LAWRENCE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION
AGENDA FOR MARCH 15, 2018
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. February Action Summary
B. Administrative Approvals
   1. DR-17-00367  1232 Louisiana Street; New Duplex; Oread Design Guidelines Review
   2. DR-17-00414  888 New Hampshire Street; Sign Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review
   3. DR-17-00526  830 Connecticut Street; Residential Accessory Structure; Certificate of Appropriateness
   4. DR-17-00564  816 Massachusetts Street; Sidewalk Dining Permit; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review
   5. DR-17-00658  811 New Hampshire Street; Sign Permit; State Law Review and Downtown Design Guidelines Review
   6. DR-17-00699  1201 Rhode Island Street; Mechanical Permit; State Law Review
   7. DR-17-00701  125 E. 10th Street; Sign Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review
   8. DR-17-00702  933 Rhode Island Street; Plumbing Permit; State Law Review
   9. DR-18-00015  1333 Kentucky Street; New Residential Duplex; Oread Design Guidelines Review
  10. DR-18-00016  1012 Tennessee Street; Electrical Permit; State Law Review
11. DR-18-00018 831 Massachusetts Street; Sign Permit; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review
12. DR-18-00019 1337 New Hampshire Street; Residential Remodel; State Law Review
13. DR-18-00022 302 W 11th Street; AT&T ROW Cabinet; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness and Oread Design Guidelines Review
14. DR-18-00026 1103 Connecticut Street; AT&T ROW Cabinet; Certificate of Appropriateness
15. DR-18-00029 844 Rhode Island Street; AT&T ROW Cabinet; State Law Review and Certificate of Appropriateness
16. DR-18-00030 1300 New Hampshire Street; AT&T ROW Cabinet; State Law Review
17. DR-18-00031 635 Rhode Island Street; AT&T ROW Cabinet; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review
18. DR-18-00032 1246 Tennessee Street; AT&T ROW Cabinet; Oread Design Guidelines Review
19. DR-18-00033 1300 Tennessee Street; AT&T ROW Cabinet; Oread Design Guidelines Review
20. DR-18-00034 303 W 11th Street; AT&T ROW Cabinet; Certificate of Appropriateness and Oread Design Guidelines Review
21. DR-18-00038 1012 Tennessee Street; Residential Remodel; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness and Oread Design Guidelines Review
22. DR-18-00043 1340 Tennessee Street; Commercial Addition; Oread Design Guidelines Review
23. DR-18-00048 1420 Crescent Road; Sign Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness
24. DR-18-00050 941 Pennsylvania Street; Residential Remodel; Certificate of Appropriateness
25. DR-18-00051 7 E 8th Street; Sign Permit; State Law Review, and Downtown Design Guidelines Review
26. DR-18-00054 1124 Rhode Island Street; Residential Addition; State Law Review and Certificate of Appropriateness
27. DR-18-00058 413 E 7th Street; Commercial Remodel; Certificate of Appropriateness

ITEM NO. 3: PUBLIC COMMENT

ADDRESSING THE COMMISSION: The public is allowed to speak to any items or issues that are not scheduled on the agenda after first being recognized by the Chair. As a general practice, the Commission will not discuss/debate these items, nor will the Commission make decisions on items presented during this time, rather they will refer the items to staff for follow up. Individuals are asked to come to the microphone, sign in, and state their name and address. Speakers should address all comments/questions to the Commission.

AGENDA ITEMS MAY BE TAKEN OUT OF ORDER AT THE COMMISSION’S DISCRETION
ITEM NO. 4:  DR-18-00060  801 Indiana Street; Residential Additions, Demolition of Accessory Garage and New Accessory Garage; State Law Review. The property is contributing to the Old West Lawrence Historic District, National Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Sabatini Architects on behalf of Josh and Casey Hunt, property owners of record.

ITEM NO. 5:  DR-18-00059  826 Rhode Island Street; New Porch Modifications to DR-16-00235; State Law Review. The property is located in the North Rhode Island Street Historic Residential District, National Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects on behalf of James Slough, property owner of record.

ITEM NO. 6:  9th Street Project Presentation; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness and 8th & Pennsylvania Street Conservation Overlay District Guidelines Review. The street project spans the length of E 9th Street from New Hampshire Street to Pennsylvania Street. The project crosses Lawrence’s Downtown Conservation Overlay District, the North Rhode Island Street Historic Residential District, National Register of Historic Places, the Environs of the Social Service League, Turnhalle, and St. Luke African Methodist Episcopal Church, Lawrence Register of Historic Places, and is located in the 8th & Pennsylvania Revitalization Overlay District.

ITEM NO. 7:  East Lawrence Neighborhood Plan

ITEM NO. 8:  MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

   A.  Provide comment on Zoning Amendments, Special Use Permits, and Zoning Variances received since February 15, 2018.

   B.  Review of any demolition permits received since February 15, 2018.

   C.  Miscellaneous matters from City staff and Commission members.
Feb. 25, 2018

Dear ELNA Board, Rev. Verdell Taylor & the St. Luke A.M.E. Congregation, Cindy Maude & the LAC Board, Stan Hernly & Assoc., Lynne Zollner, City Preservation Planner & all who love East Lawrence,

Like board member Vanessa Reynaga, I left the Jan. ELNA mtg. reflecting on the Draft Plan for East Lawrence art and the ideas suggested at the meeting. Good turn out folks!

I think the Draft Plan is strong and as a draft, ELNA and whoever is hired to coordinate this challenging process will have to hammer out the workaday details. Thanks to Cindy Maude, Josh Davis & Dave Locwenstein for their hard work on a tight deadline.

The Draft Plan gives us a Community Art framework, embraces the five lead artists, then five more and five more. East Lawrence neighborhood Artist’s Assistants, Youth Corp, Research/Story Gatherers can work to engage more residents, deepen neighborhood pride and buy-in. Paying these workers shows respect and recognizes that making art is work and should be compensated.

I have trained, worked and deeply believe in the Community Art process. If as many neighbors of all stripes gather to reflect, research and participate in the art making, we will get better, more meaningful art rooted in our home place. I have seen this model work over and over in many communities. It is a tested, grass roots method used all over the world.

I feel strongly that we must hire a half-time Project Coordinator who understands Community Art and here’s why. The City has no staff time to devote to the project. The Art Center has no staff time to devote to the project and their new Director will need time to get up to speed on all her/his responsibilities. The ELNA board is all volunteer with an overworked, ½ time Coordinator who already donates many hours to ELNA. Done right, a Project Coordinator would manage the art workers, help them with workspace, aid them in scheduling, keep the world informed regularly and work to engage as many neighbors as possible. Tall order—no a volunteer position.

We are all tired. We have all done a lot of work these past few years and attended too many meetings. Still, I would ask you to look back to the hundreds of East Lawrenceans, many gone now, who worked hard to make the city pay attention to our needs, kept 2 highways from cutting through our neighborhood, fought 3 times to keep the School Board from closing New York Elementary, etc., etc.

We don’t have to like each other (although that could happen) but we are bonded by this place we live in. If we press on, we honor those who went before and made it the neighborhood it is today and a better place for our kids and grandkids. I urge you to study the Draft document, be very specific about any part you think needs to be looked at and attend the March ELNA mtg., Monday, March 5th, 7:00 p.m. at the New York School Library.

Our river neighborhood was originally home to Indigenous people, African Americans fleeing the Jim Crow south, Mexican Americans who came to work the railroads, Germans escaping conscription, Irish from the famine, Swiss, French, Nordic peoples and on and on. There needs to be a book written my friends.
This brings me to St. Luke A.M.E. and the idea that all the grant dollars should go to the church. I would love to see if any of the Artists propose art about this historic place. I would love to see St. Luke completely restored to stand another hundred years. St. Luke is a historically African American church, has always been a Civil Rights hub, is important architecturally and has ties to Langston Hughes.

Number 1, we must ask the congregation and Rev. Verdell what they want and need. It is their church, their heritage and their choice.

When Rev. Taylor first arrived in Lawrence and learned about the long history of St. Luke, his congregants reached out to the Lawrence Preservation Alliance, Prof. Bill Tuttle and many others. Through grant writing and fund raising they were able to begin the extensive repairs the building needed. They also did the careful research work to get St. Luke on the Local, State and National Historic Registers. As a listed property on the Registers they were eligible for grants and in-kind donations.

Grants and donations paid for a comprehensive Preservation/Restoration Assessment by Stan Hernly & Assoc. finished in 2005. This Assessment lays out exactly the work that is needed to make sure this important church building remains for future generations.

Since St. Luke is on the State and National Historic Registers, any work done must be guided (presumably by Mr. Hernly’s firm since he knows the structure inside and out) and done by experienced people adhering to the Secretary of Interiors Standards. Our State Historic Resources Dept., City Preservation Planner, Lynne Braddock Zollner and Lawrence’s Historic Resource Commission would serve as advocates and advisors for a well done restoration.

Stan shared the 2005 Cost projections for a complete restoration and advised adding 4% a year for inflation. He also cautioned that these were not hard and fast numbers since materials, wages, etc. fluctuate. I’m no math whiz but it looks like they need approx. $2,837,000 in 2018 dollars. If they had 3 million they could also start an endowment for maintenance and future repairs to their building and grounds.

Any stained glass window restoration must be done by experienced professionals. The cost estimate to repair the 2 largest windows would be approx. $90,000 (2018 dollars) plus the cost of tuck pointing the brick walls around the windows so they would support the restored windows. The Iowa firm that gave the 2005 bid and specializes in restoring historic stained glass would return (for free) and give an updated quote.

Rev. Taylor and his congregation can let us know how they want to move forward. I feel certain that any group that commits to a serious fund raising campaign for them would be greatly appreciated. At the same time I believe we should create a job description for an Art Coordinator and begin the hiring process. We have approx. two years to pull this off. It’s an opportunity to try to heal and continue the good work East Lawrence is known for.

Yours on the Eastside,

K T Walsh

[Signature]
February 6th 2018

To: Dave Cronin, Public Works
    Lynne Zollner Historic Resources Administrator

Re: 9th Street Design Plans, sidewalk and curb replacement

The East Lawrence Neighborhood Association board voted at our February meeting to support the use of brick to replace sidewalks where bricks currently exist, and to the use of limestone curbs where they continue to exist on the streetscape. This is consistent with our neighborhood plan as adopted by the City in 2000, as well as with the precedents of re-use that have been implemented in other neighborhoods within the City.

These are some of the historic resources located within the original town site of the City, and they will continue to pay back to the City as we continue to push our City’s historicity as a selling point to tourism and to our general quality of life.

We recognize the extra detail that brick requires, and we feel it is worth that extra detail. Studies have shown and the City has demonstrated that the use of brick and limestone in these features can be done to ADA standards and can last for decades when properly installed and maintained.

We would also suggest additional training and/or outreach to property owners about the care and maintenance of these valuable Historic Resources.

Thank you,

East Lawrence Neighborhood Association
Phil Collison, President
eastlawrence@yahoo.com
phil@pcollison.com
ITEM NO. 1: COMMUNICATIONS
A. All communications were included in the packet.
B. No ex-parte communications.
C. No abstentions from specific agenda items by commissioners.
D. There were no Committee Reports. Ms. Zollner explained that the applicant did not appear for the scheduled Architectural Review Committee (ARC) meeting.

ITEM NO. 2: CONSENT AGENDA
A. October, November, & January Action Summaries
B. Administrative Approvals
   1. DR-17-00555 821 New Jersey Street; New Accessory Structure; Certificate of Appropriateness
   2. DR-17-00699 1201 Rhode Island Street; Mechanical Permit; State Law Review
   3. DR-17-00701 125 E 10th Street; Sign Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review
   4. DR-17-00702 933 Rhode Island Street; Sewer Replacement; State Law Review
   5. DR-18-00005 745 New Hampshire Street; Sign Permit; State Law Review and Downtown Design Guidelines Review

ACTION TAKEN
Motioned by Commissioner Bailey, seconded by Commissioner Veatch, to approve the October, November, and January Action Summaries.

Unanimously approved 4-0.

Motioned by Commissioner Veatch, seconded by Commissioner Hernly, to confirm the administrative approvals.

Unanimously approved 4-0.
ITEM NO. 3: PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Dennis Brown, Lawrence Preservation Alliance (LPA), said there isn’t much to add to the letter he and the LPA board members submitted. He explained their holistic approach to addressing proposals for detached garages. He was curious to hear feedback from the commissioners regarding the thoughts in his letter.

Commissioner Bailey said they’ll likely see more proposals for detached garages in the future; however, he pointed out that each application is unique and doesn’t feel that they’re setting a precedent. He said he understands Mr. Brown’s concerns and felt it deserved more discussion.

Commissioner Veatch said the issue could possibly be addressed with a conservation overlay district. He felt they should remain cognizant of the difference between a State Law Review and an environs review, and he’s not willing to say that residential forms such as detached garages encroach upon, damage, or destroy properties in the environs.

Mr. Brown said he respects the commissioners’ opinions but feels the playing field needs to be further defined and that in the real world, it does set a precedent.

Commissioner Hernly asked about the status of short term rental regulations.

Ms. Zollner said it’s due back on a City Commission agenda soon.

Commissioner Hernly felt the short term rental regulations might have an impact on the construction of accessory structures for the purpose of lodging.

Ms. Zollner said that will be a City Commission discussion and staff has been following its progress.

Mr. Brown pointed out that those residential forms are not appropriate in some areas where zoning precludes detached dwellings. He felt that the construction of the structures in question don’t solve any real problems, they only create them.

Commissioner Bailey said there is a balancing act in meeting a property owner’s desire to change something and still meeting the code guidelines.

Mr. Brown discussed his thought process in writing his letter.

Commissioner Veatch said he appreciates Mr. Brown’s letter.

Commissioner Erby said she particularly appreciated the point about gentrification.

Mr. Brown thanked the commissioners.

Commissioner Bailey said the topic is definitely worth further discussion.

Ms. KT Walsh, East Lawrence Neighborhood Association (ELNA), read a letter they sent to the City Commission regarding the design for the curbs and sidewalks for the East 9th Street plan. She explained their concerns about removing limestone curbs and the historic brick sidewalks and ways they can be maintained and still be “ADA compliant”. She asked for the Commission’s support in maintaining those historic elements.
Commissioner Bailey asked if the main concern driving the plan to remove the curbs and sidewalks is ADA accessibility.

Ms. Walsh said it’s the point everyone keeps bringing up.

Ms. Zollner said the East 9th Street plan will be a public hearing item on the March agenda.

Commissioner Bailey asked if ADA is the biggest concern with the plan.

Ms. Zollner explained that it has been a previous topic of discussion and staff plans to assess the condition of the curbs and sidewalks before a recommendation is made.

Ms. Walsh added that many of the bricks are crumbling and they understand that some will have to be replaced not reused.

Commissioner Bailey said he doesn’t understand how the comfort of the sidewalks is an ADA accessibility issue.

Ms. Walsh said it’s their goal to make it a smooth ride for everyone.

**ITEM NO. 4:**  
**DR-18-00007  726 Massachusetts Street; New Addition; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review.** The property is listed as a contributing structure to Lawrence’s Downtown Historic District, National Register of Historic Places, and is located in the environs of Miller’s Hall (723-725 Massachusetts Street) and the House Building (729 Massachusetts Street), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the Downtown Urban Conservation Overlay District. Submitted by TreanorHL on behalf of BWB2 LP, property owner of record.

**ITEM NO. 6:**  
**MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS**

A. No comment on Zoning Amendments, Special Use Permits, and Zoning Variances received since January 18, 2018.

B. No demolition permits received since January 18, 2018.

C. Miscellaneous matters from City staff and Commission members.

**Historic Preservation Fund/Certified Local Government Grants**

Ms. Zollner mentioned that scholarships are available for the July 18-22 National Alliance of Preservation Commissions Forum. She reminded commissioners that the City is the Certified Local Government and as such will make the final selection of grants, and proceeded to explain staff’s recommendation for grant opportunities: a resurvey and PSIQ for University Place Neighborhood, as well as a survey for half of the Barker Neighborhood. She explained that East Lawrence Design Guidelines would need more preliminary work before a grant proposal would be feasible. She said staff recommends the neighborhood and staff
work to get those preliminary items in alignment to prepare for a grant application next year.

Commissioner Hemly asked if any of the preliminary items could be funded through a grant this year.

Ms. Zollner said they could apply for the resurvey of the area and look at preparing a neighborhood plan, although typically that’s something the City has done.

Commissioner Hemly asked if it would be possible to update the revitalization plan that was written 20 years ago.

Ms. Zollner said they could update the old plan or create a new one, noting that a resurvey of the area would provide better information.

Commissioner Hemly asked if a two-stage grant is favorable or if preliminary City staff work gives them a better chance.

Ms. Zollner said they certainly like to see City support - they prefer survey grants followed by National Register nominations in the second year, but have also granted preservation plans.

Commissioner Hemly said they’ll need a lot of momentum to get the design guidelines grant on pace for next year.

Commissioner Erby asked how the grant process works.

Ms. Zollner explained the process.

Commissioner Hemly said all of staff's recommendations are for good projects, but he noted how important East Lawrence Design Guidelines are for the Commission’s review processes.

Ms. Zollner recommended the Commission narrow down their grant choices to no more than two.

Commissioner Hemly asked if grants are requested for the University Place and Barker neighborhood surveys, if there is something the Commission can do to jumpstart the East Lawrence Design Guidelines effort.

Ms. Zollner said yes. The Commission could hold a public discussion and forward comments and concerns to the Planning Director.

Commissioners Bailey & Hemly suggested they accept staff’s recommendation to prepare grants for University Place and Barker neighborhoods, and add a public discussion on East Lawrence Design Guidelines to a future agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Ms. Norma Pierce, resident of University Place Neighborhood, said they formed a committee to research and discuss survey grants and living in a historic district. She said they created a website with information and have sponsored two public meetings to discuss their ideas. She said they are excited about the recommendation for a survey grant.

Mr. Brown explained that LPA has also been working with University Place to help with education and he explained LPA’s preferences for grant opportunities.

Ms. KT Walsh, ELNA, said they’re experiencing a great deal of pressure so they appreciate the idea of a pre-planning grant for East Lawrence Design Guidelines. She asked if staff can help get the Rhode Island Street National Historic District on the local register.

Ms. Zollner said she can work with them on it.

Ms. Pam Burkhead, University Place Neighborhood, said she would appreciate any funding for their survey.

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION**
Commissioner Bailey said they don’t want to overburden staff with grant requests.

Commissioner Hernly said as long as they get the East Lawrence process started, he’s ok moving forward with the surveys for University Place and Barker neighborhoods.

Commissioners Erby and Bailey agreed.

Commissioner Bailey said they should add the discussion to their next meeting.

**ACTION TAKEN**
Motioned by Commissioner Bailey, seconded by Commissioner Veatch, to adjourn the meeting.

**ADJOURNED 7:21 PM**
A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00367 1232 Louisiana Street; New Residential Construction (Duplex) permit; Oread Design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

New Residential Duplex permit

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Oread Design Guidelines (Oread Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District)

D. STAFF DETERMINATION

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.
A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00414 888 New Hampshire Street; Sign Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Sign Permit

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-17-00526 830 Connecticut Street; Residential Accessory Structure; Certificate of Appropriateness

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Residential Accessory Structure

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-17-00564 816 Massachusetts Street; Sidewalk Dining; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Sidewalk Dining

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-17-00658 811 New Hampshire Street; Sign Permit; State Law Review and Downtown Design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Sign Permit

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

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

Downtown Design Guidelines (Downtown Urban Conservation Overlay District)

D. STAFF DETERMINATION

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).
A. SUMMARY

DR-17-00699 1201 Rhode Island Street; Mechanical Permit; State Law Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Inflow/Infiltration Abatement Permit

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-17-00701 125 E. 10th Street; Sign Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Sign Permit

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-17-00702 933 Rhode Island Street; Plumbing Permit; State Law Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Sewer Replacement Permit

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-18-00015 1333 Kentucky Street; New Residential Duplex; Oread Design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

New Residential Permit - Duplex

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Oread Design Guidelines (Oread Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District)

D. STAFF DETERMINATION

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.
A. SUMMARY

DR-18-00016 1012 Tennessee Street; Electrical Permit; State Law Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Electrical Permit

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-18-00018 831 Massachusetts Street; Sign Permit; State Law Review; Certificate of Appropriateness and Downtown Design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Sign Permit

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-18-00019 1337 New Hampshire Street; Residential Remodel; State Law Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Residential Remodel Permit

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).
LAWRENCE HISTORIC RESOURCES
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW
STAFF REPORT

A. SUMMARY

DR-18-00022 302 W. 11th Street; AT&T Right of Way Cabinet; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness and Oread design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Right-of-Way Permit – AT&T cabinet

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)

Oread Neighborhood Design Guidelines (Oread Neighborhood 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 Oread Neighborhood 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-18-00026 1103 Connecticut Street; AT&T Right of Way Cabinet; Certificate of Appropriateness

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Right-of-Way Permit – AT&T cabinet

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-18-00022 844 Rhode Island Street; AT&T Right of Way Cabinet; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Right-of-Way Permit – AT&T cabinet

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)

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.

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-18-00022 1300 New Hampshire Street; AT&T Right of Way Cabinet; State Law Review,

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Right-of-Way Permit – AT&T cabinet

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-18-00032 1246 Tennessee Street; AT&T Right of Way Cabinet; Oread design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Right-of-Way Permit – AT&T cabinet

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Oread Neighborhood Design Guidelines (Oread Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District)

D. STAFF DETERMINATION

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 Neighborhood 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-18-00033 1300 Tennessee Street; AT&T Right of Way Cabinet; Oread design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Right-of-Way Permit – AT&T cabinet

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Oread Neighborhood Design Guidelines (Oread Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District)

D. STAFF DETERMINATION

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 Neighborhood 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-18-00034 303 W. 11th Street; AT&T Right of Way Cabinet; Certificate of Appropriateness and Oread design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Right-of-Way Permit – AT&T cabinet

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

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

Oread Neighborhood Design Guidelines (Oread Neighborhood 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 Oread Neighborhood 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-18-00038 1012 Tennessee Street; Residential Remodel; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness and Oread design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Residential Remodel Permit

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)

Oread Neighborhood Design Guidelines (Oread Neighborhood 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 Oread Neighborhood 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).
A. SUMMARY

DR-18-00043 1340 Tennessee Street; Commercial Addition; Oread design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Commercial Addition Permit

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Oread Neighborhood Design Guidelines (Oread Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District)

D. STAFF DETERMINATION

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 Neighborhood Design Guidelines and determined that the project, as proposed, meets these development and design standards.
A. SUMMARY

DR-18-00048 1420 Crescent Road; Sign Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Sign Permit

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

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

D. STAFF DETERMINATION

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

DR-18-00050 941 Pennsylvania Street; Residential Remodel; Certificate of Appropriateness

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Residential Remodel Permit

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

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

D. STAFF DETERMINATION

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

DR-18-00051 7 E. 8th Street; Sign Permit; State Law Review and Downtown Design Guidelines Review

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Sign Permit

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

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

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

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).
A. SUMMARY

DR-18-00054 1124 Rhode Island Street; Residential Addition; State Law Review and Certificate of Appropriateness

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Residential Addition Permit

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)

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.

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 COMMISSION
ITEM NO. 6: DR-18-00060
STAFF REPORT

A. SUMMARY
DR-18-00060  801 Indiana Street; Residential Additions, Demolition of Accessory Garage and New Accessory Garage; State Law Review. The property is contributing to the Old West Lawrence Historic District, National Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Sabatini Architects on behalf of Josh and Casey Hunt, property owners of record.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant is requesting to remove two existing porches and construct two new additions of similar size and footprint. The applicant also proposes to demolish the existing accessory structure and construct a new larger structure on the same corner of the lot.

| 801 Indiana Street | 801 Indiana Street Accessory Structure |

The addition on the west elevation of the structure will remove an existing frame porch and replace it with a glass conservatory. The glass conservatory will be recessed from the north elevation 1’ 6” to match the existing setback of the current porch. The addition will extend 8’ to the west and to the existing building on the south. The foundation will match the lattice style brick foundation that currently exists. The glass roof will shed to the west but will have a gable centered over the west elevation doors.

The southwest elevation addition will also remove an existing porch. The addition will wrap-around the corner of the structure and project 7’ to the west the primary wall of the structure and 7’ south from the primary wall of the structure. The addition will be 23’ north to south. Clad in wood siding with half round shingle siding courses, the addition will have a shed roof with a gable and foundation to match the lattice style brick veneer.
The existing accessory structure will be demolished and a new structure on the same corner of the lot will be constructed. This frame structure will be 24’ x 28’ 3”, 678 sf, and will be clad with fiber cement board lap siding. The roof will be asphalt shingle and the foundation will be concrete slab on grade. The structure will be set back 5’ from both the south and west property lines. Vehicular access to the structure is from the alley to the west. The fenestration patterns on the north and south are similar. There is no fenestration on the east elevation.

C. STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historical property and its environment would be unimpaired.

D. STAFF ANALYSIS

The structure located at 801 Indiana Street was constructed c. 1893. When the Old West Lawrence Historic District was listed in the National Register in 1972, it did not include a list of contributing and non-contributing structures. The district was resurveyed in 1991, and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) generated a list of contributing and non-contributing structures based on this survey to determine the eligibility of structures for the Kansas Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit program. (This list was never approved by the National Park Service as an official list of contributing and non-contributing structures.) This list identifies 801 Indiana Street as a contributing structure to the district. Staff is also of the opinion that the structure is contributing to the Old West Lawrence Historic District.

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

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

West Porch
The applicant is proposing to remove the existing porch on the west elevation of the structure. This porch appears to be historic. It is not uncommon for historic porches on rear elevation to change over time. Historically, they were often filled-in and/or enlarged to gain additional interior space. The location of rear porches is also a typical location for new additions to historic structures. Most often
they provide an opportunity to expand in a location that is well suited for a lot and many times an interior space arrangement. The standards and guidelines for additions to historic structures encourage placing additions on the rear of structures. This addition is on the rear and is set in from the adjacent side wall plane which is also recommended for new additions.

The difficulty for this addition is the material. The proposed addition is a glass conservatory. An all glass addition is not typically a compatible material for a wood frame residential structure of this architectural style. However, the addition is small in size. While the size is small, the addition height is accentuated by a cross gable that is centered on the shed roof. This gable interrupts the typical shed roof form for rear additions and adds extra glazing that is highly visible to the addition. (The peak of the gable is only 9’ from the edge of the north wall.) The overall effect of the roof form creates an addition that emphasizes the use of glass as the only material on the addition.

A change in roof form to a simple shed roof like was common on most typical small porch-like additions would reduce the overall impact of the use of glass as the material for the walls and roof of the addition structure.

**Southwest Addition**

The proposed project will remove a second existing porch on the west elevation of the structure and will replace the porch with a new addition that will wrap around the southwest corner of the structure. This addition will allow for a mud room and an expanded kitchen. This addition is also located at the rear of the structure but is not recessed from the adjacent wall plane. This addition will also remove two historic exterior walls of the structure.

When new additions are added to historic structures, the least amount of historic material should be removed. If walls need to be opened for additional space, they should be opened in such a manner as to leave an appearance of the original wall configuration. Often this is achieved by using a cased opening - leaving a small portion of the wall to either side and above. Due to the small size and location of this addition, a cased opening is not possible for either the south wall or the west wall. The small size of the addition removes only 16’ of the south wall and 16’ of the west wall.
The southwest addition is located 7’ from the southern wall plane of the structure. This is not recommended for additions to historic structures. Additions should be recessed behind the wall plane of the adjacent side wall. While the addition is 7’ to the south, it will only be 2’ from the furthermost wall plane of the structure – the first bay on the south wall. This new addition will also be 73’ from the east property line. The concern for staff is the complicated roof form for the addition. This roof form will increase the height of the addition and will amplify the extension of the addition past the wall plane. If the roof form is simplified, like a shed roof form that was very common for rear additions, the impact of the addition extending past the wall plane will be minimized.

Demolition and New Construction of Accessory Structure

Demolition of historic structures is rarely positive for a neighborhood because it destroys the relationships between the structures, landscape features, and open space, and as a result the overall character of the area is diminished. When possible, staff prefers rehabilitation to retain structures and their relationship to the environs of the listed properties. If demolition is approved, it removes the opportunity for a future owner to rehabilitate the existing structure. Therefore, each request for demolition should be reviewed on a case by case basis and the approval of demolition for one property does not support the demolition of other structures.

The accessory structure located off the alley at 801 Indiana Street is typical of accessory structures in the Old West Lawrence neighborhood and the historic district.

The poor condition of this structure can be attributed to the general decline of accessory structures of this type and the neglected maintenance and care of the structure over time. Staff is of the opinion the poor condition of this structure is the result of the typical decline associated with accessory structures due to materials and construction method. The rehabilitation of the structure would likely require the lifting of the structure to construct a new foundation and carefully supporting the existing framing of the structure to allow for the wracking of the structure to be corrected. Because of the original construction materials and methods, this structure may not withstand the rehabilitation without additional harm.
The applicant has provided structural analysis and a simple cost replacement analysis. Staff has evaluated the structure and agrees with the deficiencies identified by the structural analysis submitted by the applicant.

The proposed accessory structure is larger than the existing structure but within the size of accessory structures within the district. The main portion of the structure is limited to space for vehicles and storage space is addressed by adding a small lean-to of 92 sf to the east elevation. This small addition allows for the overall size of the structure to be minimized for the use of a garage.

The proposed structure is one and ½ stories at a building height to the roof peak of 24’ 5”. This allows for an upper floor studio. (It should be noted that this property is zoned RS5 and an accessory dwelling unit/apartment/living unit is not allowed in this zoning district.) The property consists of a double lot. The size of a double lot helps to mitigate the height of the new accessory structure. While tall for the typical historic accessory structures in the district, some accessory structures of this type did historically exist in the district and were often on larger lots.

**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 9 and 10 apply to this project.

**New Additions and Interior Alterations**
The interior alterations proposed are minor alterations in secondary locations that will not impact the overall primary character of the historic structure. The amount of historic material loss, while significant in the southwest corner of the structure, is at the rear of the structure. By trying to minimize the size of the addition, there is not a good opportunity to do a cased opening on the south wall due to the existing pantry location and proposed removal of the pantry.

The new additions are compatible in size, scale, and massing.

While the materials for the western addition are compatible, the all glass conservatory material is atypical for an addition to a historic structure in the district. If the size and scale of the addition can be minimized by altering the roof to a simple shed roof form, the impact of the all glass structure will be minimized.

Additions to historic structures should be to the rear of the structure and should be setback behind the wall plane of the associated side elevation. The proposed southwest addition extends past the south wall plane of the first bay extension on the south wall plane by 2’. This extension beyond the wall plane can be minimized by simplifying the roof on the addition to a shed roof that is similar to other rear additions in the district. The change to a shed roof and the distance from the public right of way will reduce the impact of the projection of the addition past the wall plane.
Staff is of the opinion that the glass conservatory addition roof be altered to a shed roof form that is the form of the existing porch and is the primary roof form for most rear additions.

Staff is also of the opinion that the roof form for the addition on the southwest corner should be simplified to a shed roof form in keeping with rear additions and minimizing the height and mass of this addition.

**Accessory Structure**

The demolition of the existing accessory structure is warranted due to the condition of the structure. Because a new structure is proposed in a similar location, the overall effect on the district is mitigated. The proposed materials for the new structure are compatible and the modern design of the structure ensures that it is not viewed as original to the site. While the height is taller than typical historic accessory structures, it is within the range of heights that existing historically in the district. The size, scale, massing, and setbacks are appropriate for the double lot. If the structure were removed in the future, the overall integrity of the property would be unimpaired.

Staff is of the opinion the demolition and new construction of the accessory structure will not damage or encroach upon the historic district.

**E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

In accordance with the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards*, the standards of evaluation, staff recommends the Commission request the applicant to accept the amendments provided by staff to

1. Change the roof on the west addition/conservatory to a shed roof with no cross gable; and
2. Simplify the roof on the southwest addition to a shed roof appearance from the public right of way of Indiana Street.

If the amendments are accepted, staff recommends the commission approve the proposed project and make the determination that the proposed project does not damage or destroy any historic property included in the National Register of Historic Places or the State Register of Historic Places (Register of Historic Kansas Places).

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

If the amendments are not accepted, staff recommends the project be referred to the Architectural Review Committee to work with the applicant on the roof lines of the additions to find solutions that meet the project goals of the applicant while meeting Standard 9 for compatibility of additions to historic properties.
DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

PROPERTY INFORMATION
Address of Property  801 Indiana Street

Legal Description (may be attached)  LANE'S FIRST ADD BLK 8 LTS 1 &2 (U04738 & 4739 COMBINED 1987)

OWNER INFORMATION
Name(s)  Josh and Casey Hunt
Contact  Josh or Casey Hunt
Address  801 Indiana Street
City  Lawrence  State KS  ZIP  66044
Phone (785) 749-7475  Fax (    )  E-mail jhunt@mammothlive.com
Cell Phone (785) 550-4851

APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION
Contact  Dan Sabatini
Company  Sabatini  Architects
Address  730 New Hampshire St, Ste. 233
City  Lawrence  State KS  ZIP  66044
Phone (785) 331-3399  Fax (785) 331-0846
E-mail dsabatini@sabatiniarchitects.com  Cell Phone (785) 550-6564

<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>RS5</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total site area</th>
<th>Existing Building Footprint</th>
<th>Proposed Building Footprint</th>
<th>Open Space Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11,700 sf</td>
<td>1,776 SF + 540 SF Porches + 180 SF Garage</td>
<td>2,064 SF Home + 350 SF Porch + 770 SF Garage</td>
<td>8,516 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Pavement Coverage</th>
<th>Proposed Pavement Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you also submitting any of the following applications?
- Building Permit  - Site Plan  - Special Use Permit
- Variance  - State or Federal Tax Credit Application  - Zoning Change

Other (specify)
Property Address: 801 Indiana St. Lawrence, KS 66044

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

The Existing House and Garage:
The existing two-story house is a good example of late 19th century Queen Anne style located in the Old West Lawrence Historic District. In the OWL Historic District MPS Inventory the structure is documented built in 1892 and is a contributing structure to the district. The house exterior is wood shingle with a cross hip roof with asphalt shingles. The existing garage is a simple wood framed gable roof structure with garage door located on the north end. The structure is supported on an exposed concrete stem wall. The garage has a concrete floor believed to be of a later time period than the house. The garage door is modern sectional overhead door. The existing property is a typical double lot of 100’ x 117’.

Proposed House Addition:
The proposed addition to the house occurs on the west (rear) and south sides of the house. The existing shed roofed back porch on the west elevation will be removed and replaced with an addition extending 7’ beyond the existing south elevation. The addition will continue to the east to align with the existing rear portion of the house. This addition will have shed roof with gable at the SW corner, referencing the existing shed roof on the porch. The roof extension will have similar exposed rafter tails and roof decking. The new siding will match the existing wood siding with half round shingle siding courses to coordinate with detailing on the existing house and matching siding exposure. The finish foundation material will match the existing brick lattice style veneer.

Another addition also occurs on the west (rear) side of the house. An existing shed roofed porch will be removed and replaced with a glass conservatory designed to mimic the design of the existing house. The addition will be set back from the north side of the house approximately 1’-6” to match the setback of the existing porch and extend 8’ to the west of the existing house. The shed roofed conservatory will feature a cross gable similar in style to the cross gable existing on the upper level of the house. A pair of glass entry doors will be centered on the west elevation of the conservatory. Again, the foundation appearance will match the lattice style brick foundation that currently exists.

Please see attached drawings.

Existing Garage Condition
The wood framed, 1.5-story building has a distinctive roof sag and significantly leans to the east. The existing concrete foundation is shallow which is common for the time of its construction. The foundation is uneven and has broken apart because heaving and settlement. This condition has transferred to the existing wood structure and exposed the wood to decades of rot and deterioration. Lack modern lateral bracing and properly sized roof structure create the lean and the roof to sag. On the interior, the existing interior concrete floor is also in poor condition with large cracks. Rehabilitation of the garage would require a new foundation, new concrete floor slab and straightening the structure. The most effective process to construct a new foundation is to relocate or raise the structure temporarily while the foundation is constructed. Complicating the temporary relocation or raising is the wood frame structure’s lean and poor condition which could be facilitated by total removal of the exterior siding and replace much of the wall framing. If attempted to straighten even the existing nails could snap due to rust and fatigue. The cost will double, if not close to triple to renovate the existing garage than replace. We estimate renovation of the existing 254 SF garage at $74,000-$90,000. The anticipated cost for proposed replace garage $120,000-$136,000. Although the structure could be renovated much of the original
integrity of the structure and exterior is removed, replaced or rebuilt.

Proposed Detached Garage Structure:
The proposed garage is detached to retain the historical pattern of secondary structures that are accessed from the alley. The proposed garage is 24'-0” x 28'-3” (678 S.F.) with a lean-to section on the east side for additional storage (92 S.F.) appropriate for the double lot size. The owners desire to retain a historic appearance for the garage in a similar, though much simpler style than the house. Using a gable roof is intended to match the house and visually minimize the garage height. The construction details of the addition will be very simple, though taking cues from historic garage design.

Materials proposed for the garage include:
- Wood framed asphalt hip roof with exposed soffit and rafter tails to match existing;
- Smooth wood or fiber cement board lap siding (approx. 4” to 4-1/4” exposure);
- Two new garage doors in a more historically correct style (painted);
- Smooth wood or cement fiber corner, eave and trim around windows and doors similar in size and detailing to the existing;
- Skirting and mitered corner of shingle at the second-floor line.
- Wood or fiber cement shingles to match the existing.

In addition to the new garage, the propose landscape modifications to their backyard will be possible replacement of a portion of the backyard West, East and South fences with a new wood and metal fence (6’-0” maximum height) to replace the existing wood fence. The existing concrete drive will be removed and the fence along the alley rebuilt as indicated above. The new drive from the alley to the garage will be concrete. The existing brick alley will be protected during construction and repair if damaged.

Reason for Request:
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

The owners purchased this home loving its historic character. They are very committed to retaining the historic elements of this home. Unfortunately, the existing kitchen is small and lacks both work and storage space. As the primary family entrance of the house, there is also a lack of space for shoes, coats, backpacks, etc. The addition will enlarge the space enough that the family can have a more functional kitchen and have a mud-room/laundry area that will increase the usability of the space greatly. The conservatory addition will add much needed space for the owner’s home-based business while providing added light to the northwest corner of the house. The light nature of the conservatory retains the existing shed roof design so to limit the visual impact on the north façade. The conservatory addition will also allow realignment of the existing basement stair directly under the stair from the kitchen to the second floor. The current stairs to the basement are steep and precarious.

The owners desire to replace the existing garage to provide space for two cars in the garage. The owners feel that to meet modern 21\textsuperscript{st} century needs and to retain property’s viability it is necessary to provide at least a two-car garage. This also helps reduce the on-street parking needs. The owners are very concerned with retaining the historic character of the property and believe because of the design and the structure’s location it will have minimal impact to the overall character of the district. The upper floor area will be accessible for home office activities. The owner has noted similar structures throughout the neighborhood including the property direct south of theirs has a comparable 2-story garage.
Architect/Engineer/Contractor Information: Please provide name and phone number of any persons associated with the project.

Contact    Dan Sabatini

Company    Sabatini Architects Inc.

Address    730 New Hampshire St., Suite 233

City        Lawrence          State KS          ZIP  66044

Phone (785) 331-3399            Fax (785) 331-0846

E-mail     dsabatini@sabatiniarchitects.com          Cell (785) 550-6564

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 2018-02-26

Date ___________________________ Date ___________________________ Date ___________________________

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

I/WE  

[Signatures]

hereby referred to as the "Undersigned", being of lawful age, do hereby on this ___day of February, 2018, 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

[Name]

(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

[Address]

(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.

[Signatures]

Owner

Owner

STATE OF KANSAS
COUNTY OF DOUGLAS

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on this ___day of Feb., 2018,

by [Signatures]

My Commission Expires:

[Signature]

Notary Public
SOUTHEAST CORNER

NORTH ELEVATION (8TH STREET SIDE)
WEST KITCHEN PORCH  (PROPOSED ADDITION FOR KITCHEN EXTENSION)

PARTIAL WEST ELEVATION CLOSE UP
WEST KITCHEN PORCH (PROPOSED ADDITION FOR KITCHEN EXTENSION)
SOUTH ELEVATION AND KITCHEN PORCH (PROPOSED ADDITION FOR KITCHEN EXTENSION)
ALLEY VIEW

ALLEY VIEW ALONG WEST PROPERTY LINE (PROPOSED GARAGE LOCATION)
EXISTING 1-1/2 STORY GARAGE ON BRICK ALLEY

CRACKED FOUNDATION ON EXISTING GARAGE
801 Indiana Street: Contributing

A significant increase in property tax valuation occurred in 1892 when C. H. Smithmeyer was the owner of record. In 1893/94 and 1896 Frederick H. Smithmeyer (manager, Theo Poehler Mercantile Co.) was listed as a resident. By 1898 Frederick and his wife Mrs. Clara P. Smithmeyer were listed as occupants of this dwelling. Frederick H. and Clara P. Smithmeyer continued to be listed as residents in 1900/01, 1902/03, 1905, 1907, 1908/09, 1911, 1913/14, 1915, 1917, 1919, and 1923. During this time Frederick became the vice president of the Thea Poehler Mercantile Co. In 1911, 1913/14, and 1915 Frederick was also listed as the president and manager of the Kaw Valley Canning Co. Other members of the Smithmeyer family to reside at this location were: Fred P. (student, KU) (1907, 1908/09, 1911); Sophie (1908/09, 1911, 1913/14, 1915, 1917); Matilda E. (student) (1913/14, 1915, 1917, 1919). The dwelling was listed as vacant in 1925/26. The Delta K. Fraternity was listed at this location in 1927/28. The dwelling was again listed as vacant in 1929/30. The dwelling was recorded on the 1927 Sanborn Map.
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A CERTIFIED PROPERTY OWNERSHIP LIST WITHIN 250 FT OF 801 INDIANA ST (U04738A). 02/07/2018. REQUESTED BY DAN SABATINI OF SABATINI ARCHITECTS.

JOHN R. NICHOLS
DOUGLAS COUNTY CLERK’S OFFICE
1100 MASSACHUSETTS ST
LAWRENCE, KS 66044

785-832-5147

jnichols@douglascountyks.org

Douglas County Real Estate Division
County Clerk’s Office. I do hereby certify the Property Ownership listed hereto, to be true and accurate.
POL WITHIN 250 FT OF 801 INDIANA ST (U04738A)
LAURENCE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION
ITEM NO. 5: DR-18-00059
STAFF REPORT

A. SUMMARY

DR-18-00059 826 Rhode Island Street; New Porch Modifications to DR-16-00235; State Law Review. The property is located in the North Rhode Island Street Historic Residential District, National Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects on behalf of James Slough, property owner of record.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The property owner has constructed the below structure that does not match the plans approved by the Historic Resources Commission on July 21, 2016 that reflected a porch that was raised up to 2’ above grade in some locations. (DR-16-00235) Instead, the duplex was constructed with the porch at grade with no steps, no side walls with vents, and the porch column details were not constructed to the approved plans.
Approved Structure for 826 Rhode Island West Elevation

Approved Structure North Elevation
The applicant proposes to add a swale to the site that will expose approximately 4” or possibly up to 6” of concrete on a portion of the west foundation slab to mitigate the slab on grade foundation for the porch that was not approved as part of the original project.
C. **STANDARDS FOR REVIEW**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**D. STAFF ANALYSIS**

The Historic Resources Commission (HRC), at their meeting on July 21, 2016, approved the demolition of an existing structure located at 826 Rhode Island Street and the new construction of a duplex. While the structure that was approved for demolition was not a contributing property, it did not noticeably detract from the historic district’s sense of time, place and historical development. It was compatible with the character defining elements of the district. The lot at 826 Rhode Island
Street sloped to the east and the structure approved for demolition had a raised foundation that was visible on the west, north, south, and east elevations. The height of the foundation from grade changed with the slope of the lot. With this configuration, the western portion of the structure was elevated above grade. The height above grade to the door of the structure is unknown, however the photographs indicate that while the slope of the front yard may have changed to reduce the height of the foundation from the ground level on the west, there was an increase/step in height from the ground that was appropriate for the size, scale, massing, and architectural style of the structure.
Previous Structure Located at 826 Rhode Island Street in 2016
Stoop for Previous Structure Located at 826 Rhode Island Street in 2016
Visual inspection of other structures in this block of the historic district show a similar condition to the previous structure on this site in some change to the grade in front yards has taken place over time to reduce the appearance of the height adjacent to the front foundation walls and the front porch, stoop, or door. Some structures were constructed just two to three steps above grade. One brick structure has an at-grade front porch but this may be an alteration though the threshold was historically only one step up. This type of threshold is appropriate for this vernacular architectural style, size, scale, and massing of this architectural type.

New construction in historic districts should respect the size, scale, massing, setbacks, and materials of the historic district. The North Rhode Island Street Historic Residential District includes a variety of vernacular architecture that has a variety of foundation types and heights of floor grades above ground level. The majority of the structures in the district are modest in size and are 1, 1½, and 2 stories in height. Typically, larger structures are located on corner lots or on parcels that combine a lot and ½ or 2 lots.

Architectural styles in the North Rhode Island Historic Residential District vary, but most structures represent various forms of vernacular architecture. Each form has different components. One of the more consistent components is a raised foundation. While some of the forms have only a slightly raised foundation, the component still exists. Larger structures that are wood frame with complex roofs have raised foundations. Some smaller structures that were built as a simple two-over-two style and have a simple gable roof have a one step grade change.
When the HRC approved the new construction of the now-existing duplex, it was noted that the overall footprint of the structure was large, and while the proposed structure met the setback requirements for the zoning district, it was not typical for this area of the historic district. Neither the staff report nor the commission discussion of the project reflect any discussion about the height of the porch floor from grade, as the proposed project showed a concrete foundation wall and three steps up to the porch floor. Typically most structures, especially large structures that are comparable to the size of this new structure, are on raised foundations. The structure that was approved had a similar foundation and porch construction to the previous structure on site that was approved for demolition and the other existing structures in the block. The porch was elevated from grade. The structure was not constructed in accordance with the approved plans. As a result, the porch appears as a slab on grade rather than as a structure on a raised foundation wall.

Scale and massing are critical to compatible design for new construction in historic districts. Foundations are a character defining element that help to create overall scale, and “platform” contributes to the overall massing of a structure visible to the street. This structure is slab on grade at the front porch on the western elevation of the structure. This is not typical for the historic district. This slab on grade entrance is not appropriate for this lot, for this type of structure in the historic district, or for the historic district in general. The size and mass of this new structure accentuate the amount of mass that is visually vertically as well as horizontally placed on the ground level. The lack of even a small amount of visible foundation elevation for the porch creates a structure that has no platform for the large structure.

Staff has worked with the applicant to try to find ways to mitigate the effects of this non-typical, non-compatible portion of the structure. Because the structure has been constructed, mitigation is a significant challenge. The applicant has proposed a swale that will alter the slope of the front yard and allow approximately 4” (drawing states 4” minimum 6” better) of concrete slab edge to be exposed on a portion of the porch area.

The HRC reviewed a project for a front porch that was slab on grade in a historic district in 2017. (DR-17-00369 1346 Rhode Island Street) The applicant worked with staff prior to construction to find ways to mitigate the use of this form. Like the 800 block of Rhode Island Street, some of the structures were of the size, scale, mass, and architectural type with some change in grade over time that created a visual appearance of minimum elevation from the ground to the porch floor. For 1346 Rhode Island Street, the structure was placed on a pedestal to create a base for the mass of the structure. This pedestal will also prevent future grade infill toward the concrete foundation wall. The form slab edge was 2” X 12” and the front porch has a piece of 2” X 6” painted trim on the edge of the porch. The pedestal in combination with this treatment gives a visual indication from the street that the porch is raised from the ground level.
The solution of the proposed swale for this property does not provide for these same mitigation measures. While the swale may provide for some minimal visual indication of elevation for a portion of the structure for a time, because there is no pedestal, it is likely that the swale will not be successful over time to mitigate the visual appearance of the slab on grade porch.

The review standards staff must use to review projects do not change because a project has been constructed. If this project were proposed prior to construction, staff would not recommend approval. Staff is of the opinion the project does not meet Standard 9. Raised porches, however small, are a character defining feature of the historic district. The size, scale, and massing of this structure are large for the historic district. While the structure was approved with a minimum raised porch, the elevation was enough to create a pedestal and base for the scale and mass of the structure. Without this character defining detail, the structure does not protect the integrity of the district and does encroach upon and damage the historic district. Because the mass and scale created for the structure by the lack of a raised porch are not compatible with the historic district, staff recommends the HRC deny the proposed project.

Like staff, the HRC uses the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for review. If the HRC denies the project, the City Commission is the body that considers if all possible planning has been done and if there are any feasible or prudent alternatives to the project.

E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION
In accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the standards of evaluation, staff recommends the Commission deny the project and make the determination that the project does encroach upon, damage, or destroy one or more listed historic properties.
DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

PROPERTY INFORMATION
Address of Property  826 Rhode Island
Legal Description (may be attached)  Rhode Island Street, Lot 58, Lawrence, Douglas County, Kansas

OWNER INFORMATION
Name(s)    James Slough
Contact     James Slough
Address     PO Box 763
City      Lawrence
State     Kansas
ZIP     66044
Phone (785) 841-3479
Fax (___)
E-mail  troutdadd@aol.com
Cell Phone (___)

APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION
Contact    Paul Werner
Company    Paul Werner Architects
Address     123 W 8th Street, Suite B2
City      Lawrence
State     Kansas
ZIP     66044
Phone (785) 832-0804
Fax (785) 979-2243
E-mail  paulw@paulwernerarchitects.com
Cell Phone (785) 979-2243

Existing Zoning
RM24
Total site area 5,850.00
Existing Pavement Coverage 2595

Existing Land Use
Duplex

Proposed Land Use
Duplex

# of Buildings 2

Existing Building Footprint
2595
Proposed Building Footprint
2595

Open Space Area 4730

Existing Pavement Coverage
1436
Proposed Pavement Coverage

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)

Application Form
06/2016

Design Review Application
Property
Address: 826 Rhode Island

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

The project at 826 Rhode Island has been built. However, the porch was not constructed per the approved plans. The owner/contractor apologizes for this oversight and hopes to come together with the HRC to agree on a solution that everyone can be happy about.

The owner is proposing to dig out a portion of the front yard and expose 4-6" of the concrete porch. We can only dig out 4-6" before we are essentially creating a pond, which will not be good for the structure, or the neighboring properties.

While we agree that a raised porch may be a better design, what we are proposing is not inappropriate for the area. After surveying the properties on the block, we have found that 3 out of 8 have only slightly raised porches, which meets the standards as required by the HRC.

Reason for Request:
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

We need approval from the HRC in order to obtain a final occupancy permit.
**Architect/Engineer/Contractor Information:** Please provide name and phone number of any persons associated with the project.

**Contact**  
Paul Werner

**Company**  
Paul Werner Architects

**Address**  
123 W 8th, Suite B2

**City**  
Lawrence

**State**  
KS

**ZIP**  
66044

**Phone**  
785-832-0804

**Fax**  
_____

**E-mail**  
paulw@paulwerneraitects.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 2/12/2018

______________________________ Date __________________

______________________________ Date __________________

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

I, James Slough, hereby referred to as the "Undersigned", being of lawful age, do hereby on this 3 day of April, 2014, make the following statements to wit:

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

   RHODE ISLAND STREET, LOT 58, LAWRENCE, DOUGLAS COUNTY, KANSAS

2. I the undersigned, have previously authorized and hereby authorize Paul Werner Architects (Herein referred to as "Applicant"), to act on my behalf for the purpose of making application with the Planning Office of Lawrence/Douglas County, Kansas, regarding 826 Rhode Island, Lawrence, Kansas (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 3 day of April, 2014, by James Slough.

My Commission Expires: 04.16.17

Notary Public

C:sers\Tiffany\Desktop\826 Rhode Island Owner Auth.doc
Memorandum
City of Lawrence
Public Works Department

TO: Lynne Zollner
FROM: Dave Cronin, City Engineer
DATE: March 8, 2017
RE: Agenda Item for Historic Resources Commission
E. 9th Street Project

Background
In 2017 the City Commission authorized staff to proceed with final design plans for the reconstruction of 9th Street from New Hampshire to Pennsylvania to meet the ‘basic street’ design concept presented by staff. Construction is anticipated to begin in Summer 2018 and take 4-6 months. The project will be constructed in two phases: New Hampshire to New York; New York to Delaware. The project is in the 2018 CIP with a budget of $2,500,000.

The ‘basic street’ design includes reconstruction with concrete pavement, storm sewer, 6’ sidewalks on both sides of street, on-street parking, pedestrian lighting, street trees, retaining walls and preserving green space. The ‘basic street’ design does not include bike facilities, underground electrical or decorative street light poles at intersections. Existing sidewalks will be reconstructed with similar material; brick sidewalks will be replaced with brick and concrete sidewalks will be replaced with concrete. There is approximately 480’ of limestone curb in the corridor. Based on past experience with removing and replacing limestone curb, approximately half is reusable due to the condition. Any salvageable limestone curb will be stockpiled for reuse in the East Lawrence neighborhood.

Staff has discussed the preliminary plans with St. Luke AME Church at 9th & New York. The Church is working on plans to improve ADA accessibility at the north entrance to the building. The design team will be evaluating options to improve sidewalk accessibility adjacent to the Church.

Attachments
Preliminary Plans
9TH STREET PLAN & PROFILE

STA 20+00 TO 23+00

CONSTRUCT 146 SY 4" CONCRETE SIDEWALK
STA 20+20.96 TO 22+85.71
0+31.20

CONSTRUCT 8 SY ACCESS RAMP
STA 22+85.71, 45.35' RT (E 9TH STREET)

CONSTRUCT 14 SY ACCESS RAMPS
STA 20+31.66, 22.36' RT

CONSTRUCT 5 SY 6" ACCESS RAMPS
STA 20+21.47, 28.12' LT (E 9TH STREET)

CONSTRUCT 15 SY 6" ACCESS RAMPS
STA 21+29.11, 37.92' RT (E 9TH STREET)

CONSTRUCT 8 SY 4" CONCRETE SIDEWALK
STA 23+35.38, 45.35' RT (E 9TH STREET)

CONSTRUCT 8 SY ACCESS RAMP
STA 23+35.37 TO 23+47.71

CONSTRUCT 80 SY 4" CONCRETE SIDEWALK
STA 23+50

CONSTRUCT 4 SY 6" ACCESS RAMPS
STA 23+50

CONSTRUCT 29 SY 8" CONCRETE DRIVEWAY
STA 23+35.37 TO 23+47.71

CONSTRUCT 8 SY ACCESS RAMPS
STA 22+85.71, 45.35' RT (E 9TH STREET)

CONSTRUCT 29 SY 8" CONCRETE DRIVEWAY
STA 23+35.37 TO 23+47.71

CONSTRUCT 8 SY ACCESS RAMP
STA 21+66.86, 38.94' RT (E 9TH STREET)

CONSTRUCT 4 SY ACCESS RAMP
STA 20+18.74, 34.15' RT

CONSTRUCT 5 SY ACCESS RAMP
STA 20+31.66, 22.36' RT

METAL PLAN (MATTED)