Office and code required second means of egress from the existing Fire Department second floor. From an operational standpoint it is imperative that a separate entrance be provide for each of the entities inhabiting the building and that interior separation is maintained to avoid unauthorized entrance by the general public into Fire Department areas. This is a critical one of the projects original goals and objectives.

Further the project will improve existing site conditions to provide better drainage away from the existing structure, replace aging and deteriorating paved areas, modify existing planted areas that are over grown.

Reason for Request:
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

The project is needing to add onto the Fire Department side of the existing 1950's building in order to accomplish desired vertical circulation/separation between the two entities housed in the existing structure. This vertical circulation would also be required by current building code for compliant building egress.

Further best practice in Fire Station design would place the station shift office in a location where it has immediate observation of the apparatus bay apron. In an urban environment, such as Station No 1 with an existing apparatus bay, location of the apron is very difficult to adjust, predating the need for the proposed shift office location.

The addition was kept as small as possible in order to respect the historic character of the existing building, and help limit construction dollar allocations for new addition areas.
Architect/Engineer/Contractor Information: Please provide name and phone number of any persons associated with the project.

Contact Jay E. Zimmerschied, A.I.A.

Company Zimmerschied Architecture

Address 901 Branchwood Drive

City Lawrence State KS ZIP 66049

Phone (785) 550-5743 Fax (___)

E-mail jay@zimmerschiedarchitecture.com Cell (785) 550-5743

REQU RED 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 (See attached Materials List Sheet)
✓ 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 06.05.17

________________________________________ Date ____________________

________________________________________ Date ____________________

Note: If signing by agent submit Owner Authorization Form
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
MATERIALS LIST

Curved West Face of Shift Office Addition:
- Burnished Block (8x16 Burnished Block)

Vertical Circulation Stair Tower:
- Solid brick color (Darker of the existing blend-terracotta)
- Glass Block (12x12 similar to existing glass block in hose tower)
- Sheet Metal (Dark anodized similar to window finish of retro-fitted windows)

Vertical Circulation Elevator Core:
- Brick Blend (Brick blend similar to existing building)
- Glass Block (12x12 accents similar to existing glass block in hose tower)

Railings @ Walkable Roof Areas:
- Roof over Museum Bay (Reproduction of original railing from dwg’s)
- Roof over Shift Office: (Dark anodized air craft cable railing)

Majority of the original windows have been removed and are no longer available for restoration or reuse. Any remaining existing original windows will be removed, restored, and reinstalled with the exception of the three existing windows on the second floor facing Kentucky. These windows will be removed and salvaged to the owner and replaced with egress compliant windows of similar construction to those previously retrofitted.
EXTERIOR MATERIALS LIST

Curved West Face of Shift Office Addition:
Burnished Block (8x16 Burnished Block)

Vertical Circulation Stair Tower:
Solid brick color (Darker of the existing blend-terra cotta)
Glass Block (12x12 similar to existing glass block in hose tower)
Sheet Metal (Dark anodized similar to window finish of retro-fitted windows)

Vertical Circulation Elevator Core:
Brick Blend (Brick blend similar to existing building)
Glass Block (12x12 accents similar to existing glass block in hose tower)

Railings @ Walkable Roof Areas:
Roof over Museum Bay (Reproduction of original railing from dwg’s)
Roof over Shift Office: (Dark anodized air craft cable railing)

Windows:
Majority of the original windows have been removed and are no longer available for restoration or reuse.

Any remaining existing original windows will be removed restored and reinstalled with the exception of the three existing windows on the second floor facing Kentucky. These windows will be removed and salvaged to the owner and replaced with egress compliant windows of similar construction to those previously retrofitted.
INTERIOR MATERIALS LIST

Flooring:
Carpet Tile/V.C.T./Sealed Concrete/Wood Dance Flooring in lower level multipurpose room/weight room flooring in Physical Fitness

Base Material:
Glazed Structural Clay Tile where possible to retain/Wood/Rubber Base

Wall Finish Material:
Glazed Structural Clay Tile where possible to retain/Exposed brick masonry in apparatus bay (paint removal required)/Painted existing plaster and new gypsum board

Ceiling Finish Material:
Dryfall paint in lower level multi-purpose room/Painted Gypsum Board/Acoustical Tile

Casework:
Stainless Steel casework & countertops in Station Kitchen/P-Lam casework/Solid Surface & p-lam countertops
ROOF REPLACEMENT GENERAL NOTES:
1. DO NOT SCALE THESE DRAWINGS.
2. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS.
3. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY ACTUAL ROOFING DIMENSIONS PRIOR TO BID AND PERFORMING WORK. REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO THE ARCHITECT.
4. NAILERS SHALL BE SECURLEY ANCHORED TO THE EXISTING DECK TO RESIST A MINIMUM FORCE OF 300 POUNDS PER LINEAR FOOT. FOLLOW FACTORY MUTUAL LOSS PREVENTION DATA SHEET 1-49 RECOMMENDATIONS.
5. THE THICKNESS OF THE NAILER SHALL MATCH THE HEIGHT OF THE INSULATION OR SURFACE TO WHICH THE MEMBRANE IS TO BE APPLIED AT ROOF EDGE CONDITIONS FOR AREAS OTHER THAN AT PARAPETS.

ROOF DEMOLITION NOTES:
1. CONTRACTOR SHALL REMOVE AND PROPERLY DISPOSE OF EXISTING ROOFING AND INSULATION BACK TO THE EXISTING CONCRETE OR STEEL DECK - TYPICAL FOR THE ENTIRE ROOF AREA.
2. CONTRACTOR SHALL CLEAN AND SCOPE EXISTING ROOF DRAINS, AND PROVIDE DOCUMENTATION OF POSITIVE FLOW.
3. CONTRACTOR SHALL REMOVE ONLY THE AMOUNT OF ROOFING THAT CAN BE REPLACED WITH NEW ROOFING IN THE SAME DAY.
4. CONTRACTOR SHALL DRY-IN THE THE LINE BETWEEN NEWLY INSTALLATED ROOFING AND EXISTING ROOFING MATERIALS AT THE END OF EACH DAYS WORK.
5. CONTRACTOR SHALL INSPECT EXISTING DECK MATERIAL TO INSURE INTEGRITY AND APPROPRIATENESS FOR NEW ROOFING INSTALLATION AND REPORT ANY DEFICIENCIES TO THE ARCHITECT.
A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00295  1101 Massachusetts Street; Rehabilitation; State Law Review and Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is a contributing structure to Lawrence’s Downtown Historic District, National Register of Historic Places, and is located in the environs of South Park (1140-1141 Massachusetts Street), Watkins Bank Building (1047 Massachusetts Street) and the Douglas County Courthouse (1100 Massachusetts Street), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the Downtown Conservation Overlay District. Submitted by TreanorHL on behalf of 1101 Mass LLC, property owner of record.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant is requesting rehabilitation which will include some restoration of original historical elements. The applicant proposes removal of the existing façade coverings to expose original details and to restore and recreate the historical storefront based on photographic images from the early 1900’s. The project will repair and restore all other existing cornice and ornamental work as well as remove a non-original entrance portico on the north side of the building. All wood windows will be repaired and replaced as required. Repair and replacement of existing skylights as well as re-structuring the existing roof framing system will also take place.
Interior work will consist of preparing the spaces to be tenant ready for finish with all tenant improvements to be submitted under separate permits. The applicant proposes to install an elevator to connect all 3 floors. New mechanical, electrical & plumbing systems will be installed as well as a fire suppression system. The largest interior improvement will be the total reconstruction of the second floor structural system.

There is no new signage proposed with the project.

The applicant is seeking State and Federal Tax Credit assistance with the project.

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.

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.
D. STAFF ANALYSIS

History
According to the National Register Nomination for Lawrence's Downtown Commercial Historic District, the district comprises the extant core of the historic central business district of Lawrence, Kansas. It is generally located along Massachusetts Street between 6th and South Park Streets. Massachusetts Street is the primary north/south artery through the downtown. A grid-system of streets in Lawrence's downtown runs to the four compass points. Lawrence's downtown is located on a generally level area which slopes gently down to the Kansas River to the north. Diagonal parking is provided along Massachusetts Street, and parallel parking along New Hampshire and Vermont Streets.

The vast majority of buildings in the district are the commercial block property type. These commercial buildings feature a distinction between the storefront level and the upper zone. Most of the storefront levels have large display windows flanking an entry which is generally recessed. Second story windows are usually narrower than those on the first floor. Most have flat roofs with symmetrically arranged facades.

The commercial architectural styles in the district range from those found in the late Victorian era through those of the early to mid-twentieth century, with some examples of Modern architecture as well. Even though constructed over a period spanning several decades, the majority of contributing buildings within the district share similar building features, forms and massing as well as a shared history.
The subject property is located at 1101-1103 Massachusetts Street/105 W. 11th Street and is commonly known as the J. E. Stubbs Building circa 1909. It is a contributing structure to the district. According to the National Register Nomination for the historic district, this is a large corner two-part commercial block building with Classical Revival style features. The building is angled at the northeast corner. Its upper story is clad in hard-fired red brick. There are four windows on the second story of the east elevation. These are 12/1 double hung and have thin stone labels above with a simple stone sill. One window also has a Gibbs surround (jambs with protruding blocks and quoin) without keystones. This window has two panes in the upper sash, while the lower sash has a stone panel carved with “J.E. Stubbs Building 1909.” The window at the angled corner has a decorative surround of small stone and brick panels, giving the appearance of quoin or blocks. The north elevation has seven pairs of 9/1 double-hung windows, all sharing a thin stone label above and a stone sill below. Above the windows is a very wide, overhanging metal cornice supported by brackets with impost, with paired brackets at the building’s corner. There is a corbelled band of bricks below that form dentils. A parapet roof above has regularly spaced short brick pilasters. The parapet at the angled corner of the building rises in a shallow pediment with a stone fleur-de-lis decoration. There are two storefronts on the east (Massachusetts) elevation, and one of the north (11th Street) elevation. The two storefronts on the east elevation share a flat projecting metal canopy, and a signboard formed by corrugated metal covering the transom area. The southern storefront has a recessed entry at the north end, with full height display windows which angle in to meet the door. The northern storefront has a recessed entry, and display windows on the north which have glazed tile block kick plates. There is another entry at the northeast angled entry, which has an aluminum framed door and display windows, also with glazed tile block kick plates. The first story of the north elevation has two small square windows with narrow stone sills and wide flat stone lintels. There are also three entry doors at the west end. The centered entry door has a full Classical Revival surround with engaged pilasters supported by a
Another door is found centered within the western storefront. It has a stone arched transom above supported by two brick columns, and is flanked by display windows.

**Project Review**

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, as part of a district, or in the case of a Certificate of Appropriateness, located in the environs of a listed property or 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 proposed project consists of both restoration and rehabilitation; repair and replacement of the structural deficiencies of the structure; and preparation of the interior space for tenant finish. Improvements include replacing all mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems, installation of a fire-suppression system, and the addition of an elevator connecting all three floors. All additional tenant finishes will be reviewed under individual tenant permit applications.

The restoration of the historical store front based on photographic images from the early 1900’s will include removal of the existing façade coverings to expose original work. All other historical cornice and ornamental work will be restored or repaired as appropriate. The masonry will be repointed where required along with cleaning of limestone. The project will also remove a non-original entrance portico on the north side of the building. All wood windows will be restored or replaced as required. There will be repair and replacement of existing skylights and additional new skylights will be installed. The skylights will be pyramidal double hip glass with metal frame. The restoration of these features based on the historic photograph and architectural evidence meet the applicable standards and guidelines. It will be important during the rehabilitation process to make sure the bulkhead, storefront glazing, and transom areas continue to be proportionate as shown in the historic photograph.

There is very little evidence of balcony structures on historic buildings during the historic period of downtown Lawrence. Balconies, however, did exist on some structures downtown and on the southeast corner of this structure as shown by the historic photograph below. The restoration of a balcony for this structure does not set a precedent for the addition of balconies to other structures because there is documentation that a balcony existed on this structure. If future applicants propose balconies for historic structures, similar evidence will be required for approval.
The interior work will include the installation of a 3 story elevator, installation of new mechanical, plumbing and electrical systems and preparation of the spaces for future tenant finish. The existing roof framing system will be restructured. The scope of the project also includes the removal of a second floor that is completely failing. A shoring plan will be obtained from the structural engineer when the construction team has been selected. The design team is finalizing the method of removal and replacement of the floor. All interior lighting changes will be current day fixtures that emulate the period fixture as seen in historical interior photographs. Cut sheets will be provided.

**State Law Review**

The City of Lawrence has an agreement with the State Historic Preservation Officer to conduct reviews required under K.S.A. 75-2724 using the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. The Historic Resources Commission is charged with determining whether or not projects will “damage or destroy” historic resources. Interior alterations are also included in this review.

Standards 1, 2, and 6 apply to this project.

Standard 1 is met by continuing the use of the structure for uses that have historically existed in the structure. The project is maintaining the downtown ground floor storefront with the upper stories prepared for future tenant use. The interior alterations in the primary areas of the structure are being restored or repaired.

Standard 2 is met by the restoration of any historical elements including the storefront, wood
windows, cornices and all ornamental work. All items will be repaired and only replaced in-kind if repair is not possible.

Standard 6 is met by the restoration and repair of historical elements that will replicate the original structure. Design elements such as cornices, windows, doors, materials and architectural details will be repaired or replaced in-kind. Replacement of the existing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence such as the replacement of the historic storefront to match historical photos.

Certificate of Appropriateness
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. Interior alterations are not included in this review.

In addition to review by 22-505, the proposed alterations and new construction should be reviewed using the design criteria in 22-506. These design criteria help to promote the standards set forth in 22-505. Specifically, 22-506(c)(2) provides review criteria for additions to existing buildings. Identified criteria for new additions 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 structure is located in the environs of South Park (1140-1141 Massachusetts Street), Watkins Bank Building (1047 Massachusetts Street) and the Douglas County Courthouse (1100 Massachusetts Street). The property is located in all three environs definitions in the downtown commercial core. The definitions respond to this location and reflect that properties should continue to represent the historic downtown patterns. Interior work is not covered in this review. The storefront restoration meets the review criteria for all three environs definitions.

Downtown Design Guidelines Review
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.

E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

State Law Review
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).
Certificate of Appropriateness

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 landmarks or their environs and issue the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed project.
DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

PROPERTY INFORMATION
Address of Property 1101 Massachusetts Street
Legal Description (may be attached) Park Lots 17, 19 & 21, City of Lawrence

OWNER INFORMATION
Name(s) 1101 Mass LLC
Contact Matt Gilhousen
Address 602 Walnut St.
City Lawrence State KS ZIP 66046
Phone (__) 785-331-8678 Fax (__)
E-mail matt@tradewindenergy.com Cell Phone (___)

APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION
Contact Chris Cunningham
Company TreanorHL
Address 1040 Vermont Street
City Lawrence State KS ZIP 66044
Phone (__) 785-842-4858 Fax (__)
E-mail ccunningham@treanorhl.com Cell Phone (___)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Zoning CD-UC</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Commercial</th>
<th>Proposed Land Use Commercial</th>
<th># of Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area 6,201</td>
<td>Existing Building Footprint 5,920</td>
<td>Proposed Building Footprint 5,920</td>
<td>Open Space Area 281sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

The project includes the following work:
- Removal of existing facade coverings to expose original work
- Restoration and recreation of historical storefront based on photographic images from early 1900's
- Repair / restoration of all other existing comice and ornamental work
- Pointing of masonry where required along with cleaning of limestone
- Removal of non-original entrance portico on North side of building
- Repair and / or replacement of existing wood windows - as required
- All spaces to be shelled out to a white box condition, prepared for tenant finish
- All tenant finish work to be submitted under separate submittal
- Installation of elevator to connect all 3 floors
- Existing tenant (Mass Street Soda) will be temporarily moved during construction
- Building to receive new MEP systems and Fire Suppression system
- Re-Structuring of the existing roof framing system
- Removal and replacement of existing 2nd floor floor to allow for a flat floor
- Repair and replacement of existing skylights along with installation of new skylights

Reason for Request:  
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

The building is listed as a contributing building in the Downtown Lawrence Historic district. The building ownership group is also seeking state and federal tax credit assistance with the project.
Architect/Engineer/Contractor Information: Please provide name and phone number of any persons associated with the project.

Contact _________________________________ Same as Applicant _________________________________

Company _________________________________

Address _________________________________

City _________________________________ State _______ ZIP _______

Phone (____) _________________________________ Fax (____) _________________________________

E-mail _________________________________ 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 5-31-17

____________________________________________ Date __________________________________

____________________________________________ Date __________________________________

Note: If signing by agent submit Owner Authorization Form

Application Form 06/2016                                      Page 3 of 4          Design Review Application
OWNER AUTHORIZATION

I/WE 1101 Mass LLC, hereby referred to as the "Undersigned", being of lawful age, do hereby on this 31st day of May, 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:

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

2. I/We the undersigned, have previously authorized and hereby authorize TreanorHL (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 1101 Massachusetts (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

STATE OF KANSAS
COUNTY OF DOUGLAS

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on this 5th day of June, 2017, by Matt Gilhousen.

My Commission Expires: 4/26/21

4/26/21 Emma Elaine Bartke
Notary Public

Owner Authorization Form 12/09
SCOPE OF WORK:
- Address life safety issues
- Rework exterior façade to 'original' condition
- Repair and replace sidewalks
- Repair window wells along North sidewalk
- Abate asbestos (basement & 1st level)
- Address all deferred maintenance items
  - Paint all exterior trim, windows and doors
  - Repair and/or replace deteriorated exterior trim
  - Point masonry as required
  - Fix all exterior windows to operable condition
  - Repair roof leaks / downspout gutter replacement
- Remove all suspended and wall mounted condensing units to roof
- Remove Galvanized piping and replace with copper
- Install roof hatch and ladder
- New MEP systems throughout
- Restructure 2nd floor / level and install new wood floors
- Re-work bearing condition of roof
- Insulate roof to meet current energy codes
- Enlarge and open all existing skylights to original
- Install Elevator
- Install building sprinkler system 1101 Mass (North Suite) & 1101 ½ Mass (Upstairs)
- White box space to leaseable condition
- Demo all un-needed items
- Repair / Replace tin ceiling
- Repair and refinish wood floors
- Upgrade / Update MEP services
- Upgrade / Update Mechanical Systems
- 1103 Mass (South Suite) – Mass Street Soda Shop
- Remove Asbestos
- Address items noted in inspection report

REVISIONS

LOCATION MAP

SHEET INDEX
- ARCHITECTURAL:
  - A101 BTH PLAN
  - A105 FLOOR PLAN
  - A104 LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN
  - A201 2nd FLOOR PLAN
  - ELEVATIONS

PHOTO CREDIT: PICTORIAL HISTORY OF LAWRENCE, VIRGINIA BEERY SHAW AND WATKINS COMMUNITY MUSEUM
W 11TH STREET (RW = 80')

SITE PLAN NOTES
1. EXISTING CURB AND GUTTER TO REMAIN, PATCH AND REPAIR AS NEEDED
2. EXISTING CONCRETE SIDEWALK, REPAIR AND REPLACE METAL GRATES
3. REPAIR ALL UTILITY POLES AND UFMM REAR TO MATCH CITY STANDARD
4. EXISTING LANDSCAPE AREA/PLANTER TO REMAIN
5. EXISTING HEAT/FIRE HYDRANTS TO REMAIN
6. EXISTING STEEL GATE/LOCK TO REMAIN
7. EXISTING CEMENT STEP TO REMOVE AND REPLACE WITH LIMESTONE STEP
8. EXISTING BUILDING SETBACK PER CITY ZONING
9. AC UNIT SERVING 1101 MASSACHUSETTS STREET TO REMOVE
10. EXISTING UTILITY POLES TO REMOVE
11. EXISTING STREET TREE AND TREE GRATE TO REMOVE
12. NEW STREET TREE AND TREE GRATE PER CITY STANDARD (TYPICAL OF 3)

1/8" = 1'-0"
A. SUMMARY
DR-17-00293 1208 Mississippi Street; Rehabilitation; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness, and Oread Design Guidelines. The property is a contributing structure to the Hancock Historic District, National Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the environs of the Jane A Snow Residence (706 W 12th Street), and is located in the Conservation Overlay District - Hancock Historic District - UC4. Submitted by TreanorHL on behalf of Classical Developments LLC, property owner of record.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The applicant is requesting to rehabilitate the structure located at 1208 Mississippi Street and convert the use back to a single-dwelling structure. The project proposes to remove a non-original sleeping porch on the south side of the rear elevation and removal of the enclosed porch entrance on the north side of the rear elevation. Other exterior changes include the addition of a dormer that was previously removed when the existing addition was added. The new dormer would replicate the original. A new rear porch and mudroom addition is also proposed. Repairs also include restructuring and repair of the front porch.
The scope of the interior changes include reworking of the existing kitchen, conversion of one bedroom upstairs to a master bathroom, reworking the downstairs to include new mechanical room, laundry and guest suite. Mold remediation is required throughout.

New mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems are proposed.

There is an associated lot line adjustment that is required to move a lot line between 1208 and 1218 Mississippi. The lot line would move 20’ feet to the south. A Minor Subdivision application for the lot line adjustment has not been submitted.

**It should be noted that this project design is based on a minor subdivision that has not been submitted, reviewed, or approved. Changes required by the minor subdivision process may require additional review by the Historic Resources Commission.**

The project is also seeking State and Federal Tax Credit assistance for the project.
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.

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 project is located in the environs of the Jane A. Snow House. The Snow House was listed in the Lawrence Register of Historic Places prior to the practice of adopting environs definitions for properties as they are listed.

D. STAFF ANALYSIS

History

According to the National Register Nomination for the Hancock District

The Hancock District is located adjacent to the north edge of the University of Kansas in blocks 8 and 9 of the Oread Addition subdivision. The district encompasses approximately two blocks of dwellings and outbuildings. The district includes the properties on the north and south sides of the 700 block of W. 12th Street, as well as adjacent properties on Mississippi Street, Indiana Street and Oread Avenue.

The district’s character reflects the description set forth in the MPDF for the period between 1900 and 1945, a Quiet University Town. Many of the houses in the district were built for instructors and the University of Kansas and every building in the district has housed at least one person associated with the University. The topography and landscaping of W. 12th Street and Mississippi shield the houses from the students that have passed by daily for nearly a century. The properties range from small bungalows to impressive architect-designed homes to a 1922 apartment building. Most of the buildings retain their integrity in design and materials. The shaded streets still have stone retaining walls and decorative planted areas in the medians, elements considered character-defining features of the district.

The period of significance, 1907-1925, matches a time of intense building activity on the nearby campus of the University of Kansas. The school grew to become a well-established academic center between 1880 and 1900 and several new buildings, now demolished, were constructed during these early years. Between 1902 and 1918, the substantial buildings that provide the mainstay of today’s campus were constructed. This period of tangible campus growth undoubtedly influenced nearby residential construction.
The district consists of eleven dwellings, nine contributing and two non-contributing, and two non-contributing garages. The house styles of the Hancock Historic District are fairly evenly divided among 20th Century types. Housing styles within the district include: Colonial Revival (3), Prairie (3), Craftsman (3), Shingle (1) and Commercial Style (1).

The subject property located at 1208 Mississippi is known as the Parks House, circa 1907 and is a contributing structure to the district.

The two-story, side-gable, frame Colonial Revival dwelling sits on an exposed rusticated limestone foundation. Paired wood piers placed on stone piers support the roof of the integrated front porch. The house is clad in wide clapboards. The gambrel roof has two shed dormers on the façade. A brick chimney rises on the north side. The house has a two-story, flat-roofed extension on the south side, a one-story, shed-roofed extension on the north side and a two-story, shed-roofed extension on the rear. The Colonial Revival Style, identified primarily by a symmetrical façade, an accentuated entrance and the decorative use of columns or pilasters, can be seen at 1208 Mississippi. The house features an entrance emphasized by a portico and a doorway with sidelights. The gambrel roof, dormers and integrated front porch support the columns places the structure squarely in the Colonial Revival Category.

The property significantly increased in value between 1907 and 1908, when Eleanor Parks was the owner. City directories listed Alexander Parks (trav. Agt.), wife Mary E. and Mary Parks (boarding as residents in 1907). Willis K. Folks (Lawrence Realty Co.) purchased the property and is listed as a resident in 1908 through 1911 with his wife Emma. Sarah Fox purchased the property in 1911. The house is listed as the residence of Samuel L. and Sarah Fox in the 1915 through 1919 city directories. It is listed as the Wita Wenton House, group living quarters, from 1923 to 1926. Jone Ise (inst. KU) and wife Lillie are listed as owners from 1927 to 1930. The house is shown on the 1927 Sanborn map as a two-story dwelling with an integrated full front porch.

Project Review
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, as part of a district, or in the case of a Certificate of Appropriateness, located in the environs of a listed property or 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 project will consist of converting the property to single dwelling use. This will include substantial rehabilitation, repair and replacement of historic elements of the structure. The non-original sleeping porch on the south side of the rear elevation will be removed in its entirety and a
rear porch addition will be added in this location. The attachment of the new porch should not
damage the existing structure. This is addressed by its self-supporting construction. Attachment
details should be provided to show minimal impact. Plumbing, mechanical and electrical fixtures
will be removed and replaced with new. Mold remediation and interior modifications to the space
will also take place.

Exterior changes include changes to door and window openings, flipping the existing door swing
and hardware. Removing an existing door and window and placing a new door opening in the old
window location is also proposed. An exterior wood stair, landing and railings will be removed on
the east elevation and this area will be landscaped.

The new addition will be a self-supported addition that will tie into the existing roof at the eave line
so that the roof transition to the standing seam metal roof is continuous. The standing seam roof is
suitable because the addition is new and not visible from the street.

The matching dormer to the north dormer on the east elevation has been framed over by the
 southern two-story porch. The existing two-story addition will be carefully removed so that it can
be preserved and repaired to match the other existing dormers. The existing northern entry porch
is framed in below the eave and can be easily removed without damage to the existing structure.

Interior walls will be removed to reconfigure spaces. An interior door will be removed to return to
an open stair landing. The original newel post to the ceiling will be maintained. A cut into an
interior wall will create a new mechanical room door. Wood paneling, crown molding and built-in
cabinetry is throughout the first floor living room, second floor living room, second floor dining room
and the stairwell to the third level and are to be preserved. All other significant items will be
preserved where possible, such as doors, trim, hardware, etc. Flooring, ceiling and some interior
finishes will be removed, replaced and refinished. A further mold inspection and remediation report
has been ordered and will confirm the extent of existing material that will need to be removed and
how it should be remediated. A closet will be removed. All interior walls that are required to be
removed will be documented. Some of the interior historical fabric and finishes may need to be
removed. This will be minimized and general finishes should not damage the remaining historical
elements.

A new wood framed back porch will be installed and the front porch floor, roof and columns will be
repaired.

**State Law Review**

The City of Lawrence has an agreement with the State Historic Preservation Officer to conduct
reviews required under K.S.A. 75-2724 using the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The Historic
Resources Commission is charged with determining whether or not projects will “damage or
destroy” historic resources. Interior alterations are also included in this review.

Standards 1, 2, 6, 9 and 10 apply to this project.

Standard 1 is met by returning the use of the structure to the original single family dwelling use.
Standard 2 is met by removing non-original elements such as the sleeping porch and repairing and restoring the existing historical elements of the structure. New elements and details such as the dormer will be built to match the existing historical dormer. The new dormer is being constructed in the location that an original dormer was located and had since been removed by constructed alterations.

Standard 6 will be met by repairing and replacing all historical elements as required. New elements will match the existing historical elements in design, color and texture and, where possible, the same materials will be used. Wood windows, doors and hardware will be repaired and replaced as required.

Standards 9 and 10 speak to the compatibility of the proposed dormer and new rear porch and mudroom addition. The additions attempt to minimize the loss of historic materials that characterize the property. The dormer will replicate the original dormer that was removed to construct a sleeping porch. The removal of the rear sleeping porch allows for the rebuilding of this dormer. The addition of the rear porch is respectful of the historic character of the structure. The use of materials are compatible and the design maintains the essential form and integrity of the historical property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The new rear addition is compatible with the listed structure in size, scale, massing, materials, and location. It is subordinate to the listed structure.

Certificate of Appropriateness

Environs 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. Interior alterations are not included in this review.

In addition to review by 22-505, the proposed alterations and new construction should be reviewed using the design criteria in 22-506. These design criteria help to promote the standards set forth in 22-505. Specifically, 22-506(c)(2) provides review criteria for additions to existing buildings. Identified criteria for new additions 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 Jane A Snow Residence (706 W 12th Street). The Snow Residence was listed in the Lawrence Register of Historic Places prior to the adoption of the environs definition process.

Standards 1 and 9 apply to this project.

All of the exterior work on the historic structure is repair and replacement in-kind if necessary.
The existing non-character defining addition will be removed and a new addition constructed on the rear of the structure. The new addition is subordinate to the historic structure and is compatible in size, scale, massing, materials, and placement.

**Oread Design Guidelines**
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 Oread Design Guidelines and determined that the project, as proposed, meets these development and design standards.

**E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**State Law Review**
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).

**Certificate of Appropriateness**
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 landmarks or their environs and issue the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed project.
DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

PROPERTY INFORMATION
Address of Property 1208 Mississippi Street
Legal Description (may be attached) Read Addition Block 8 Lot 11, City of Lawrence

OWNER INFORMATION
Name(s) Classical Developments LLC
Contact Mike Heitman
Address 3715 Shawnee Mission Parkway
City Fairway State KS ZIP 66205
Phone (913) 787-3470 Fax (___) 
E-mail mike@miikeheitmann.com Cell Phone (___) 

APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION
Contact Chris Cunningham
Company TreanorHL
Address 1040 Vermont Street
City Lawrence State KS ZIP 66044
Phone (___) 785-842-4858 Fax (___) 
E-mail ccunningham@treanorhl.com Cell Phone (___) 

<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>RM 32-UC</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1</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>12,500 / 10,000</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>8,926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Pavement Coverage</th>
<th>Proposed Pavement Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you also submitting any of the following applications?
- Building Permit X
- Site Plan X
- Special Use Permit
- Zoning Change
- Variance
- State or Federal Tax Credit Application X
- Other (specify)
Property Address: 1208 Mississippi Street

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

The project includes the following work:

- Rehabilitation of existing structure to a single family home type use
- Removal of non-original sleeping porch on the South side of rear elevation
- Addition of dormer where addition was removed to replicate original
- Removal of enclosed porch entrance on the North side of the rear elevation
- New rear porch and mudroom addition
- Rework of existing kitchen and bathroom
- Conversion of one bedroom upstairs into a master bathroom
- Rework of downstairs to include new mechanical room, laundry and guest suite
- Restructuring and repair of existing front porch
- Mold remediation throughout
- New mechanical systems

-Lot adjustment is also required for this work. Existing lot line between 1208 and 1218 is to be moved 20' to the South

Reason for Request:
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

The building is listed in Hancock district nomination. The building ownership group is also seeking state and federal tax credit assistance with the project.
**Architect/Engineer/Contractor Information:** Please provide name and phone number of any persons associated with the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Same as Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone (__)</td>
<td>Fax (__)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Cell (__)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 5-31-17

Signature(s): ___________________________ Date ________________

Signature(s): ___________________________ Date ________________

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

I/WE Classical Developments LLC, hereby referred to as the "Undersigned", being of lawful age, do hereby on this 31st day of May, 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:

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

2. I/We the undersigned, have previously authorized and hereby authorize

TreasurHL (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 1208 & 1218 Mississippi Street (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  MISSOURI
COUNTY OF DOUGLAS  CLAY

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on this 31st day of May, 2017, by Michael Heitmann

______________________________  ________________________________
My Commission Expires:  Notary Public
WHITNEY BRIGGS
Notary Public - Notary Seal
State of Missouri, Clay County
Commission # 13508832
My Commission Expires Nov 13, 2017

Owner Authorization Form 12/2009
GENERAL DEMOLITION NOTES

1. REMOVE EXISTING DOOR AND WINDOW IN OLD WINDOW LOCATION, PREP FOR NEW DOOR OPENING.
2. REMOVE EXISTING DOOR IN ITS ENTIRETY: ROOF, WALLS, FLOORS, PREP FOR NEW DOOR OPENING.
3. CUT 3'X6'-8" FRAMED OPENING IN EXISTING WALL, PREP FOR NEW WOOD FRAMING.
4. REMOVE PLUMBING FIXTURES, FLOORING, AND CEILING, PREP FOR NEW FIXTURES AND FINISHES.
5. REMOVE EXISTING DOOR AND WINDOW, NEW DOOR OPENING IN OLD WINDOW LOCATION, PREP FOR NEW DOOR.
6. REMOVE CLOSET AND INFILL WALL WITH GYPSUM BOARD WALL.
7. REMOVE WALL TO EXTENT SHOWN AND PREP FLOOR FOR NEW FINISH.
8. REMOVE EXTERIOR DOOR, INFILL OPENING WITH DOUBLE HUNG WINDOW TO MATCH EXISTING STYLE AND REPLACE WALL BELOW WITH WOOD FRAMING AND SIDING.
9. REMOVE DOORS, MAINTAIN OPENING, PAINT EXISTING TRIM.
10. REMOVE DOOR AND WALL TO RETURN TO OPEN STAIR LANDING, MAINTAIN NEWELL POST TO CEILING.
11. REMOVE DOOR AND WINDOW AND INFILL WALL WITH GYPSUM BOARD WALL.
12. REMOVE WALL TO EXTENT SHOWN AND INFILL OPENING WITH GYPSUM BOARD WALL.

DEMO 06/20/17

HRC SUBMITTAL

1208 Mississippi Street
Lawrence, KS, 66045

CLASSICAL DEVELOPMENT LLC
3715 SHAWNEE MISSION PKWY
FAIRWAY, KS 66205

#1 REMOVE PORCH IN ITS ENTIRETY: ROOF, WALLS, FLOORS
2 FLIP EXISTING DOOR AND HARDWARE (SEE A101), PAINT TRIM
3 CUT 3'X6'-8" FRAMED OPENING IN EXISTING WALL 4 REMOVE PLUMBING FIXTURES, FLOORING, AND CEILING, PREP FOR NEW FIXTURES AND FINISHES
5 REMOVE EXISTING DOOR AND WINDOW, NEW DOOR OPENING IN OLD WINDOW LOCATION, PREP FOR NEW DOOR
6 REMOVE CLOSET
7 REMOVE EXTERIOR WOODEN STAIR, LANDING, RAILINGS AND PREP FOR LANDSCAPING
8 REMOVE EXTERIOR DOOR, INFILL OPENING WITH DOUBLE HUNG WINDOW TO MATCH EXISTING STYLE AND REPLACE WALL BELOW WITH WOOD FRAMING AND SIDING
9 REMOVE DOORS, MAINTAIN OPENING, PAINT EXISTING TRIM
10 REMOVE DOOR AND WALL TO RETURN TO OPEN STAIR LANDING, MAINTAIN NEWELL POST TO CEILING
11 REMOVE DOOR AND WINDOW AND INFILL WALL WITH GYPSUM BOARD WALL
12 REMOVE WALL TO EXTENT SHOWN AND PREP FLOOR FOR NEW FINISH
13 CUT OPENING IN WALL FOR NEW MECHANICAL ROOM DOOR

DEMO 06/20/17

HRC SUBMITTAL

1208 Mississippi Street
Lawrence, KS, 66045

CLASSICAL DEVELOPMENT LLC
3715 SHAWNEE MISSION PKWY
FAIRWAY, KS 66205

DATE: UNLESS A PROFESSIONAL SEAL WITH SIGNATURE AND DATE IS AFFIXED, THIS DOCUMENT IS PRELIMINARY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.

AD101

DEMO 06/20/17

HRC SUBMITTAL

1208 Mississippi Street
Lawrence, KS, 66045

CLASSICAL DEVELOPMENT LLC
3715 SHAWNEE MISSION PKWY
FAIRWAY, KS 66205

#1 REMOVE PORCH IN ITS ENTIRETY: ROOF, WALLS, FLOORS
2 FLIP EXISTING DOOR AND HARDWARE (SEE A101), PAINT TRIM
3 CUT 3'X6'-8" FRAMED OPENING IN EXISTING WALL 4 REMOVE PLUMBING FIXTURES, FLOORING, AND CEILING, PREP FOR NEW FIXTURES AND FINISHES
5 REMOVE EXISTING DOOR AND WINDOW, NEW DOOR OPENING IN OLD WINDOW LOCATION, PREP FOR NEW DOOR
6 REMOVE CLOSET
7 REMOVE EXTERIOR WOODEN STAIR, LANDING, RAILINGS AND PREP FOR LANDSCAPING
8 REMOVE EXTERIOR DOOR, INFILL OPENING WITH DOUBLE HUNG WINDOW TO MATCH EXISTING STYLE AND REPLACE WALL BELOW WITH WOOD FRAMING AND SIDING
9 REMOVE DOORS, MAINTAIN OPENING, PAINT EXISTING TRIM
10 REMOVE DOOR AND WALL TO RETURN TO OPEN STAIR LANDING, MAINTAIN NEWELL POST TO CEILING
11 REMOVE DOOR AND WINDOW AND INFILL WALL WITH GYPSUM BOARD WALL
12 REMOVE WALL TO EXTENT SHOWN AND PREP FLOOR FOR NEW FINISH
13 CUT OPENING IN WALL FOR NEW MECHANICAL ROOM DOOR

DEMO 06/20/17

HRC SUBMITTAL

1208 Mississippi Street
Lawrence, KS, 66045

CLASSICAL DEVELOPMENT LLC
3715 SHAWNEE MISSION PKWY
FAIRWAY, KS 66205

DATE: UNLESS A PROFESSIONAL SEAL WITH SIGNATURE AND DATE IS AFFIXED, THIS DOCUMENT IS PRELIMINARY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.

AD101

DEMO 06/20/17

HRC SUBMITTAL

1208 Mississippi Street
Lawrence, KS, 66045

CLASSICAL DEVELOPMENT LLC
3715 SHAWNEE MISSION PKWY
FAIRWAY, KS 66205

#1 REMOVE PORCH IN ITS ENTIRETY: ROOF, WALLS, FLOORS
2 FLIP EXISTING DOOR AND HARDWARE (SEE A101), PAINT TRIM
3 CUT 3'X6'-8" FRAMED OPENING IN EXISTING WALL 4 REMOVE PLUMBING FIXTURES, FLOORING, AND CEILING, PREP FOR NEW FIXTURES AND FINISHES
5 REMOVE EXISTING DOOR AND WINDOW, NEW DOOR OPENING IN OLD WINDOW LOCATION, PREP FOR NEW DOOR
6 REMOVE CLOSET
7 REMOVE EXTERIOR WOODEN STAIR, LANDING, RAILINGS AND PREP FOR LANDSCAPING
8 REMOVE EXTERIOR DOOR, INFILL OPENING WITH DOUBLE HUNG WINDOW TO MATCH EXISTING STYLE AND REPLACE WALL BELOW WITH WOOD FRAMING AND SIDING
9 REMOVE DOORS, MAINTAIN OPENING, PAINT EXISTING TRIM
10 REMOVE DOOR AND WALL TO RETURN TO OPEN STAIR LANDING, MAINTAIN NEWELL POST TO CEILING
11 REMOVE DOOR AND WINDOW AND INFILL WALL WITH GYPSUM BOARD WALL
12 REMOVE WALL TO EXTENT SHOWN AND PREP FLOOR FOR NEW FINISH
13 CUT OPENING IN WALL FOR NEW MECHANICAL ROOM DOOR

DEMO 06/20/17

HRC SUBMITTAL

1208 Mississippi Street
Lawrence, KS, 66045

CLASSICAL DEVELOPMENT LLC
3715 SHAWNEE MISSION PKWY
FAIRWAY, KS 66205

DATE: UNLESS A PROFESSIONAL SEAL WITH SIGNATURE AND DATE IS AFFIXED, THIS DOCUMENT IS PRELIMINARY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.
**GENERAL NOTES**

1. **SOUTH ELEVATION**
   - E01 NEW ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOF, REPAIR & PATCH SUBSTRATE AS REQUIRED
   - E02 NEW DORMER TO MATCH EXISTING E03 REPAIR/REPLACE EXISTING DOUBLE HUNG WINDOWS AS REQUIRED (TYP OF ALL)
   - E04 REPAIR & RECLAD BEAM AT PORCH ROOF E05 POINT MASONRY AS REQUIRED (TYP OF ALL)
   - E06 NEW PORCH STRUCTURE, FLOOR & RAILING, MATCH EXISTING
   - E07 RE-BUILD PORCH COLUMNS TO MATCH EXISTING (TYP OF ALL)
   - E08 EXISTING SHINGLES, PATCH AS NEEDED & PAINT
   - E09 POINT CHIMNEYS & INSPECT FOR INTERNAL DAMAGE. REPAIR AS REQUIRED. CAP UNUSED CHIMNEY
   - E10 PATCH & REPAIR ALL SIDING AS NEEDED. PAINT & CAULK
   - E11 NEW SIDING (MATCH EXISTING)
   - E12 NEW STANDING SEAM METAL ROOFING
   - E13 NEW PRE-FINISHED GUTTERS & DOWNSPOUTS THROUGHOUT
   - E14 NEW PICKET SHINGLE DETAIL TO MATCH PREVIOUS PORCH

2. **WEST ELEVATION**
   - A1
   - C1

**KEYNOTES**

- DATE: 06/20/17
- HRC SUBMITTAL
- 1208 Mississippi
- 1208 Mississippi Street
- Lawrence, KS, 66045
- GENERAL NOTES
- REVIEWS
- NO. DESCRIPTION DATE

**REVISIONS**

- 1/4" = 1'-0"
KEYNOTES

E01 NEW ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOF, REPAIR & PATCH AS SUBSTRATE AS REQUIRED
E02 NEW DORMER TO MATCH EXISTING
E03 REPAIR/REPLACE EXISTING DOUBLE HUNG WINDOWS AS REQUIRED (TYP OF ALL)
E05 POINT MASONRY AS REQUIRED (TYP OF ALL)
E06 NEW PORCH STRUCTURE, FLOOR & RAILING, MATCH EXISTING
E07 RE-BUILD PORCH COLUMNS TO MATCH EXISTING (TYP OF ALL)
E08 EXISTING SHINGLES, PATCH AS NEEDED & PAINT
E09 POINT CHIMNEYS & INSPECT FOR INTERNAL DAMAGE. REPAIR AS REQUIRED. CAP UNUSED CHIMNEY
E10 PATCH & REPAIR ALL SIDING AS NEEDED. PAINT & CAULK
E11 NEW SIDING (MATCH EXISTING)
E12 NEW STANDING SEAM METAL ROOFING
E13 NEW PRE-FINISHED GUTTERS & DOWNSPOUTS THROUGHOUT
E14 NEW PICKET SHINGLE DETAIL TO MATCH PREVIOUS PORCH
UNA-CLAD™
Metal Roofing Systems
VERSATILE • SUSTAINABLE • BEAUTIFUL
Since the introduction of UNA-CLAD Metal Roofing Systems more than 30 years ago, they have become one of the leading architectural metal roofing products in the construction industry. Firestone Building Products systems are recognized the world over for their outstanding construction and innovative design.

UNA-CLAD offers a variety of sustainable, reliable and environmentally-friendly roofing system options. UNA-CLAD allows for maximum design freedom with a wide range of materials, widths and finishes.

To further protect your investment, install the roofing system over our innovative new CLAD-GARD™ roofing underlayment. This easy-to-handle skid-resistant material is the ideal moisture barrier to protect your roofing investment from corrosion and other environmental concerns.

And once your roof is installed, the unparalleled Red Shield® Warranty assures that your roof will provide outstanding performance for decades to come.

Thank you for your interest in Firestone Building Products UNA-CLAD roofing systems. For detailed information about anything covered in this brochure, please contact your local Firestone Representative or visit www.firestonebpo.com.
To help prevent distortion (called “oil-canning”) that can occur on metal roofs, Firestone Building Products offers a variety of stiffening rib profile options. Striations, Flat Ribs and Pencil Ribs are subtly raised sections that run parallel to panel seams and add rigidity and visual interest. Not all profiles are available on all panels, please see each product description for details.

When we say “Nobody Covers You Better” we mean it. Red Shield Warranties provide industry-leading coverages from 5 to 20 years for most roofing systems, and can even be transferred from owner to owner. No competitor can match our 100 year+ heritage of innovation and customer support. When you have a Firestone roof and Red Shield Warranty over your head, you can be confident of outstanding roofing performance for decades to come.*

* Subject to certain terms and conditions. 25 year warranty coverage may be available with the UC-4 system.
RED SHIELD™ WARRANTY SYSTEMS

RED SHIELD STANDING SEAM ROOFING SYSTEMS COMPRISE A SYSTEM OF INTERLOCKING METAL PANELS THAT GENERALLY RUN VERTICALLY FROM THE ROOF RIDGE TO THE EAVES. THE SEAM WHERE THE TWO PANELS JOIN TOGETHER IS RAISED ABOVE THE SURFACE OF THE PANEL, THEREBY GIVING THE PRODUCT ITS NAME.

These metal roofs freely expand and contract with the weather without damage to the substrate, provide exceptional rain and snow runoff, perform well in high-wind environments, minimize oil-canning and provide great design versatility.

FIRESTONE UNA-CLAD™ RED SHIELD SERIES

Building on proven standing seam technology, Firestone developed the UNA-CLAD Red Shield Series to provide designers, architects and building owners with a wide selection of beautiful, durable and functional metal roofs. The Red Shield Series is available in a variety of colors, materials, widths, textures, profiles and seam designs.

UNA-CLAD UC-3

This double-lock standing seam system uses mechanical sealing for a durable, virtually leak proof seal. UC-3 roofs create a traditional look, and allow specified radius profiles to enhance the architect’s design.

Standard UC-3 materials are painted steel; painted and anodized aluminum; architectural grade sheet copper and zinc.

Available with embossing, striations and ribs (flat and pencil) to minimize oil-canning.

UNA-CLAD UC-4

The patented seam design snap locks securely and fastens to a solid substrate without the use of clips. This provides superior leak resistance and can reduce labor by up to 30%.

Standard UC-4 materials are painted steel; painted and anodized aluminum and architectural grade sheet copper. Available with embossing, striations and ribs (flat and pencil) to minimize oil-canning.
UNA-CLAD UC-6
The double-lock standing seam system utilizes proven Pittsburg Locking in conjunction with a floating concealed-clip assembly. This design allows for free expansion and contraction, and outstanding wind uplift resistance.

Standard UC-6 materials are painted steel; painted and anodized aluminum; architectural grade sheet copper and zinc. Available with embossing, striations and ribs (flat and pencil) to minimize oil-canning.

UNA-CLAD UC-14
The concealed-clip snap-lock seam system eliminates the need for mechanical seaming or separate battens, accommodating very long panels while maintaining free expansion and contraction capability.

Standard UC-14 materials are painted steel; painted and anodized aluminum and architectural grade sheet copper. Available with embossing, striations and ribs (flat and pencil) to minimize oil-canning.
ARCHITECTURAL

BATTENS ARE DISTINCTIVE ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES. PANEL SYSTEMS WITH BATTENS OR CAPS ALLOW FOR THE PANELS TO BE INSTALLED IN NON-SEQUENTIAL ORDER, THUS ACCOMMODATING COMPLEX ROOF DESIGNS. THESE PANELS CAN BE COUNTED ON TO ALLOW FREE EXPANSION AND CONTRACTION IN CHANGING WEATHER CONDITIONS, AS WELL AS PROVIDE EXCEPTIONAL RAIN/SNOW RUNOFF AND GOOD WIND UPLIFT PERFORMANCE.

THESE PANELS AND BATTENS ARE ROLL-FORMED AND PROCESSED WITH STATE-OF-THE-ART TECHNOLOGY TO ENSURE UNPARALLELED QUALITY AND SERVICE FROM COIL TO FINISHED PRODUCT.

FIRESTONE UNA-CLAD™ ARCHITECTURAL SERIES
Firestone developed the UNA-CLAD Architectural Series to allow designers, architects and building owners to utilize the unique profile a batten roof delivers. In addition to their beautiful appearance, these metal roofing systems are reliable and durable. The Architectural Series is available in a variety of colors, batten widths, materials and panel widths.
UC-7 SNAP-ON ARCHITECTURAL SERIES

This concealed clip fastening system is capped with a narrow, low-profile snap-on batten that provides a thin-line appearance while providing the designer freedom to specify radius or high profile features. UC-7 delivers good thermal movement.

Standard UC-7 materials are painted steel; painted and anodized aluminum; architectural grade sheet copper and zinc. Available in heavier gauges, narrower widths, embossing and ribs (flat and pencil) to minimize oil-canning.
SOFFITS SERVE MANY PURPOSES IN COMMERCIAL ARCHITECTURE, INCLUDING WEATHER-SHELTERING OVERHANGS, BUILDING VENTILATION PORTS, CONVENIENT CONCEALMENT SECTIONS FOR HVAC OR ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS AND OTHER APPLICATIONS. THE RIGHT SOFFIT AND FASCIA TREATMENT CAN PROVIDE A FINISHED LOOK TO THE STRUCTURE, AS WELL AS AID WATER RUNOFF, BUILDING VENTILATION AND COOLING.

METAL SOFFIT SYSTEMS PROVIDE A STRONG, DURABLE AND RELIABLE MATERIAL THAT ENHANCES THE LONGEVITY OF THE SOFFIT AND CREATES AN AESTHETICALLY-PLEASING APPEARANCE.

**FIRESTONE UNA-CLAD™ METAL SOFFIT SYSTEMS**

Designers, architects and building owners can create a comprehensive, finished look to their buildings with Firestone UNA-CLAD Metal Soffit Systems. The wide selection of metal soffit and fascia products allows for an uninterrupted and consistent appearance. The Metal Soffit Systems are available in a variety of colors, materials, widths, textures, profiles and seam designs to visually integrate with Firestone metal roofing products.
**UC-500 FLUSH PANEL**

This interlocking, concealed fastening metal panel system is engineered for both soffit and fascia applications. UC-500 delivers a flat or flush look that provides a neat, finished appearance.

Standard UC-500 materials are painted steel; painted and anodized aluminum; architectural grade sheet copper and zinc. Available in heavier gauges, narrower widths, embossing and pencil ribs to minimize oil-canning. Venting available for soffit applications.

**UC-501 REVEAL FLUSH PANEL**

Similar in characteristics to UC-500, the Reveal Flush Panel system creates a flat appearance with a bold channels (reveals) that provide visual interest to the soffit.

Standard UC-501 materials are painted steel; painted and anodized aluminum; architectural grade sheet copper and zinc. Available in heavier gauges, narrower widths, embossing and pencil ribs to minimize oil-canning. Venting available for soffit applications.

**UC-750 V-GROOVE SOFFIT PANEL**

This interlocking architectural aluminum panel is engineered specifically for soffit applications. UC-750 utilizes a concealed fastening system with interlocking leg. Subtle V-grooves run the length of the panel providing a clean, traditional appearance.

Standard UC-750 material is painted and anodized aluminum. Full- or half-vent options available.
FOR CENTURIES, LARGE STRUCTURES SUCH AS CATHEDRALS HAVE RELIED ON THE INHERENT DURABILITY OF METAL ROOFING. IN MODERN USAGE, CORRUGATED METAL ROOFING PANELS HAVE TWICE THE AVERAGE LIFESPAN OF ASPHALT ROOFING, AND PROVIDE EXCEPTIONAL RAIN AND SNOW SHEDDING ABILITIES.

DESIRABLE BECAUSE OF THEIR DESIGN VERSATILITY, LOW MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS AND HIGH STRENGTH-TO-WEIGHT RATIO, ARCHITECTS, DESIGNERS AND BUILDING OWNERS ARE TURNING TO METAL ROOFS FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION.

FIRESTONE UNA-CLAD™ PROFILED PANEL SERIES

To answer the need for a durable and economical metal roofing solution, Firestone created the UNA-CLAD Profiled Panel Series. Commercial-grade metal roof and wall panels provide a traditional metal panel appearance with bold recurring or successive ribs. Architects, designers and building owners can choose from a variety of materials and rib patterns to best accentuate their structure.
OMEGA SERIES UR-PRO OMEGA, HR-ULTRA OMEGA, VR-CLASSIC OMEGA

The Omega Series is factory-formed corrugated metal roofing with exposed mechanical fasteners. Panels have overlapping seams with bold ribs for an appealing accent to any architectural design. Can be installed in non-sequential patterns. Each Omega Series product has identical physical characteristics but with a unique rib pattern to provide greater design versatility.

Standard Omega Series materials are painted steel; painted aluminum and architectural grade sheet copper. Omega Series panels are suitable for wall cladding.

5-V-CRIMP PROFILED PANELS

Like Omega Series panels, 5-V-Crimp panels are factory-formed corrugated metal roofing with exposed mechanical fasteners. Panels have overlapping seams with V-shaped ribs to add a unique “old world” styling to your roof profile.

Standard 5-V-Crimp materials are painted steel; painted aluminum and architectural grade sheet copper. 5-V-Crimp panels are suitable for wall cladding.

UC-600 & UC-601 CORRUGATED PANELS

Like Omega Series panels, UC-600 and UC-601 panels are factory-formed corrugated metal roofing with exposed mechanical fasteners. Panels have overlapping seams with gently undulating striations to give you the option of a softer roof profile.

Standard UC-600 materials are painted steel; painted aluminum; architectural grade sheet copper and zinc. Standard UC-601 materials are painted steel and zinc. UC-600/UC-601 panels are suitable for wall cladding.
CLAD-GARD Roofing Underlayment is easy to install and provides the ideal moisture barrier between the roof deck and the adjacent metal roofing system. It features a skid-resistant surface; is watertight around fasteners such as nails or other anchors; offers great high-temperature resistance; and is unaffected by water so it can be left exposed for up to 3 months before applying the metal roofing system.

**CLAD-GARD SA Underlayment**
Self-adhered underlayment for quick, simple installation.

- Premium non-reinforced product that minimizes wrinkling
- Available in a convenient 2-square roll 3’ x 67” (.09 m x 20 m)
- Heavy-duty adhesive is protected by a split-release plastic liner, which is easily removed for quick installation and placement of the underlayment
- Two available formulations: CLAD-GARD SA-S (heat resistant up to 250°F [121°C]) and CLAD-GARD SA-N (heat resistant up to 230°F [110°C])

**CLAD-GARD R Underlayment**
Self-adhered underlayment at an economical price.

- Split-release backer for easy installation
- Comes unboxed which means less waste on the jobsite.
- Available in a 2-square roll (3’ x 66.7”) (.09 m x 20 m).
- Can be applied directly to Firestone HailGard® Composite, OSB and plywood substrates.
- Eligible for up to a 20-year Red Shield® Warranty

**CLAD-GARD MA Underlayment**
Mechanically-attached choice for reliable results.

- Available in 10-square rolls that are 4’ (1.2 m) wide for more square feet per roll and fewer seams
- Lighter than roofing felt at only 31 lb (14 kg) per roll
- Lays flat and stays wrinkle-free, meaning fewer nails are needed to fasten compared to felt underlayment
- Heat resistant up to 230°F (110°C) without degradation of the material
- Heat resistant up to 230°F (110°C) without degradation of the material

A VALUABLE ADDITION TO A SUSTAINABLE BUILDING PROJECT.
## COLOR SELECTION GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color Name</th>
<th>Color Name</th>
<th>Color Name</th>
<th>Color Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STONE WHITE</td>
<td>BONE WHITE</td>
<td>ALMOND</td>
<td>SANDSTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLATE GRAY</td>
<td>CITYSCAPE</td>
<td>CHARCOAL GRAY</td>
<td>SIERRA TAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM BRONZE</td>
<td>DARK BRONZE</td>
<td>EXTRA DARK BRONZE</td>
<td>MATTE BLACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRANDYWINE</td>
<td>COLONIAL RED</td>
<td>TERRA COTTA</td>
<td>MANSARD BROWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGAL RED</td>
<td>AWARD BLUE</td>
<td>SKY BLUE</td>
<td>ELECTRIC BLUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGAL BLUE</td>
<td>TEAL</td>
<td>PATINA GREEN</td>
<td>DARK IVY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHERWOOD GREEN</td>
<td>HARTFORD GREEN</td>
<td>HEMLOCK GREEN</td>
<td>TROPICAL PATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVER METALLIC</td>
<td>CLASSIC COPPER</td>
<td>CHAMPAGNE METALLIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colors shown are as close to actual colors as allowed by the printing process. Your local sales rep can provide actual metal samples and answer questions about custom colors and other special requests.
Firestone Building Products
250 West 96th St., Indianapolis, IN 46260
Corporate Office: 1-800-428-4442 • 317-575-7000

International Offices:

Firestone Building Products Canada
2835 Argentia Rd., Unit #2
Mississauga, ON L5N 8G6
1-888-292-6265 • 905-363-3150
Fax: 877-666-3022

Firestone Building Products Europe
Ikaroslaan 75 - 1930 Zaventem, Brussels, Belgium
+32 2 7114450 • Fax: +32 2 7212718

Firestone Building Products Latin America
8200 NW 52nd Terrace, Suite #107
Miami, FL 33166
305-471-0117 • Fax: 305-471-0377

www.firestonebpco.com

Note: This brochure is meant only to highlight Firestone’s products and specifications. Information is subject to change without notice. ALL products and specifications are listed in approximate weights and measurements. For complete product and detail information, please refer to the Technical Manual. Firestone takes responsibility for furnishing quality materials which meet Firestone’s published product specifications. As neither Firestone itself nor its representatives practice architecture, Firestone offers no opinion on, and expressly disclaims any responsibility for, the soundness of any structure on which its products may be applied. If questions arise as to the soundness of a structure or its ability to support a planned installation properly, the owner should obtain opinions of competent structural engineers before proceeding. Firestone accepts no liability for any structural failure or for resultant damages, and no Firestone representative is authorized to vary this disclaimer.

Printed on Recycled Paper
A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00296  1218 Mississippi Street; New Multi-Family; Certificate of Appropriateness environs in the Lawrence Register (Jane A Snow Residence), Oread Conservation Overlay District - Hancock Historic District – UC4. Submitted by TreanorHL on behalf of Classical Developments LLC, property owner of record.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to construct a new three level apartment building on the vacant lot located at 1218 Mississippi Street. The building will have six units with a total of 12 bedrooms. The three story frame structure will be placed on a concrete foundation that is also a parking garage. The approximately 4,240 sf footprint of the parking garage will provide 14 parking spaces as designed. The entrance to the garage is from Mississippi Street. The three story apartment portion of the project will be clad in a mixture of brick, stone, cementious lap siding and metal panels. The overall height of the structure is approximately 45’ but the peak of the roof will be approximately 63’ from Mississippi Street. The structure will be approximately 52 ½’ X 64’ above grade.

**It should be noted that this project design is based on a minor subdivision that has not been submitted, reviewed, or approved. Changes required by the minor subdivision process may require additional review by the Historic Resources Commission.**

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
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.
(C) In considering any application for a certificate of appropriateness and in reviewing and commenting on matters before other bodies, the Commission shall consider the standards for review listed above and the following:

(2) New Construction and Additions to Existing Buildings.
   (a) The design for new construction shall be sensitive to and take into account the special characteristics that the district is established to protect. Such consideration may include, but should not be 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.
   (b) New buildings need not duplicate older styles of architecture but must be compatible with the architecture within the district. Styles of architecture will be controlled only to insure that their exterior design, materials, and color are in harmony with neighboring structures.
   (c) The following specific design criteria shall be used to review all applications for certificates of appropriateness for new construction or additions to existing buildings (See 22-506.1).

(3) Demolition, Relocation, and Land Surface Change.
   (c) Major and substantial change of land surface within the boundaries of a landmark or historic district should not be permitted. Exceptions will be allowed only if there is substantial evidence that the change would not be detrimental to the historical and architectural character of surrounding structures or landscaping.

(5) Accessory Structures and Landscaping.
   (a) Existing characteristic features such as trees, walls, stairs, paving materials, fencing, walkways and other similar structures or site features that reflect the landmark or historic district’s history and development shall be retained.
   (b) Landscaping should be appropriate to the scale and the unique features of the landmark or historic district.
**HEIGHT**

**Consider** - Relating the overall height of new construction to that of adjacent structures. As a general rule, construct new buildings to a height roughly equal to the average height of existing buildings from the historic period on and across the street.

**Avoid** - New construction that greatly varies in height (too high or too low) from older buildings in the vicinity.

**SCALE**

**Consider** - Relating the size and proportions of new structures to the scale of adjacent buildings. Although much larger than its neighbors in terms of square footage, the building shown maintains the same scale and rhythm as the existing buildings.

**Avoid** - Buildings that in height, width, or massing violate the existing scale of the area. The new building shown here disrupts the scale and rhythm of the streetscape, although it might be appropriate in a different location.

**MASSING**

**Consider** - Breaking up uninteresting boxlike forms into smaller, varied masses such as are common on most buildings from the historic period. Variety of form and massing are elements essential to the character of the streetscape in historic districts.

**Avoid** - Single, monolithic forms that are not relieved by variations in massing. Boxlike facades and forms are intrusive when placed in a streetscape of older buildings that have varied massing and facade articulation.

**DIRECTIONAL EXPRESSION**

**Consider** - Relating the vertical, horizontal, or nondirectional facade character of new buildings to the predominant directional expression of nearby buildings. Horizontal buildings can be made to relate to the more vertical adjacent structures by breaking the facade into smaller masses that conform to the primary expression of the streetscape.

**Avoid** - Strongly horizontal or vertical facade expressions unless compatible with the character of structures in the immediate area. The new building shown does not relate well to either its neighbors or to the rhythm of the streetscape because of its unbroken horizontal facade.
SETBACK
Consider - Maintaining the historic facade lines of streetscapes by locating front walls of new buildings in the same plane as the facades of adjacent buildings. If exceptions are made, buildings should be set back into the lot rather than closer to the street. If existing setbacks vary, new buildings should conform to historic siting patterns.

Avoid - Violating the existing setback pattern by placing new buildings in front of or behind the historic facade line. Avoid placing buildings at odd angles to the street, unless in an area where diverse siting already exists, even if proper setback is maintained.

PLATFORMS
Consider - The use of a raised platform is a traditional sitting characteristic of some of the older buildings in Lawrence. This visual "pedestal" is created by retaining walls and stepped entries.

Avoid - Bringing walls of new buildings straight out of the ground without a sense of platform, i.e., without maintaining the same entry height as neighboring buildings. Such structures seem squat, visually incomplete, and do not relate well to their elevated neighbors. Also avoid leveling off terraced slopes or removing retained platforms.

SENSE OF ENTRY
Consider - Articulating the main entrances to the building with covered porches, porticos, and other pronounced architectural forms. Entries were historically raised a few stops above the grade of the property and were a prominent visual feature of the street elevation of the building.

Avoid - Facades with no strong sense of entry. Side entries or entries not defined by a porch or similar transitional element result in an incompatible "flat" first-floor facade.

ROOF SHAPES
Consider - Relating the roof forms of the new buildings to those found in the area. Although not entirely necessary, duplication of the existing or traditional roof shapes, pitches, and materials on new construction is one way of making new structures more visually compatible.

Avoid - Introducing roof shapes, pitches, or materials not traditionally used in the area.
The project is located in the environs of the Jane A. Snow House. The Snow House was listed in the Lawrence Register of Historic Places prior to the practice of adopting environs definitions for properties as they are listed.
D. STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant proposed to build an apartment complex on the vacant lot located at what is identified as 1218 Mississippi Street (legal- the north ½ Lot 10 Block 8 of the Oread Addition).

Historically (1927) Lot 10 supported two residential structures.
When the University of Kansas purchased the majority of the block to construct a parking garage, the structures to the south of Lot 10 were demolished, including the structure located on the south half of Lot 10. Lot 10 continued to have one residential structure. Between 2003 and 2006, the structure on Lot 10 burned. The lot has been vacant since 2006.
The structure proposed by the applicant is a very large apartment complex adjacent to the existing historic residential structure to the north. During the review process, staff noted the existence of a historic apartment complex at the corner of Oread Avenue and 12th Street that is located in the Hancock Historic District, National Register of Historic Places, as well as in the environs of the Snow House. This historic apartment complex is also adjacent to smaller residential structures. Staff also noted the massive parking garage structure to the south of the vacant property also located in the environs of the Snow House.
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 alterations and 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. Maintaining views to the listed property and maintaining the rhythm and pattern within the environs are the primary focus of review.

There is a line of site to the listed property. Staff has analyzed the proposed new structure using the criteria located in Chapter 22.

**Height**
The structure is not compatible with the height of the residential structures in the district even if the height is viewed from the grade of the new structure and not Mississippi Street. While some of the height will be to the east portion of the structure and may not be visible from the public right-of-way, the height to the top of the western elevation is too high to be compatible with the residential structures in the environs. As a transitional structure to the garage to the west, height could be more compatible but greater than the average height of the structures in the environs. It may be possible to reduce the overall height of the structure.

**Massing**
As designed, the structure is not compatible with the massing of the structures in the environs, including the existing historic apartment building in the environs. The view from the public right-of-way is that of a large square block in an area that is characterized with residential elements that create an appearance of a mass that is broken down by porches, roof shapes, and architectural elements appropriate for the size of the structure.

**Scale**
Scale of a building is associated with the massing of a building. For the proposed structure, some of the areas of the building are appropriately scaled for the massing of this building, but do not necessary reflect the scale of the structures in the environs. If the size and mass of the building can be adjusted, the scale of the building can be adjusted accordingly and may be compatible with the environs. The massive stone columns are too big for the small wood columns they support. Currently, some of the windows are taller than they are wide and this is an appropriate way to help achieve scale on a structure and for this project helps to create a scale that is more appropriate for the environs.

**Materials**
Overall, the materials proposed for the project are compatible with the environs. The applicant proposes to use true dimensional brick and stone and no vinyl windows. The only concern for staff is the use of board and batten siding and metal panels. These materials are not typical in the environs.

**Roof shape**
The roof shape of the proposed structure is not compatible with the majority of the structures in the
environ of the listed property. However, the flat roof is appropriate for apartment buildings and is similar to the existing historic apartment building in the environs. The details of the flat roof on the majority of the structure are not typical and appear more commercial in nature. In addition, rooftop decks do not exist in the environs.

*Directional Expression, Setback, Site Coverage, Spacial Relationships, Sense of Entry, Rhythm, and Platform*

All of these items are compatible with the environs. The rhythm is challenged by the size of the structure but if broken down into fenestration and bays, the overall pattern is compatible.

While there are some significant compatibility issues with the proposed structure, staff is of the opinion that there are mitigating circumstances that should be included in this evaluation: the existence of the historic apartment building in the environs, and the massive parking garage to the south of the project site. When recognizing these items, staff is of the opinion that the proposed structure could be compatible with the environs if refinement of the design can reduce the extent of the non-compatible elements of the project. Staff is also of the opinion this can be accomplished with the applicant working with the Architectural Review Committee.

In the commission’s review of the project, staff is of the opinion the commission should determine if the existence of a historic apartment building in the environs has an impact on the review of the roof and massing of the structure although the location of the proposed project was historically a single detached dwelling.

*Oread Conservation Overlay District – Hancock Historic District – UC4*

Staff has not reviewed the project using the Oread Design Guidelines. This review will be completed by staff once the HRC has had the opportunity to review revised plans if the commission sends the project to the ARC.

**E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends the project be referred to the Architectural Review Committee for design refinement to include the height of the structure, the massing of the structure, the scale of the façade/west elevation, and possibly the roof type of the structure. Refinement of these elements should create a structure that has appropriate scale.
# Design Review Application

## Property Information
- **Address of Property**: 1218 Mississippi Street
- **Legal Description**: Oread Addition Block 8 N 1/2 LT 10, City of Lawrence

## Owner Information
- **Name(s)**: Classical Developments LLC
- **Contact**: Mike Heitman
- **Address**: 3715 Shawnee Mission Parkway
- **City**: Fairway, **State**: KS, **ZIP**: 66205
- **Phone**: 913-787-3470, **Fax**: ____________
- **E-mail**: mike@mikeheitmann.com, **Cell Phone**: ____________

## Applicant/Agent Information
- **Contact**: Chris Cunningham
- **Company**: TreanorHL
- **Address**: 1040 Vermont Street
- **City**: Lawrence, **State**: KS, **ZIP**: 66044
- **Phone**: 785-842-4858, **Fax**: ____________
- **E-mail**: ccunningham@treanorhl.com, **Cell Phone**: ____________

<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>RM 32-UC</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>0</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>6,250 / 8,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>6,309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Pavement Coverage</th>
<th>Proposed Pavement Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Are you also submitting any of the following applications?
- Building Permit **X**
- Site Plan **X**
- Special Use Permit
- Zoning Change
- Variance
- State or Federal Tax Credit Application
- Other (specify)
Property Address: 1218 Mississippi Street

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

The project includes the following work:

- One new 3 story building with 6 apartment units
- Each unit to have 2 bedrooms
- Rooftop will be a common area rooftop garden to be accessible to tenants only
- 14 stall underground garage will be constructed, it will be accessible to tenants only
- Materials will be mix of full depth brick veneer, limestone, cementitious siding, smooth metal siding

- Site work will include moving existing sanitary sewer line to the South between KU parking garage and new structure

- Lot adjustment is also required for this work. Existing lot line between 1208 and 1218 is to be moved 20’ to the South

Reason for Request:  
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

The building is located within the environs of the Hancock District
Architect/ Engineer/ Contractor Information: Please provide name and phone number of any persons associated with the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Same as Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone (__)</td>
<td>Fax (__)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Cell (__)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUIRE D 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 5-31-17

_____________________________ Date ________________

_____________________________ Date ________________

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

I/WE Classical Developments LLC, hereby referred to as the “Undersigned”, being of lawful age, do hereby on this 31st day of May, 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:

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

2. I/We the undersigned, have previously authorized and hereby authorize TreanorHL (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 1208 & 1218 Mississippi Street (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 of 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
[Signature]
Owner

STATE OF KANSAS MISSOURI
COUNTY OF DOUGLAS CLAY

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on this 31st day of May, 2017, by Michael Heitmann

[Signature]
Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 12/2009
Note: THESE DOCUMENTS ARE A PROGRESS SET TOWARDS FINAL CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS. BY THEIR NATURE, THEY ARE INCOMPLETE. THEY ARE NOT SUITABLE FOR BIDDING OR CONSTRUCTION. ANY ATTEMPT TO ESTABLISH CONSTRUCTION COSTS FROM THESE DOCUMENTS MUST BE DONE WITH EXTREME CAUTION. COST ALLOWANCES MUST BE PROVIDED FOR DESIGN ELEMENTS AND MATERIALS NOT YET INDICATED ON THESE DOCUMENTS. TREATOH AND OUR CONSULTANTS HAVE NO RESPONSIBILITY OR LIABILITY FOR COSTS OF CONSTRUCTION ASSOCIATED WITH DESIGN ELEMENTS AND MATERIALS NOT YET SHOWN ON THESE DOCUMENTS.

This drawing is an instrument of service and shall remain the property of TREATOH. This drawing and the concepts and ideas contained herein shall not be used, reproduced, revised, or retained without the express written approval of TREATOH.

Submission or distribution of this drawing to meet official or regulatory requirements or for other purposes in connection with the project is not to be construed as publication in derogation of any of the rights of TREATOH.

TreanorHL NO. 1040 Vermont Lawrence, Kansas 66044 Office: 785.842.4858 Fax: 785.842.7536 www.TreanorHL.com

A102 PLANS - LEVEL 2

Classical Development LLC
1218 Mississippi Apts
1218 Mississippi St.
Lawrence, KS 66044

DV16.033.00B

1/4" = 1'-0"
Note:

THESE DOCUMENTS ARE A PROGRESS SET TOWARDS FINAL CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS. BY THEIR NATURE, THEY ARE INCOMPLETE. THEY ARE NOT SUITABLE FOR BIDDING OR CONSTRUCTION. ANY ATTEMPT TO ESTABLISH CONSTRUCTION COSTS FROM THESE DOCUMENTS MUST BE DONE WITH EXTREME CAUTION. COST ALLOWANCES MUST BE PROVIDED FOR DESIGN ELEMENTS AND MATERIALS NOT YET INDICATED ON THESE DOCUMENTS. TreanorHL AND OUR CONSULTANTS HAVE NO RESPONSIBILITY OR LIABILITY FOR COSTS OF CONSTRUCTION ASSOCIATED WITH DESIGN ELEMENTS AND MATERIALS NOT YET SHOWN ON THESE DOCUMENTS.

This drawing is an instrument of service and shall remain the property of TreanorHL. This drawing and the concepts and ideas contained herein shall not be used, reproduced, revised, or retained without the express written approval of TreanorHL. Submission or distribution of this drawing to meet official or regulatory requirements or for other purposes in connection with the project is not to be construed as publication in derogation of any of the rights of TreanorHL.
HardiePanel® vertical siding delivers style and substance. When combined with HardieTrim® boards, it achieves the rustic board-and-batten look that defines cottage charm. The covered seams contribute to a well-insulated home.

Its crisp, clean lines make HardiePanel vertical siding a smart choice for strong, contemporary designs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thickness</th>
<th>5/16 in.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>12 ft. planks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>5.25 in. 6.25 in. 7.25 in. 8.25 in. 9.25 in.* 12 in.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>4 in. 5 in. 6 in. 7 in. 8 in. 10.75 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ColorPlus Pcs./Pallet</td>
<td>324 280 252 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Pcs./Pallet</td>
<td>360 308 252 230 190 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pcs./Sq.</td>
<td>25.0 20.0 16.7 14.3 12.5 9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*9.25 in. only available primed.  
**12 in. only available primed and in select areas.

Available Colors

View all HardiePlank Lap Siding Products
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/4 NT3°</td>
<td>SMOOTH</td>
<td>Arctic White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4 NT3°</td>
<td>SMOOTH</td>
<td>Arctic White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4 NT3°</td>
<td>ROUGHSAWN</td>
<td>Arctic White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4 NT3°</td>
<td>ROUGHSAWN</td>
<td>Arctic White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CROWN MOULDING</td>
<td>Arctic White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Products are available primed or with ColorPlus Technology. For more details, visit [jameshardie.com](http://jameshardie.com)
LIMESTONE VENEER

With eight quarries throughout Kansas, U.S. Stone specializes in local, natural limestone for the building industry. We offer eight different types of Kansas Limestone with a variety of unique colors and characteristics. Our stone can also be custom blended to create unlimited design potential.

Kansas Limestone is durable and incredibly versatile. It is a choice material for a range of interior and exterior building applications including cut stone, veneer, thin veneer, paving, landscape and specialty stone. Our Kansas Limestone can yield blocks as large as eighteen feet or be cut as thin as one inch. We offer multiple finishes including sawn or split face, and can produce different corner units so our stone can be applied quickly and easily. With a state-of-the art manufacturing facility U.S. Stone can provide a strong, resilient, low-maintenance natural stone with all of the engineered benefits of a molded concrete product.

At U.S. Stone we prioritize product excellence and quality control. Each quarry is managed for regularity, allowing us to provide large quantities of a consistent product. Our manufacturing team is careful and efficient, guaranteeing the integrity of the stone through the production process.

PROJECTS USING LIMESTONE VENEER

http://usstoneindustries.com/Stone/LimestoneVeneer
LAWRENCE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION
ITEM NO. 10: DR-17-00300 and DR-17-00308
STAFF REPORT

A. SUMMARY
DR-17-00300 and DR-17-00308  524 Ohio Street; Residential Remodel and Variance; State Law Review and Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located in the Pinckney II Historic District, National Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the environs of the Griffith House (511 Ohio Street), and the Dillard House (520 Louisiana Street), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Rockhill & Associates on behalf of Kami Day and Michele A Eodice, property owners of record.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The applicant is requesting to rehabilitate the structure located at 524 Ohio Street. The rehabilitation will include a small addition added to the back elevation as well as a wraparound covered front porch that will connect the front and side door entries which are elevated above grade. The wraparound porch is not part of the existing footprint but there is historical evidence that a wraparound front porch existed. The reconstructed porch will maintain the use of the existing doors but will be of modern design. All of the existing wood double hung windows and historic wood doors are to remain with the exception of a rear door adjacent to the patio that is directly above the exterior basement access stairs. This door will be replaced with a window. Exterior shutters and trim elements will be repaired. The existing brick will be gently cleaned. The existing asphalt shingle roof will be replaced with a metal standing seam roof.

The new addition will be placed on the east elevation and will be approximately 176 sf. The 11’ X 16’ addition will be in line with the existing south house plane and will provide space for an entertainment room. The addition will be wood frame with lap siding and a standing seam shed metal roof. Fenestration includes a pair of square awning fiberglass windows on the south elevation, one egress casement window on the east elevation, and glass panel door on the north elevation.

A wood framed screen will be constructed adjacent to the patio. A metal shed will also be removed from the site. Existing mechanicals and electrical elements will remain. A new mini-split system will be installed at the rear of the addition for heating and cooling the addition. Exterior basement access stairs will be repaired and protected with a lockable access hatch. Parking will be along the alley.
The applicant is also seeking a variance for the encroachment into the setback that will be created by the wraparound porch, DR-17-00308. The applicant is also submitting a State Tax Credit
It should be noted that the owner has removed the artificial siding to review the historic wood lap siding.

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.

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 subject property is located in the environs of the Griffith House (511 Ohio Street), and the Dillard House (520 Louisiana Street), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. These properties were listed in the Lawrence Register prior to the practice of adopting environs definitions.

There is a direct line of sight from the subject property to the Griffith House. There is no line of sight to the Dillard House.
D. STAFF ANALYSIS

Project Review
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, as part of a district, or in the case of a Certificate of Appropriateness, located in the environs of a listed property or 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 proposed project will consist of both interior and exterior rehabilitation. Repairs will be made to existing architectural elements on the façade. There is also a proposed addition to the rear of the historic structure as well as adding a wraparound front porch.

When adding an addition to a historic structure, the primary concerns are to minimize the loss of historic materials, place the addition where it has a minimal impact on the primary façade, and the
use of compatible materials. The single story addition at the rear of the structure will remove an exterior door, however the placement of the addition is on the portion of the façade with minimal fenestration and is situated such as to have minimal impact on the rear façade. The door that will be lost on the rear elevation will be moved to the adjacent wall of the addition to provide access. A window at the rear elevation of the addition will be added in a similar place visually to where the door would have been in direct line of sight. The loss of materials will be minimal and the new addition will be clad in new painted clapboard siding to match the existing in exposure. The new materials proposed for the addition are historic in nature though modern in design. The high, exposed concrete pier foundation for the addition is not typical for historic properties.

Proposed additions should not be visible from the public right-of-way. When reviewing additions for historic structures, this is one of the primary goals of a project. Particular attention should be placed where the addition attaches to the existing structure. The proposed addition, should be stepped back from the existing wall line to read as a separation between the new and existing structure. The addition, as proposed, does not step back, however if the addition was substantially stepped back in this case, there would be more impact on the existing rear façade as it would impact the upper story window and create a greater loss of historic fabric. The size of the addition and the proposed location on the rear elevation will have less of an impact on the existing structure as proposed but staff would suggest at least a 1 foot step back from the existing wall as a reduction to clearly separate the historic from the new construction. Design refinement for this issue can be addressed if the applicant works with the Architectural Review Committee. Window sizes and compatible materials should also be incorporated into the new addition. While the proposed lap siding is compatible with the historic structure, the roof material and roof form are not typical for additions to historic structures of this style in this district. The proposed window sizes and placement are also not typical for the historic structure of this historic district. The proposed addition size is compatible with the structure and will continue to allow open green space at the rear of the property as well as allow parking adjacent to the alley.

The exterior basement access is proposed to change and will also create a loss of historic material and character. The exterior wood door would be removed and locked access hatch doors would be replaced where the exterior access steps exist. The existing basement and stone foundation walls will be maintained. Some of the existing foundation walls will no longer be visible due to the raised new addition and the wraparound porch. Because these elements are not character defining for the structure and are located on the rear elevation, the alterations do not damage the structure. The historic character of the rear elevation is impacted by the exposed concrete piers and painted steel horizontal screening installed under the porch and new addition floors.

The gravel parking area would not be permitted by the Land Development Code. The applicant shall provide an approved parking surface adjacent to the alley in keeping with the historic environs and the listed property.

The proposed design details of the wraparound front porch and the roof materials for the porch and the historic structure are not compatible with this historic structure. Staff would recommend the applicant work with the Architectural Review Committee to establish a compatible redesign of the front porch and compatible roofing material for both the porch and the historic structure.
The proposed wraparound front porch does not currently exist but indication of the location and size was discovered as part of the artificial siding removal and architectural investigation of the property. The size of the proposed wraparound porch is designed to replicate this footprint. The restoration of a porch in the historically appropriate location requires the need for a variance and associated BZA application for a side yard setback encroachment because the original porch was located in this area of the property. The variance request proposes a sideyard setback of 3’-3” feet. The variance will be considered at the August 3, 2017 BZA meeting.

Exterior elements such as wood windows, shutters and trim are being repaired and painted in accordance with the applicable standards and guidelines. Any windows that are proposed to be replaced should be of compatible size, profile, and material.

**State Law Review**

The City of Lawrence has an agreement with the State Historic Preservation Officer to conduct reviews required under K.S.A. 75-2724 using the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. The Historic Resources Commission is charged with determining whether or not projects will “damage or destroy” historic resources. Interior alterations are also included in this review.

Standards 1, 6, 9, and 10 apply to this project.

Standard 1 is met by the continuing use of the structure for uses that have historically existed in the structure. The new addition is a minimal alteration to allow for the expansion of the space for the continuation of the use. Likewise, the interior alterations in the primary areas of the structure appear to be minimized to allow for the continued use of the structure as a single family home.

Standard 6 is met by the repair and repainting of existing historic features and matching the old feature in design, color, texture, color and material. Replacement of the existing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence such as the located original porch footings. All work will be in accordance with the applicable standards and guidelines.

Standards 9 & 10 speak to the compatibility of the proposed addition and new wraparound porch. The addition does attempt to minimize the loss of historic materials that characterize the property. While the size, scale and massing protect the historical integrity of the property and its environment, staff recommends working with the Architectural Review Committee to differentiate between the historic building and the addition as well as the compatibility of the proposed roof form of the structure. The use of modern materials that are compatible and the design differentiation should ensure that if the addition were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The interior alterations to the historic structure appear to meet the applicable standards and guidelines.

Staff is of the opinion based on the above project review that the project should be referred to the Architectural Review Committee for design refinement that will allow the project to meet the applicable standards and guidelines while achieving the applicant’s project goals. Specifically, staff recommends review of the porch details, roofing materials, fenestration for the addition, alignment
of the addition, and the roof form of the addition.

**Certificate of Appropriateness**

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 alterations and new construction should be reviewed using the design criteria in 22-506. These design criteria help to promote the standards set forth in 22-505. Specifically, 22-506(c)(2) provides review criteria for additions to existing buildings. Identified criteria for new additions 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 subject property is located in the environs of the Griffith House (511 Ohio Street), and the Dillard House (520 Louisiana Street), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. These properties were listed in the Lawrence Register prior to the practice of adopting environs definitions.

There is a direct line of sight from the subject property to the Griffith House. There is no line of sight to the Dillard House.

Due to the placement of the proposed addition, there will be no line of sight from the addition to the Griffith House.

There is a direct line of sight to the Griffith House from the front porch restoration and roofing materials for both the historic structure and the restored front porch will be visible from the landmark. The architectural details for the restored porch are not compatible with the environs of the listed property nor are they typical for the environs of the listed property. These modern details should be simplified. This design element can likely be achieved by the applicant working with the ARC.

Similar to the architectural details of the porch, the roof material for both the porch and the historic portion of the structure are not compatible with the environs of this listed property nor are they typical for the environs of this listed property. While metal roofs existed historically, they were not a material for this architectural style of structure in this area. Additional documentation would be needed to substantiate the use of a metal roof on this structure in this area of the environs of the listed properties. Roof materials can be reviewed by the ARC.

**E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**State Law Review**

Staff is of the opinion based on the above project review that the project should be referred to the Architectural Review Committee for the following items:

1. Design details of the wraparound porch.
2. Placement/setback of the addition wall in relation to the existing structure.
3. Window sizes and materials for the addition and materials for altered existing windows.
4. Roof material for both the historic structure and the addition.

Certificate of Appropriateness
Staff is of the opinion based on the above project review that the project should be referred to the Architectural Review Committee for the following items:
1. Design details of the wraparound porch.
2. Placement/setback of the addition wall in relation to the existing structure.
3. Window sizes and materials for the addition and materials for altered existing windows.
4. Roof material for both the historic structure and the addition.
**DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION**

**PROPERTY INFORMATION**
- Address of Property: 524 OHIO STREET
- Legal Description: OHIO STREET S 30 LOT 30

**OWNER INFORMATION**
- Name(s): KAMI DAY + MICHELE EDICE
- Contact: KAMI DAY
- Address: 320 NORTH PETERS AVE.
- City: NORMAN
- State: OK
- ZIP: 73069
- Phone (785) 760-6483
- E-mail: kamiday@gmail.com

**APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION**
- Contact: DAVID SAIN
- Company: ROCKHILL + ASSOCIATES
- Address: 1546 E. 350 ROAD
- City: LEOMINSTER
- State: MA
- ZIP: 66050
- Phone (785) 393-0746
- E-mail: david.sain@sunflower.com

<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>RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Total site area: 3510 S.F.
- Existing Building Footprint: 572 S.F.
- Proposed Building Footprint: 987 S.F. (INCLUDE ALL PERIM.
- Open Space Area: 2310 S.F.

**Are you also submitting any of the following applications?**
- Building Permit ❌
- Site Plan ❌
- Special Use Permit ❌
- Zoning Change ❌
- Variance ❌
- State or Federal Tax Credit Application ❌
- Other (specify) ❌
Property Address: 524 OHIO STREET

Detailed Description of Proposed Project:
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)
REHABILITATION OF THE EXISTING HOUSE WITH A SMALL ADDITION ADDED TO THE BACK ELEVATION.
SEE ATTACHED DRAWINGS AND PHOTOS.

Reason for Request:
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)
TO GET A BUILDING PERMIT AND TAX CREDIT FROM THE STATE OF OHIO.
Architect/Engineer/Contractor Information: Please provide name and phone number of any persons associated with the project.

Contact: DAVID SAIN

Company: ROCKHILL ASSOCIATES.

Address: 1546 E. 350 Road

City: LEOMPTON State: KS ZIP: 66050

Phone: (785) 393-0746 Fax: ( )

E-mail: david.sain@sunflower.com Cell: (785) 393-0746

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 (called out in drawings)
☑ 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: 6/18/2017

Date: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Note: If signing by agent submit Owner Authorization Form
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 524 0470 STREET, 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 WHEREOF, I, the Undersigned, have set my hand and seal below.

[Signature]

Owner

[Signature]

Owner

STATE OF KANSAS
COUNTY OF LAWRENCE

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on this ___ day of ______, 20___

by ____________________________

My Commission Expires: 03/10/19

Notary Public

Owner Authorization Form
12/2009
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THE FRONT ELEVATION FROM OHIO STREET LOOKING EAST

THE BACK OF THE HOUSE FROM THE YARD AND ALLEY LOOKING WEST

T H E   D A Y / E O D I C E   H O U S E   R E H A B I L I T A T I O N
EXISTING HOUSE
232 SQUARE FEET

NEW ADDITION
1144 SQUARE FEET

ALLEY
PROPERTY LINES
SETBACK LINES
EXISTING CONCRETE WALKWAYS TO REMAIN
EXISTING SIDEWALK AT OHIO STREET

EXISTING HOUSE FOOTPRINT
572 SQUARE FEET
NEW FOOTPRINT INCLUDING THE FRONT PORCH WHICH MATCHES THE HISTORIC FOOTPRINT (RE P22) 981 SQUARE FEET

ORIGINAL BRICK HOUSE
BUILT 1871

WOOD FRAME ADDITION
BUILT 1905

NEW WRAPAROUND FRONT PORCH

EXISTING AC UNIT

PROPOSED PERVIOUS PATIO PAVERS
NEW PATIOS

NEW WRAPAROUND FRONT PORCH

EXISTING CONCRETE WALKWAYS TO REMAIN

REMOVE METAL SHED

NEW PATIO

Rockhill + Associates
1546 East 350 Road
Lecompton, KS 66050

Dan Rockhill
785.393.0747
rockhill@sunflower.com

David Sain
785.393.0746
davidsain@sunflower.com

Day/Edicic House
524 Ohio Street, Lawrence, Kansas, 66044
R+A

June 2017

1/8" = 1'-0"

A2

SITE PLAN
EXISTING FURNACE/AIRHANDLER TO REMAIN
EXISTING HOT WATER TO REMAIN BUT THE FLUE IS RELOCATED TO SHARE THE FURNACE FLUE OR ITS CHASE

REMOVE THE EXISTING WOOD DOOR

EXISTING STAIRS TO REMAIN BUT BE CLOSED OFF FROM THE LIVING ROOM

EXISTING STONE FOUNDATION WALLS

9’ - 7”
12’ - 11”
17’ - 10”
2’ - 2”
6’ - 10”
10’ - 3”

EXISTING SUMP PUMP TO REMAIN

EXISTING CONCRETE AND PAVER FLOOR

WATER SHUT OFF

EXISTING BASEMENT ACCESS STEPS REPAIRED AND PROTECTED WITH A LOCKABLE ACCESS HATCH

EXISTING BASEMENT ACCESS STEPS REPAIRED AND PROTECTED WITH A LOCKABLE ACCESS HATCH

EXISTING BASEMENT ACCESS STEPS REPAIRED AND PROTECTED WITH A LOCKABLE ACCESS HATCH

EXISTING SUMP PUMP TO REMAIN

EXISTING HOT WATER TO REMAIN BUT THE FLUE IS RELOCATED TO SHARE THE FURNACE FLUE OR ITS CHASE

EXISTING SUMP PUMP TO REMAIN

EXISTING BASEMENT ACCESS STEPS REPAIRED AND PROTECTED WITH A LOCKABLE ACCESS HATCH

EXISTING BASEMENT ACCESS STEPS REPAIRED AND PROTECTED WITH A LOCKABLE ACCESS HATCH

EXISTING BASEMENT ACCESS STEPS REPAIRED AND PROTECTED WITH A LOCKABLE ACCESS HATCH

EXISTING BASEMENT ACCESS STEPS REPAIRED AND PROTECTED WITH A LOCKABLE ACCESS HATCH
NEW 26 GAUGE 16" WIDE SMOOTH PAN GALVALUME STANDING SEAM ROOFING

NEW 5" GALVALUME HALF ROUND GUTTERS WITH 4" ROUND DOWNSPOUTS

EXISTING CLAPBOARDS REPAIRED AND PAINTED

THE EXISTING BRICK WILL BE GENTLY CLEANED TO REMOVE THE LOOSE PAINT AND THEN WILL BE REPAIRED AND TUCKPOINTED. AT THAT TIME A DETERMINATION WILL BE MADE ABOUT LEAVING IT AS IS OR PAINTING UNLESS NOTED ALL WOOD DOUBLE HUNG WINDOWS REMAIN

EXISTING FRONT DOOR REPAIRED AND PAINTED

NEW 26 GAUGE 16" WIDE SMOOTH PAN GALVALUME STANDING SEAM ROOFING

HOSE BIBB RELOCATED TO THE PORCH FLOOR FRAME

NEW PAINTED WOOD PORCH STRUCTURE

NEW TREATED LUMBER FRAMED PORCH FLOOR STRUCTURE WITH PAINTED TRIM BOARDS AT THE PERIMETER

NEW PORCH DECKING

GAS METER
NEW PAINTED CLAPBOARD SIDING TO MATCH THE EXISTING EXPOSURE

NEW 26 GAUGE 16" WIDE SMOOTH PAN GALVALUME STANDING SEAM ROOFING

NEW 5" GALVALUME HALF ROUND GUTTERS WITH 4" ROUND DOWNSPOUTS

EXISTING CLAPBOARDS REPAIRED AND PAINTED

THE EXISTING BRICK WILL BE GENTLY CLEANED TO REMOVE THE LOOSE PAINT AND THEN WILL BE REPAIRED AND TUCKPOINTED. AT THAT TIME A DETERMINATION WILL BE MADE ABOUT LEAVING IT AS IS OR PAINTING

UNLESS NOTED ALL WOOD DOUBLE HUNG WINDOWS REMAIN

EXISTING CLAPBOARDS REPAIRED AND PAINTED

NEW STANDING SEAM ROOFING

NEW PAINTED CLAPBOARD SIDING TO MATCH THE EXISTING EXPOSURE

NEW STANDING SEAM ROOFING

MINI SPLIT FOR HEATING AND COOLING THE ADDITION

NEW FIBERGLASS AWNING WINDOWS

PAINTED STEEL SCREEN

THE SILL OF THE EXISTING WOOD FRAME REPAIRED

NEW 26 GAUGE 16" WIDE SMOOTH PAN GALVALUME STANDING SEAM ROOFING

NEW PORCH DECKING

NEW PAINTED WOOD PORCH STRUCTURE

CONCRETE PIER PORCH FOUNDATIONS

PAINTED STEEL SCREEN

NEW FIBERGLASS AWNING WINDOWS

PAINTED STEEL SCREEN
NEW PAINTED CLAPBOARD SIDING TO MATCH THE EXISTING IN EXPOSURE

NEW 26 GAUGE 16" WIDE SMOOTH PAN GALVALUME STANDING SEAM ROOFING

NEW 5" GALVALUME HALF ROUND GUTTERS WITH 4" ROUND DOWNSPOUTS

EXISTING CLAPBOARDS REPAIRED AND PAINTED

UNLESS NOTED ALL WOOD DOUBLE HUNG WINDOWS REMAIN

NEW STANDING SEAM ROOFING

NEW FIBERGLASS EGRESS CASEMENT WINDOW

NEW FIBERGLASS REPLACEMENT EGRESS WINDOW INSTALLED IN THE EXISTING WINDOW FRAME

EXISTING DOOR TRIM TO BE REPAIRED AND RETAINED

NEW FIBERGLASS WINDOWS SET IN THE EXISTING DOOR OPENING

EXISTING BASEMENT ACCESS STEPS REPAIRED AND PROTECTED WITH A LOCKABLE ACCESS HATCH

EXISTING ELECTRIC SERVICE TO REMAIN

NEW WOOD FRAMED SCREEN

RELOCATED HOSE BIB

EXISTING BASEMENT ACCESS STEPS REPAIRED AND PROTECTED WITH A LOCKABLE ACCESS HATCH

THE SILL OF THE EXISTING WOOD FRAME REPAIRED

EXISTING AC UNIT

CONCRETE PIER FOUNDATIONS

MINI SPLIT HEATING AND COOLING FOR THE ADDITION

NEW 26 GAUGE 1/4" WIDE SMOOTH PAN GALVALUME STANDING SEAM ROOFING

NEW FIBERGLASS REPLACEMENT EGRESS WINDOW INSTALLED IN THE EXISTING WINDOW FRAME

EXISTING CLAPBOARDS REPAIRED AND PAINTED

UNLESS NOTED ALL WOOD DOUBLE HUNG WINDOWS REMAIN

NEW STANDING SEAM ROOFING

NEW FIBERGLASS EGRESS CASEMENT WINDOW

NEW FIBERGLASS REPLACEMENT EGRESS WINDOW INSTALLED IN THE EXISTING WINDOW FRAME

EXISTING DOOR TRIM TO BE REPAIRED AND RETAINED

NEW FIBERGLASS WINDOWS SET IN THE EXISTING DOOR OPENING

EXISTING BASEMENT ACCESS STEPS REPAIRED AND PROTECTED WITH A LOCKABLE ACCESS HATCH

EXISTING ELECTRIC SERVICE TO REMAIN

NEW WOOD FRAMED SCREEN

RELOCATED HOSE BIB

EXISTING BASEMENT ACCESS STEPS REPAIRED AND PROTECTED WITH A LOCKABLE ACCESS HATCH

THE SILL OF THE EXISTING WOOD FRAME REPAIRED

EXISTING AC UNIT

CONCRETE PIER FOUNDATIONS

MINI SPLIT HEATING AND COOLING FOR THE ADDITION
NEW PAINTED CLAPBOARD SIDING TO MATCH THE EXISTING IN EXPOSURE

NEW 26 GAUGE 16" WIDE SMOOTH PAN GALVALUME STANDING SEAM ROOFING

NEW 5" GALVALUME HALF ROUND GUTTERS WITH 4" ROUND DOWNSPOUT

EXISTING CLAPBOARDS REPAIRED AND PAINTED

THE EXISTING BRICK WILL BE GENTLY CLEANED TO REMOVE THE LOOSE PAINT AND THEN WILL BE REPAIRED AND TUCKPOINTED. AT THAT TIME A DETERMINATION WILL BE MADE ABOUT LEAVING IT AS IS OR PAINTING

UNLESS NOTED ALL WOOD DOUBLE HUNG WINDOWS REMAIN

NEW 26 GAUGE 16" WIDE SMOOTH PAN GALVALUME STANDING SEAM ROOFING

MINI SPLIT HEATING AND COOLING FOR THE ADDITION

WOOD FRAMED SCREEN SIDED WITH CEMENT FIBERBOARD CLAPBOARDS

NEW FULL PANEL GLASS PATIO DOOR

THE EXISTING WINDOW WILL REMAIN AND BE REPAIRED AND PAINTED

EXISTING SHUTTERS SET IN FRONT OF THE BRICKED IN OPENING WILL BE REPAIRED AND PAINTED

NEW 5" GALVALUME HALF ROUND GUTTERS WITH 4" ROUND DOWNSPOUT

THE EXISTING 26 GAUGE 16" WIDE SMOOTH PAN GALVALUME STANDING SEAM ROOFING

THE SILL OF THE EXISTING WOOD FRAME REPAIRED

CONCRETE PIER PORCH FOUNDATIONS

NEW PAINTED WOOD PORCH STRUCTURE

NEW 26 GAUGE 16" WIDE SMOOTH PAN GALVALUME STANDING SEAM ROOFING

NEW PORCH DECKING

PAINTED STEEL SCREEN

NEW 26 GAUGE 16" WIDE SMOOTH PAN GALVALUME STANDING SEAM ROOFING

PROPOSED ADDITION 2017

WOOD FRAME ADDITION BUILT 1905

ORIGINAL BRICK HOUSE BUILT 1871
EXISTING BASEMENT AND STONE FOUNDATION

2X8 R-38 RIGID BOARD INSULATED FLOOR FRAME

2X12 R-38 CELLULOSE FIBER INSULATED ROOF FRAME

2X6 R-19 CELLULOSE FIBER INSULATED STUD WALLS AT THE ADDITION

CONCRETE COLUMN FOUNDATIONS

MINI SPLIT EXTERIOR COMPONENT

EXISTING BRICK WALL AND PLASTER TO REMAIN AND ARE FINISHED WITH A NEW SKIM COAT OF PLASTER

DRYWALL/PLASTER TO REMAIN, FILL VOIDS IN THE WOOD FRAMED WALLS WITH CELLULOSE INSULATION

UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED, ALL OF THE EXISTING WOOD DOUBLE HUNG WINDOWS ARE TO REMAIN

NEW PICTURE RAILS TO MATCH THE HISTORIC TRIM

THE PLASTER WILL DIE INTO THE HISTORIC TRIM THROUGHOUT, WHERE THE HISTORIC TRIM IS MISSING OR HAS BEEN REPLACED NEW TRIM WILL BE INSTALLED TO MATCH THE REMAINING EXAMPLES

NEW 26 GAUGE 16" WIDE SMOOTH PANELED GALVANIZED STANDING SEAM ROOFING

AT THE FIRST FLOOR THE BRICK WALLS OF THE 1871 BUILDING HAVE BEEN FURRED OUT 2X6 SLEEPERS AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN ADDED TO THE EXISTING DRYWALL AND BETWEEN THE BRICK AND DRYWALL. THIS CONDITION WILL REMAIN UNCHANGED. NEW PLASTER WILL BE APPLIED TO THE EXISTING DRYWALL

ORIGINAL BRICK HOUSE BUILT 1871

WOOD FRAME ADDITION BUILT 1905

PROPOSED ADDITION 2017

WOOD FRAME ADDITION BUILT 1905

ORIGINAL BRICK HOUSE BUILT 1871
ORIGINAL BRICK HOUSE BUILT 1871
WOOD FRAME ADDITION BUILT 1905

EXISTING BRICK WALL TO REMAIN AND ARE FINISHED WITH A NEW SEAL COAT OF PLASTER

EXISTING WINDOW SEAT REPAIRED AND REFINISHED

EXISTING TRIM AND DOOR WIDE PLANK FLOOR PAINTED

OAK FLOORS REFINISHED

EXISTING OPENING AND TRIM

EXISTING MID 20TH CENTURY PARTITIONS WILL BE REMOVED

THE PLASTER WILL DIE INTO THE HISTORIC TRIM THROUGHOUT. WHERE THE HISTORIC TRIM IS MISSING OR HAS BEEN REPLACED NEW TRIM WILL BE INSTALLED TO MATCH THE REMAINING EXAMPLES

THE EXISTING MID 20TH CENTURY PARTITIONS THAT FRAME THE TOP OF THE EXISTING STAIRS WILL BE REMOVED

NEW EGRESS CASEMENT WINDOW IN THE EXISTING OPENING AND FRAME

AT THE FIRST FLOOR THE BRICK WALLS OF THE 1871 BUILDING MAINLY REFRAMED WITH 2X6 SLEEPERS AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED BETWEEN THE BRICK AND THE DRYWALL AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED A NEW PLASTER WILL BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING DRYWALL

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

DRYWALL/PLASTER TO REMAIN, FILL Voids IN THE WOOD FRAMED WALLS WITH CELLULOSE INSULATION

R-38 OF CELLULOSE INSULATION ADDED TO THE EXISTING INSULATION IN THE ATTIC

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

AT THE FIRST FLOOR THE BRICK WALLS OF THE 1871 BUILDING MAINLY REFRAMED WITH 2X6 SLEEPERS AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED BETWEEN THE BRICK AND THE DRYWALL AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED A NEW PLASTER WILL BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING DRYWALL

EXISTING MID 20TH CENTURY PARTITIONS THAT FRAME THE TOP OF THE EXISTING STAIRS WILL BE REMOVED

NEW EGRESS CASEMENT WINDOW IN THE EXISTING OPENING AND FRAME

AT THE FIRST FLOOR THE BRICK WALLS OF THE 1871 BUILDING MAINLY REFRAMED WITH 2X6 SLEEPERS AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED BETWEEN THE BRICK AND THE DRYWALL AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED A NEW PLASTER WILL BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING DRYWALL

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

DRYWALL/PLASTER TO REMAIN, FILL Voids IN THE WOOD FRAMED WALLS WITH CELLULOSE INSULATION

R-38 OF CELLULOSE INSULATION ADDED TO THE EXISTING INSULATION IN THE ATTIC

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

EXISTING MID 20TH CENTURY PARTITIONS THAT FRAME THE TOP OF THE EXISTING STAIRS WILL BE REMOVED

NEW EGRESS CASEMENT WINDOW IN THE EXISTING OPENING AND FRAME

AT THE FIRST FLOOR THE BRICK WALLS OF THE 1871 BUILDING MAINLY REFRAMED WITH 2X6 SLEEPERS AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED BETWEEN THE BRICK AND THE DRYWALL AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED A NEW PLASTER WILL BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING DRYWALL

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

DRYWALL/PLASTER TO REMAIN, FILL Voids IN THE WOOD FRAMED WALLS WITH CELLULOSE INSULATION

R-38 OF CELLULOSE INSULATION ADDED TO THE EXISTING INSULATION IN THE ATTIC

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

EXISTING MID 20TH CENTURY PARTITIONS THAT FRAME THE TOP OF THE EXISTING STAIRS WILL BE REMOVED

NEW EGRESS CASEMENT WINDOW IN THE EXISTING OPENING AND FRAME

AT THE FIRST FLOOR THE BRICK WALLS OF THE 1871 BUILDING MAINLY REFRAMED WITH 2X6 SLEEPERS AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED BETWEEN THE BRICK AND THE DRYWALL AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED A NEW PLASTER WILL BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING DRYWALL

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

DRYWALL/PLASTER TO REMAIN, FILL Voids IN THE WOOD FRAMED WALLS WITH CELLULOSE INSULATION

R-38 OF CELLULOSE INSULATION ADDED TO THE EXISTING INSULATION IN THE ATTIC

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

EXISTING MID 20TH CENTURY PARTITIONS THAT FRAME THE TOP OF THE EXISTING STAIRS WILL BE REMOVED

NEW EGRESS CASEMENT WINDOW IN THE EXISTING OPENING AND FRAME

AT THE FIRST FLOOR THE BRICK WALLS OF THE 1871 BUILDING MAINLY REFRAMED WITH 2X6 SLEEPERS AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED BETWEEN THE BRICK AND THE DRYWALL AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED A NEW PLASTER WILL BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING DRYWALL

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

DRYWALL/PLASTER TO REMAIN, FILL Voids IN THE WOOD FRAMED WALLS WITH CELLULOSE INSULATION

R-38 OF CELLULOSE INSULATION ADDED TO THE EXISTING INSULATION IN THE ATTIC

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

EXISTING MID 20TH CENTURY PARTITIONS THAT FRAME THE TOP OF THE EXISTING STAIRS WILL BE REMOVED

NEW EGRESS CASEMENT WINDOW IN THE EXISTING OPENING AND FRAME

AT THE FIRST FLOOR THE BRICK WALLS OF THE 1871 BUILDING MAINLY REFRAMED WITH 2X6 SLEEPERS AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED BETWEEN THE BRICK AND THE DRYWALL AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED A NEW PLASTER WILL BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING DRYWALL

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

DRYWALL/PLASTER TO REMAIN, FILL Voids IN THE WOOD FRAMED WALLS WITH CELLULOSE INSULATION

R-38 OF CELLULOSE INSULATION ADDED TO THE EXISTING INSULATION IN THE ATTIC

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

EXISTING MID 20TH CENTURY PARTITIONS THAT FRAME THE TOP OF THE EXISTING STAIRS WILL BE REMOVED

NEW EGRESS CASEMENT WINDOW IN THE EXISTING OPENING AND FRAME

AT THE FIRST FLOOR THE BRICK WALLS OF THE 1871 BUILDING MAINLY REFRAMED WITH 2X6 SLEEPERS AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED BETWEEN THE BRICK AND THE DRYWALL AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED A NEW PLASTER WILL BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING DRYWALL

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

DRYWALL/PLASTER TO REMAIN, FILL Voids IN THE WOOD FRAMED WALLS WITH CELLULOSE INSULATION

R-38 OF CELLULOSE INSULATION ADDED TO THE EXISTING INSULATION IN THE ATTIC

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

EXISTING MID 20TH CENTURY PARTITIONS THAT FRAME THE TOP OF THE EXISTING STAIRS WILL BE REMOVED

NEW EGRESS CASEMENT WINDOW IN THE EXISTING OPENING AND FRAME

AT THE FIRST FLOOR THE BRICK WALLS OF THE 1871 BUILDING MAINLY REFRAMED WITH 2X6 SLEEPERS AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED BETWEEN THE BRICK AND THE DRYWALL AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED A NEW PLASTER WILL BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING DRYWALL

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

DRYWALL/PLASTER TO REMAIN, FILL Voids IN THE WOOD FRAMED WALLS WITH CELLULOSE INSULATION

R-38 OF CELLULOSE INSULATION ADDED TO THE EXISTING INSULATION IN THE ATTIC

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

EXISTING MID 20TH CENTURY PARTITIONS THAT FRAME THE TOP OF THE EXISTING STAIRS WILL BE REMOVED

NEW EGRESS CASEMENT WINDOW IN THE EXISTING OPENING AND FRAME

AT THE FIRST FLOOR THE BRICK WALLS OF THE 1871 BUILDING MAINLY REFRAMED WITH 2X6 SLEEPERS AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED BETWEEN THE BRICK AND THE DRYWALL AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED A NEW PLASTER WILL BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING DRYWALL

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

DRYWALL/PLASTER TO REMAIN, FILL Voids IN THE WOOD FRAMED WALLS WITH CELLULOSE INSULATION

R-38 OF CELLULOSE INSULATION ADDED TO THE EXISTING INSULATION IN THE ATTIC

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

EXISTING MID 20TH CENTURY PARTITIONS THAT FRAME THE TOP OF THE EXISTING STAIRS WILL BE REMOVED

NEW EGRESS CASEMENT WINDOW IN THE EXISTING OPENING AND FRAME

AT THE FIRST FLOOR THE BRICK WALLS OF THE 1871 BUILDING MAINLY REFRAMED WITH 2X6 SLEEPERS AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED BETWEEN THE BRICK AND THE DRYWALL AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED A NEW PLASTER WILL BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING DRYWALL

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

DRYWALL/PLASTER TO REMAIN, FILL Voids IN THE WOOD FRAMED WALLS WITH CELLULOSE INSULATION

R-38 OF CELLULOSE INSULATION ADDED TO THE EXISTING INSULATION IN THE ATTIC

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFACT

EXISTING MID 20TH CENTURY PARTITIONS THAT FRAME THE TOP OF THE EXISTING STAIRS WILL BE REMOVED

NEW EGRESS CASEMENT WINDOW IN THE EXISTING OPENING AND FRAME

AT THE FIRST FLOOR THE BRICK WALLS OF THE 1871 BUILDING MAINLY REFRAMED WITH 2X6 SLEEPERS AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED BETWEEN THE BRICK AND THE DRYWALL AND FIBERGLASS INSULATION HAS BEEN REPLACED A NEW PLASTER WILL BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING DRYWALL

EXISTING BASEMENT STAIRS CLOSED OFF BUT REMAIN AS AN ARTIFAC
LEGEND
* Images taken in the basement
** All of the floors are step wood flooring other than the upper floor of the 1871 building which is wide plank flooring
*** Image P8-5 is an example patch

ORIGINAL BRICK HOUSE BUILT 1871
WOOD FRAME ADDITION BUILT 1905

WEST (FRONT) ELEVATION
SOUTH ELEVATION
EAST ELEVATION
NORTH ELEVATION

IMAGES TAKEN IN THE BASEMENT
ALL OF THE FLOORS ARE STEP WOOD FLOORING OTHER THAN THE UPPER FLOOR OF THE 1871 BUILDING WHICH IS WIDE PLANK FLOORING

IMAGE P8-5 IS AN EXAMPLE PATCH
THE FRONT ELEVATION FROM OHIO STREET.

THE EXISTING BRICK WILL BE GENTLY CLEANED TO REMOVE THE LOOSE PAINT AND THEN WILL BE REPAIRED AND TUCKPOINTED. AT THAT TIME A DETERMINATION WILL BE MADE ABOUT LEAVING IT AS IS OR PAINTING THE ENTIRE BRICK WALLS WITH AN APPROPRIATE MASONRY PAINT.

THE BACK ELEVATION FROM THE ALLEY.

THE EXISTING CLAPBOARD SIDING AND TRIM WILL BE REPAIRED, CLEANED AND PAINTED. THE ADDITION WILL BE SUPPORTED BY CONCRETE PIERs AT THE EAST END AND WILL BE ATTACHED TO THE HOUSE FRAME ABOVE THE SILL AND NOT ATTACHED TO THE STONE FOUNDATION.

THE GHOST OF A WRAPAROUND PORCH IS EVIDENT. A NEW WOOD FRAMED WRAPAROUND PORCH WILL BE BUILT.

THE BRICK WAS PAINTED PRIOR TO THE INSTALLATION OF ASBESTOS SHINGLES. IT IS APPROXIMATELY 60% BONDED TO THE BRICK SURFACE. THE BRICK WILL BE GENTLY CLEANED TO REMOVE THE LOOSE PAINT WHILE PROTECTING THE SURFACE. AT THAT TIME A DETERMINATION WILL BE MADE ABOUT LEAVING IT AS IS OR PAINTING.

THE FRONT PORTION OF THE HOUSE WAS BUILT IN 1871. THE WOOD FRAMED ADDITION WAS BUILT IN 1905.
The sill of the window appears to have been notched into the roof line of the wraparound porch. This condition led to extensive damage. The sill will be repaired and the new wraparound porch will be designed to engage the brick wall below the window sill to allow for proper flashing at the bottom of the window.

The double hung window at the 2nd floor of the south elevation is damaged and will need repair. The horizontal muntin in the lower sash has been altered to allow the glass to pass in front and the lower pane of glass on the bottom right has been cracked.

On the north elevation the brick had deteriorated and was poorly patched with a material that has failed. The patch material will be removed and the voids will be repaired with mortar while tuckpointing.

The size of the wraparound porch has been determined by the ghost of its plan in the existing concrete. This layout is confirmed by the 1905 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (re: P22).

The stone foundation has been covered with stucco. To remove the stucco would lead rise damage to the stone if it will remain. The stucco will be removed. New secco will be applied to finish the dressing. A new mortar joint will be applied at the base mortar joint to promote easy drainage of water across the face and to the ground.
THE EXISTING WOOD WINDOW AND DOOR FRAMES WILL BE REPAIRED AND PAINTED.

A DOOR ONCE EXISTED IN THE NORTH WALL OF THE 1871 BRICK BUILDING. IT WAS BRICKED IN AND A SET OF SHUTTERS WERE INSTALLED AT THE OUTER BRICK WyTHE OF THE WALL. THIS CONDITION WILL REMAIN. THE BRICK AND THE SHUTTERS WILL BE REPAIRED AND PAINTED.

THE BOTTOM COURSES OF THE BRICK HAVE HAD THE GREATEST DETERIORATION OF THE MORTAR. WHEN THE WALLS ARE TUCKPOINTED AND THE FOUNDATION STUCCO IS REPAIRED THE STUCCO WILL BE TAPERED AT THE TOP TO MEET THE BASE MORTAR. JOT TO PROMOTE EASY DRAINAGE OF WATER ACROSS THE FACE AND TO THE GROUND.

THE UPPER PART OF THE NORTH GABLE (APPROXIMATELY 15” wide) WILL BE STABILIZED THROUGH TUCKPOINTING AND, IF NEEDED, BRACING IN THE ATTIC USING THE ROOF FRAMING.
The existing gable roofs and the existing eaves will be repaired, the existing profiles retained and then painted.

At the corners the clapboards die into vertical trim boards. The trim and the clapboard will be repaired with sealant or, for larger problems patched with epoxy or replaced with new wood to match.

The 1st floor window will be removed and the opening extended to access the addition. The 2nd floor window to the left (south) will be removed and replaced with a fiberglas replacement casement window that meets the egress codes.

The hot water heater flue will redirected thru the existing HVAC chase inside the house. The existing door will be removed and replaced with windows. The door trim will be repaired and retained.

The basement windows will be repaired, painted and will remain.

The electric service will remain in its existing location. The meter will be accessed from the new entry stairs to the addition.
THE SILL CONDITIONS OF THE WOOD FRAME WILL REQUIRE REPAIR, REINFORCEMENT OR REPLACEMENT PARTICULARLY IN THE LOCATIONS WHERE THE LATER DAY PORCHES WERE ATTACHED AND POORLY FLUSHED. THE SILL WILL BE PATCHED WITH CLAPBOARDS REMOVED WHERE THE NEW ADDITION IS ATTACHED TO THE 1905 ADDITION OR NEW WOOD BEVEL SIDING TO MATCH.


AT THE POINT WHERE THE LATER DAY PORCH WAS ADDED TO THE SOUTH ELEVATION THE SILL HAS DETERIORATED EXTENSIVELY AND WILL REQUIRE REBUILDING. BEFORE THE NEW WOOD FRAME PORCH IS BUILT THE SILL OF THE DOOR WILL BE PROPERLY FLUSHED ABOVE THE NEW PORCH TO AVOID THE REOCURRENCE OF THIS TYPE OF DAMAGE. THE STONE FOUNDATION WILL BE REPAIRED AND FINISHED WITH STUCCO TO MATCH THE EXISTING.

THE SIDING HAS BEEN DAMAGED IN SEVERAL LOCATIONS WHERE THE SERVICES PENETRATED THE ASPHALT SHINGLES. THE HOLES AND CRACKS WILL BE PATCHED WITH EPOXY, PRIMED AND PAINTED WITH THE REST OF THE SIDING.
The existing basement door will be removed. The masonry retaining walls and stairs will be repaired. A new masonry curb will be built at the top of steps to block water from funnelling into the basement. A new hatch door will be installed on top of the curb.

The existing basement door will be removed to allow for easy passage into the basement when the hatch door at the patio is opened.

The roof viewed from the neighboring yard, the neighboring porch is visible in the foreground. The original 1871 brick house is roofed with a north/south gable roof. When the 1915 addition was built, it also has a north/south gable roof. The two are connected by a perpendicular gable, creating an "H" shaped roof.

The existing asphalt shingle roof will be removed. The roof frame and the sheathing will be repaired as needed. A new galvalume standing seam metal roof will be installed. There will be a 5" wide drainage bottomed flank. The new gutters will be 5" galvalume half round with 4" round downspouts.

A new furnace flue and vent covers will be included when the new standing seam roof is being installed.

The eave edge where the 1915 addition extends beyond the brick has deteriorated to the point that the rafters will require rebuilding. The sheathing near the eaves will have to be removed and the rafters secured with new material that will support the new gutters and roofing.
The wood strip floors will be resurfaced and clear coated.

The wide plank flooring upstairs in the set brick building will be repaired and painted. The older high quality patches in the wide plank floor will be retained and painted.

The recent sheet metal patches with sharp edges will be removed and replaced.

At the wide plank flooring, wood patches will be installed and painted with the rest of the floor. At the oak strip flooring plate steel patches will be set flush with the floor and sealed with a clear coat.

Unpatched floor holes or inadequate patches will be repaired with new patches rather than attempted to blend new wood into the existing flooring.

At the wide plank flooring wood patches will be installed and painted with the rest of the floor. At the oak strip flooring plate steel patches will be set flush with the floor and sealed with a clear coat.

Example of a floor patch:

For the larger floor patches in the clear coat floors, new steel will be set flush with the floor. New steel rather than blending in wood flooring, the steel will be clear coated.

For the new patches in the painted floor new boards will be set flush with and painted to match the rest of the floor, but will not be blended into the layout of the existing boards.
THE EXISTING FRONT DOOR AND FRAME WILL BE REPAIRED AND PAINTED. NEW HARDWARE WILL BE INSTALLED.

THE EXISTING DOOR FROM THE KITCHEN TO THE NEW WRAPAROUND PORCH WILL BE REPAIRED AND PAINTED. NEW HARDWARE WILL BE INSTALLED.

UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED, ALL OF THE EXISTING DOUBLE HUNG WINDOWS WILL BE REPAIRED, MADE OPERABLE, AND PAINTED. THE EXISTING HISTORIC HARDWARE WILL REMAIN IN USE.

THE ORIGINAL TRIM IS SIMPLE 1X MATERIAL AND QUARTER ROUND WITH NO MOLDING TRIM OR PROFILED EDGES. THE TRIM WILL BE REPAIRED AND PAINTED. ALL NEW TRIM WILL BE INSTALLED TO MATCH.
The existing window hardware will be stripped of paint, repaired and remain in use.

The missing pin hole will be filled and painted when the sash is painted.

All but one window uses hardware to hold them open. The window uses the sash pulleys and counterweights. The window will be repaired and remain as is.
P11-1
The existing lath and plaster exterior walls on the 1905 addition will remain. Cellulose insulation will be blown through holes in the plaster to fill the framing cavities as needed. The walls will then be patched and finished with a skim coat of plaster.

The existing recently added cabinetry and sink will be removed.

P11-2
The kitchen window in the back (east) elevation will be removed and the opening will be extended to create a passage to the addition.

P11-3
On the first floor, the electric outlets will be integrated into the new baseboard which will match the examples visible on the upper floor. All of the outlets will have new receptacles and covers installed in the existing boxes.

P11-4
The exterior plaster of the brick walls and the lath and plaster walls of the wood-framed addition will remain. A finish coat of skim coat plaster will be installed throughout and will die into the trim.

New exposed conduit will be used to distribute electricity to the front room of the 2nd floor by the 1871 brick building.

P11-5
The floor outlet will be replaced and will be incorporated into a new steel floor patch.
ALL OF THE WOOD PANELING WILL BE REMOVED. THE PLASTER WILL BE REPAIRED AND A NEW FINISH SKIM COAT WILL BE INSTALLED.

THE EXISTING PANELS DOORS WILL BE USED. THE MIDDLE DOOR IN THIS IMAGE IS BADLY DAMAGED AND WILL BE REMOVED. THE CASED OPENING WILL REMAIN.

THE EXISTING BOX LOCKS WILL BE USED THROUGHOUT OR, IF NECESSARY DUE TO DAMAGE REPLACED WITH HISTORICALLY ACCURATE HARDWARE.

THIS WINDOW ON THE BACK ELEVATION WILL BE REMOVED AND REPLACED WITH A NEW FIBERGLASS REPLACEMENT CASEMENT WINDOW THAT IS EGRESS CODE COMPLIANT.

THE DOOR FROM THE KITCHEN ON THE EAST (BACK) ELEVATION WILL BE REMOVED AND REPLACED WITH WINDOWS. THE EXISTING FRAME AND EXTERIOR CASING TRIM WILL REMAIN.

THE "POPCORN" FINISH ON THE CEILINGS WILL BE REMOVED AND THE EXISTING DRYWALL WILL BE FINISHED WITH A SKIM COAT OF PLASTER TO MATCH THE WALLS. ALL OF THE EXISTING LIGHTING WILL BE REPLACED.

THE EXISTING PANELS DOORS WILL BE USED. THE MIDDLE DOOR IN THE IMAGE IS BADLY DAMAGED AND WILL BE REMOVED. THE CASED OPENING WILL REMAIN. THE EXISTING BOX LOCKS WILL BE USED THROUGHOUT OR, IF NECESSARY DUE TO DAMAGE REPLACED WITH HISTORICALLY ACCURATE HARDWARE.
THE VINYL FLOORING WILL BE REMOVED.

THE EXISTING DOORS AND THEIR HARDWARE WILL BE REPAIRED AND REMAIN.

THE EXISTING WANSCOT, PANEL DOOR, AND CLOSET WILL BE REPAIRED AND PAINTED. THE EXISTING TOILET WILL BE REPLACED WITH A NEW LOW FLOW TOILET.

THE EXISTING CLAW FOOT TUB WILL BE REPAIRED AND RENAIRED. IT WILL HAVE A SHOWER FIXTURE AND A SHOWER RING INSTALLED. THE WALL BEHIND THE TUB WILL BE FINISHED WITH SKIM COAT PLASTER WHICH WILL BE SEALED WITH A CLEAR WATER RESISTANT FINISH.

THE VINYL FLOORING WILL BE REMOVED.
The existing multi-directional staircase is a later addition done in two stages. The half that is contained within the 1871 building will be stabilized, repaired, and painted. The extension into the 1905 addition will be removed. This appears to have been a poorly executed attempt to make it easier to house the house while it was being used as a home for the elderly. The stairwell was extended to a single story also makes it easier to adapt the house to the needs of the owners as they age by adding a chair lift. This would not be viable with the current multi-directional layout. The owners have undertaken the project to create a place to retire and want to incorporate universal design ideas while still respecting the historic value of the house.

The stairway in the 1871 building appears to have been cut through the existing 2nd floor. Judging by the baseboard, it appears this was a closet at one time.

Even the staircases in the 1871 building appear to be a poorly built addition done at the same time the cement fiber shingle siding was added to the house. The shingles were used to close off the space between the kitchen and the basement stairs in the original window opening in the 1871 building.

Cement fiber shingles were used to close off the space between the kitchen and the basement stairs in the original window opening in the 1871 building.

The stair passes in front of one of the original window openings in the 1871 brick form. The walls of the stair are cluttered with attempts to close off the window and cover various changes in materials. These surfaces will be cleaned up and finished with plaster.

The stairway in the 1871 building appears to have been cut through the existing 2nd floor. Judging by the baseboard, it appears this was a closet at one time.
P15-1
Looking up at the staircase structure from the basement stairs. The staircase appears to have been a haphazard effort and is poorly built. In this example an old door frame was used for support.

P15-3
One of the stair stringers bears on a piece of subfloor, which bears on a concrete block, which bears on an inadequate timber lintel. The entire house has sagged toward this point due to this solution. The staircase will remain but will be structurally stabilized.

P15-4
The other stair stringer bears on a piece of subfloor only. The entire house has sagged toward this point due to this solution. The staircase will remain but will be structurally stabilized.

P15-2
The existing basement stairs will remain as artifacts but will be closed off at the 1st floor level.
The entire staircase was a later addition and was done in two stages. The extension into the first addition will be removed. This appears to have been a poorly executed attempt to make it easier to divide the house while it was being used as rental property for the last few decades.

In the 1871 brick building, the front of the stairs have rounded nosing. The stairs that turn into the 1905 addition have treads with square nosing.

When the back stairs were added, the floor was cut out of the way.

THE FACT THAT THE WOOD STRIP FLOORING AND THE BASEBOARD CONTINUE TO THE WINDOW IS FURTHER EVIDENCE THAT THIS STAIR WAS CUT IN LATER.

THE HAPHAZARD STRUCTURE OF THE STAIRS WHICH HAS FAILED.
THE BASEMENT ACCESS DOOR WILL BE REMOVED AS WELL AS ITS PARTITIONS. THE STAIR PARTITION WILL BE EXTENDED ALL THE WAY TO THE NORTH WALL TO CREATE A CLEAN CORNER FOR FURNISHINGS. ALL OF THE PARTITIONS AROUND THE STAIR AND AT THE 2ND FLOOR OF THE 1871 BUILDING APPEAR TO BE MID-20TH CENTURY CONSTRUCTION MOST LIKELY DONE AT THE SAME TIME THE HOUSE WAS SIDED WITH THE CEMENT FIBER SHINGLES.

THE CLOSET IS A RECENT ADDITION AND WILL BE REMOVED.

THE PARTITIONS THAT SEPARATE THE 2ND FLOOR ROOM IN THE 1871 BUILDING FROM THE STAIRCASE IS A LATER ADDITION AND WILL BE REMOVED. THESE PARTITIONS APPEAR TO BE MID-20TH CENTURY CONSTRUCTION MOST LIKELY DONE AT THE SAME TIME THE HOUSE WAS SIDED WITH THE CEMENT FIBER SHINGLES. THERE IS VISIBLE GHOSTING ON THE WIDE PLANK FLOOR OF PARTITION THIS APPEARS TO HAVE BEEN A POORLY EXECUTED ATTEMPT TO MAKE IT EASIER TO DIVIDE UP THE HOUSE WHILE IT WAS BEING USED AS RENTAL PROPERTY FOR THE LAST FEW DECADES.

THE WIDE PLANK FLOOR AT THE 2ND FLOOR OF THE 1871 BUILDING HAS GHOSTING OF EARLIER PARTITIONS AT THE LOCATION OF THE PARTITIONS WE PROPOSE TO REMOVE.

THE WIDE PLANK Flooring HAD BEEN PAINTED AT THE TOP OF THE STAIRS (TOP RIGHT SPACE IN THIS PHOTO).
THE STAIRCASE WAS CUT INTO THE EXISTING FLOOR AND THE PARTITIONS HAVE BEEN THRU A NUMBER OF ARRANGEMENTS. THIS CONDITION WITH THE FLOOR EXTENDING BEYOND THE PARTITION (WITH BASEBOARD) WOULD NOT HAVE OCCURRED UNLESS HAPHAZARD CHANGES WERE BEING MADE.

THE PARTITIONS AT THE SECOND FLOOR THAT ENCLOS THE STAIRCASE WILL BE REMOVED AND REPLACED WITH BOOKSHELVES AND A RAILING. THESE PARTITIONS APPEAR TO BE MID 20TH CENTURY CONSTRUCTION MOST LIKELY DONE AT THE SAME TIME THE HOUSE WAS SIDED WITH THE CEMENT FIBER SHINGLES. THERE IS VISIBLE GHOSTING ON THE WIDE PLANK FLOOR OF PAST PARTITIONS.

THE EXISTING HVAC CHASE WILL REMAIN AND BE ENCLOSED BY NEW PARTITIONS. THE HOT WATER FLUE WILL BE RE-ROUTED FROM THE EAST ELEVATION TO THIS CHASE.

THE EXISTING HVAC CHASE WILL REMAIN AND BE ENCLOSED BY NEW PARTITIONS. THE HOT WATER FLUE WILL BE RE-ROUTED FROM THE EAST ELEVATION TO THIS CHASE.


At the upstairs bathroom plywood was run over the wide plank flooring. It is covered with layers of vinyl flooring. The plywood and vinyl will be removed. If there has been minimal damage to the wide plank flooring it will be patched, repaired and painted. If not, a new tile floor will be installed.

At the upstairs transition from the 1871 building to the 1905 addition there is a step that has been finished with concrete. It has been damaged and will be repaired with new material.

The fir strip flooring at the north half of the 1st floor of the 1905 addition has numerous holes that have been patched with plywood. The debris flooring was installed over wide plank floors under the existing staircase. The stairs will be removed and a new wood floor will be installed flush with the rest of the debris flooring to create a floor for the new laundry area.

At the 1st floor of the 1871 building a large plywood patch exists in the floor at the base of the stairs. A new flush steel plate patch will be installed and sealed with a clear coat.

At the 1st floor of the 1871 building a large plywood patch exists in the floor at the base of the stairs. An opening is framed in the floor structure below this patch. The flooring will be patched and reinforced as needed from below. The evidence of a past hatch or floor heating unit will remain.
P21-1
There is a gap between the window frame and the wall structure of this window which will need to be repaired and trimmed to create a weather-tight barrier.

P21-2
An existing opening thru the 2nd floor of east wall of 1905 addition will be repaired. The cavity filled with insulation and new interior plaster and exterior trim installed.

P21-3
An existing upper window in the east elevation of the 1871 building was filled in with wood framing that was finished with lath and plaster. The wood framing was not sized properly for the wall, settled enough to damage the interior plaster which had fallen out. The window patch will be be secured as needed and the plaster repaired.
Images from the Lawrence Collection of Residential Photographs at the University of Kansas Kenneth Spencer Research Library

These images show the use of standing seam metal roofing on a variety of housing types in the 1871-1905 era when the brick house at 524 Ohio Street was originally built and then added to with the wood frame structure in 1905.

1905 Lawrence, Kansas Sanborn Fire Insurance Map

The image confirms the fact that the wraparound porch was in place in 1905 and that its layout matches the evidence visible on the brick walls and in the concrete flatwork.
A. SUMMARY
DR-17-00311 644 Mississippi Street; New Accessory Structure; Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located in the environs of the Wilder Clark House (643 Indiana Street), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Lance Adams of Adams Architects, LLC on behalf of Gregory Rupp and Jennifer Roth, property owners of record.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The applicant proposes to construct a new accessory structure to the east of the primary structure located at 644 Mississippi Street. The wood frame structure will be placed adjacent to the alley on a concrete slab foundation. The southern portion of the proposed structure will be one story with a flat roof that will serve as an open deck. The northern portion of the structure will be two stories and will have a gable roof. The structure will have a footprint of approximately 707 sf. With the northern portion footprint 270 sf and the southern portion 437 sf. The ground floor of the structure will be utilized as parking, a work space, and a 14 X 12.5’ storage space. The upper level on the northern portion of the structure will be used as a recreation room. Materials for the proposed structure include: lap cement siding, cedar shake shingles, cedar trim, wood windows and an asphalt shingle roof. The stair to the second level will be painted wood.
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.

Design Criteria 22-506
(C) In considering any application for a certificate of appropriateness and in reviewing and commenting on matters before other bodies, the Commission shall consider the standards for review listed above and the following:

(2) New Construction and Additions to Existing Buildings.
(a) The design for new construction shall be sensitive to and take into account the special characteristics that the district is established to protect. Such consideration may include, but should not be 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.
(b) New buildings need not duplicate older styles of architecture but must be compatible with the architecture within the district. Styles of architecture will be controlled only to insure that their exterior design, materials, and color are in harmony with neighboring structures.

(c) The following specific design criteria shall be used to review all applications for certificates of appropriateness for new construction or additions to existing buildings (See 22-506.1).

(5) Accessory Structures and Landscaping.

(a) Existing characteristic features such as trees, walls, stairs, paving materials, fencing, walkways and other similar structures or site features that reflect the landmark or historic district's history and development shall be retained.

(b) Landscaping should be appropriate to the scale and the unique features of the landmark or historic district.

(c) Accessory structures within the boundaries of a designated landmark site shall be appropriate to and compatible with the architectural features of the primary landmark structure. Structures accessory to noncontributory buildings within a designated historic district shall be so designated as to not detract from the historical or architectural character of the district. (Ord. 5950, Sec. 1)
HEIGHT
Consider - Relating the overall height of new construction to that of adjacent structures. As a general rule, construct new buildings to a height roughly equal to the average height of existing buildings from the historic period on and across the street.

Avoid - New construction that greatly varies in height (too high or too low) from older buildings in the vicinity.

SCALE
Consider - Relating the size and proportions of new structures to the scale of adjacent buildings. Although much larger than its neighbors in terms of square footage, the building shown maintains the same scale and rhythm as the existing buildings.

Avoid - Buildings that in height, width, or massing violate the existing scale of the area. The new building shown here disrupts the scale and rhythm of the streetscape, although it might be appropriate in a different location.

MASSING
Consider - Breaking up uninteresting boxlike forms into smaller, varied masses such as are common on most buildings from the historic period. Variety of form and massing are elements essential to the character of the streetscape in historic districts.

Avoid - Single, monolithic forms that are not relieved by variations in massing. Boxlike facades and forms are intrusive when placed in a streetscape of older buildings that have varied massing and facade articulation.

DIRECTIONAL EXPRESSION
Consider - Relating the vertical, horizontal, or nondirectional facade character of new buildings to the predominant directional expression of nearby buildings. Horizontal buildings can be made to relate to the more vertical adjacent structures by breaking the facade into smaller masses that conform to the primary expression of the streetscape.

Avoid - Strongly horizontal or vertical facade expressions unless compatible with the character of structures in the immediate area. The new building shown does not relate well to either its neighbors or to the rhythm of the streetscape because of its unbroken horizontal facade.
SETBACK
Consider - Maintaining the historic facade lines of streetscapes by locating front walls of new buildings in the same plane as the facades of adjacent buildings. If exceptions are made, buildings should be set back into the lot rather than closer to the street. If existing setbacks vary, new buildings should conform to historic siting patterns.

Avoid - Violating the existing setback pattern by placing new buildings in front of or behind the historic facade line. Avoid placing buildings at odd angles to the street, unless in an area where diverse sitting already exists, even if proper setback is maintained.

PLATFORMS
Consider - The use of a raised platform is a traditional siting characteristic of some of the older buildings in Lawrence. This visual "pedestal" is created by retaining walls and stepped entries.

Avoid - Bringing walls of new buildings straight out of the ground without a sense of platform, i.e., without maintaining the same entry height as neighboring buildings. Such structures seem squat, visually incomplete, and do not relate well to their elevated neighbors. Also avoid leveling off terraced slopes or removing retained platforms.

SENSE OF ENTRY
Consider - Articulating the main entrances to the building with covered porches, porticos, and other pronounced architectural forms. Entries were historically raised a few stops above the grade of the property and were a prominent visual feature of the street elevation of the building.

Avoid - Facades with no strong sense of entry. Side entries or entries not defined by a porch or similar transitional element result in an incompatible "flat" first-floor facade.

ROOF SHAPES
Consider - Relating the roof forms of the new buildings to those found in the area. Although not entirely necessary, duplication of the existing or traditional roof shapes, pitches, and materials on new construction is one way of making new structures more visually compatible.

Avoid - Introducing roof shapes, pitches, or materials not traditionally used in the area.
Please note: The following environs definition for this property was adopted prior to the changes in the State Preservation Law to remove the review of projects located within 500' of a property listed in the National Register of Historic Places or the Register of Historic Kansas Places.

**Environs for 714 Mississippi, the John Robert Greenlees House**

All of the properties located in the identified 250’ environs of the John Robert Greenlees House located at 714 Mississippi Street are currently in the environs of properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The local environs for the John Robert Greenlees House located at 714 Mississippi Street will be considered as one area and shall be reviewed in the following manner and with the following standards applied:

Maintaining the existing structures and visual appearance of the environs is the primary focus of review. Main structure demolitions may be approved if documentation is provided that indicates the structure is unsound and a replacement structure is proposed, or a certificate of economic hardship
is approved.

Minor projects 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 Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effect of Projects on Environs and the Criteria set forth in 22-505.

Major projects (demolition, new construction and additions larger than 20% of the building footprint) will be reviewed by the Historic Resources Commission. All design elements are important. The proposed alteration or construction shall meet the intent of the Standards and Guidelines for Evaluating the Effect of Projects on Environs and the Criteria set forth in 22-505.

The Environs 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

The Historic Resources Commission approved the demolition of a historic accessory structure in October of 2015 (DR-15-00450). In March of 2016, the HRC approved an accessory structure for this property in the general location of the new proposal (DR-16-00049).

According to the research completed for the previous demolition project, there has been an accessory structure adjacent to the alley on this property at least since the 1927 Sanborn Map for the area.
Project Review
The applicant proposes to construct a new accessory structure on the property located at 644 Mississippi Street.

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. The environ definitions for the listed properties give additional guidance for the review of projects in the environ. In addition to review by 22-505, the proposed alterations and 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. Maintaining views to the listed property and maintaining the rhythm and pattern within the environ are the primary focus of review.

The standards that apply to this project from Section 22-505 are Standards 1, 2, and 9. Standard 1 addresses the compatible use of the proposed project. The re-introduction of an accessory structure in the location of previous accessory structures does not alter the environment of the listed property. Standard 2 addresses the distinguishing qualities of the environment. The new garage will not destroy the qualities or character of the environment of the listed property. The new structure as identified in the application is within the range of other accessory structures in the area and materials are compatible. However, the proposed location of the structure may not be compatible with the character of the environs of the listed properties.

In addition to review by 22-505, the proposed alterations and new construction should be reviewed using the design criteria in 22-506. 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 new structure is appropriate in orientation to the alley, façade and window patterns, entrance sizes and locations, general design, materials, textures, color, architectural details, roof form (although flat roofs used as decks were not typical), and directional expression. The concerns for staff are related to the size, proposed location of the structure, and site coverage due to the overall size of the structure.

The trend in the historic core historic districts is the demolition of small accessory structures and the replacement of the structures with large accessory structures, most often with a second floor usable space for office, studio, or family room. Although the previous structure on the site was demolished due to the deteriorated condition of the structure, this proposal follows this trend. While historically some large barns and carriage houses in the area were large in size and scale, they were not the dominant accessory form in the area. The overall size of this proposed structure at 37’ in length and a total footprint of 707 sf is not typical of the historic size of historic accessory structures in the area. This type and size of structure did exist historically in the area, and the Historic Resources Commission has approved structures in similar type and size if the structure is compatible with the listed property or environs. The overall scale of the proposed structure is a direct reflection of the overall height of the structure. The scale is appropriate for the proposed height, but the height is greater than the adjacent portion of the roof of the primary structure. This relationship accentuates the height and scale of the new structure.

While the size is of concern for staff, the greatest concern is the proposed location of the new structure in relationship to the façade/primary elevation of the primary structure. Historically, accessory structures were constructed behind the front wall plane of the primary structure and this aided in the indication that the structure, even if it was a barn size structure, was subordinate to the primary structure. Corner lots, while more challenging, were not always exceptions to this historic pattern. It was rare historically in this area to have an accessory structure in line with or proud of the primary structure. The proposed location of this accessory structure is not appropriate for the environs of the listed properties. The design of the structure requires the placement of the structure in this location to allow for the proposed width of the garage portion of the structure. Staff is of the opinion that the structure footprint should be redesigned to allow for the placement of the structure a minimum of 5’ from the south wall plane of the primary structure.

The proposed project is located in the environs of the John Robert Greenlees House at 714 Mississippi Street. There is no direct line of sight from the primary elevation of the Greenlees House to the proposed site of the new garage. There is, however, a line of sight from the east property line of the Greenlees House along the alley to the proposed garage site.

The proposed project is also located in the environs of the Wilder-Clark House directly across the alley. There is a direct line of site from the location of the new accessory structure to the Wilder-Clark House.
Because this is an environs review, the least stringent evaluation is applied. There is a presumption that a Certificate of Appropriateness will be approved unless the proposed project would significantly encroach on, damage, or destroy the landmark or historic district.

Staff is of the opinion that the proposed accessory structure size is within the range of historic and new construction accessory structures in the environs of the listed property. While the trend of the construction of large structures to replace the once smaller form of accessory structures that were dominant in the area historically is a concern for staff, the proposed structure in size alone will not significantly encroach on, damage, or destroy the landmark or historic district. However, staff is also of the opinion that the placement of the structure is not appropriate for the environs and will encroach on the landmarks or their environs.

Design alternatives exist to allow this project to meet the applicable criteria. Staff is of the opinion the applicant can work with the Architectural Review Committee to refine the design to allow the project to meet the standards while achieving the applicants’ goals.

**E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends the Historic Resources commission refer the project to the Architectural Review Committee for design refinement to allow for the placement of the structure to be a minimum of 5’ to the north of the primary/south elevation of the primary structure. (Approximately 43’+/-)
# DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

## PROPERTY INFORMATION
- **Address of Property**: 644 Mississippi Street
- **Legal Description (may be attached)**: LANE'S FIRST ADD BLK 2 LTS 3 & 4 ALSO MISSISSIPPI STREET S 10FT LT 168 (U62283 4644 & 4645 COMBINED 1988)

## OWNER INFORMATION
- **Name(s)**: Greg Rupp and Jennifer Roth
- **Contact**: Greg Rupp
- **Address**: 644 Mississippi St
- **City**: Lawrence
- **State**: KS
- **ZIP**: 66044
- **Phone**: (785) 550-2053
- **Fax**: ( )
- **E-mail**: ruppgre@yahoo.com
- **Cell Phone**: ( )

## APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION
- **Contact**: 
- **Company**: 
- **Address**: 
- **City**: 
- **State**: 
- **ZIP**: 
- **Phone**: ( )
- **Fax**: ( )
- **E-mail**: 
- **Cell Phone**: ( )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Land Use</th>
<th># of Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area</td>
<td>Proposed Building Footprint</td>
<td>Open Space Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Building Footprint</td>
<td>Proposed Building Footprint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Pavement Coverage</td>
<td>Proposed Pavement Coverage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Construction of a two-car garage with additional ground floor storage and a second floor recreation space with rooftop deck. The second floor will include a bath area and may have some mechanicals including a mini-split HVAC and hot water capability.

Reason for Request:
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

To get approval from HRC to move ahead with construction phase.
Architect/Engineer/Contractor Information: Please provide name and phone number of any persons associated with the project.

Contact  
Company Adams Architects
Address  
City Lawrence  
State KS  
ZIP 66044
Phone 785 213-3980 Fax ( )
E-mail

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

(see attached)

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 6/14/17

Date
Date

Note: If signing by agent submit Owner Authorization Form

Application Form  
06/2016  
Page 3 of 4  
Design Review Application
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 of 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