
MINUTES**HUTCHINSON LANDMARKS COMMISSION**

City of Hutchinson

Thursday, November 10, 2016 – 4:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

125 E. Avenue B, Hutchinson, Kansas

1. Roll Call

Members present: Jo Higgins, Tony Karam, Wes Bartlett, Chelsey Dawson, Shannon Whetzel, and Greg Holmes. Gale Wall was absent.

Staff present: Jana McCarron, Planning Director; Aaron Barlow, Associate Planner; and Stephanie Stewart, Planning Technician.

2. Welcome by Chairperson – Bartlett welcomed all who were in attendance.

3. Approval of Minutes

Karam motioned to approve the October 13, 2016, minutes. Higgins seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

4. Projects Approved Administratively:**a. 16-LM-000002 427 N Main St, Union Labor Building - Reroof**

Barlow stated that the Union Labor Temple building on Main Street has been granted a permit to replace the roof with the same materials as the existing roof.

5. Projects Approved by the SHPO: None.

6. Projects Approved by the City Council: None.

7. New Business**a. 16LM-000001 1602 N Main St, Trinity United Methodist Church – LED Sign**

Barlow reviewed the application to replace the existing changeable copy sign with an electronic message center. The existing sign was installed on the property in 2008. The property was listed on the local historic register on June 6, 1989. The Design Review Committee met on October 27, 2016, and asked staff to research the current sign and comparable signs prior to the Landmarks Commission meeting, and Barlow reviewed his findings with the Commission.

Faye Summervill, Trinity United Methodist Church, stated that the church wants to use the electronic message board sign to promote all the activities that the church offers. Mike McQueen, Luminous Neon, Inc., explained to the Commission that the sign is computer programmed and can be dimmed or turned off at specified times to comply with the zoning regulations. McCarron stated that there are regulations pertaining to brightness that would be noted on the sign permit.

Barlow reviewed Staff’s analysis of the ten factors that the Commission shall consider when reviewing a project for a property that is listed on the local historic register. The ten factors are the same as the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*, as follows:

Factor	Analysis	Met	Not Met
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.	Installation of the electronic message center (EMC) will not change the use of the structure.	✓	
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.	The existing sign at the corner of 17th Avenue and Main Street was approved by staff and constructed in 2008 and is not historic. Changes to this sign will not affect the historic nature of the property any more than it already has.	✓	
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.	The installation of an EMC is not an attempt at conjecture and will not create a false sense of history. The historical features of the property will remain as a physical record of its time, place, and use.	✓	
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.	The existing sign was installed in 2008 and is not historic in its own right.	✓	
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.	This project will not affect distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the property.	✓	
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.	This project is not replacing any historic features.	✓	
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.	This project does not involve cleaning surfaces of any historic materials.	✓	
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.	The historic property is not an archaeological resource.	✓	

<p>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.</p>	<p>The existing sign does not interfere with existing historic material. The nature of the new EMC will allow the sign to be significantly differentiated from the old, yet compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.</p>	<p>✓</p>	
<p>10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.</p>	<p>The existing sign is not attached to the historic church building and future removal (if performed carefully) will not impair the essential form and integrity of the property and its environment.</p>	<p>✓</p>	

Holmes motioned to approve this request for historic review and issuance of a certificate of appropriateness based upon a finding of conformance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* for replacement of a portion of the existing changeable copy sign located at 1602 North Main Street with an electronic message center. Whetzel seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

b. Update on the 2016 Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) Grant

McCarron announced that staff received four proposals in response to the Request for Proposals; two for each service. The selection committee is in the process of reviewing the proposals. McCarron thanked Dawson for her assistance on the selection committee. At the December 6, 2016, City Council meeting, the HPF grant contracts will be awarded.

8. Old Business

a. 2016 Historic Preservation Action Plan

Barlow updated the Commission and stated that Staff proposes to send out notices of potential historical status changes and historic district boundary adjustments to property owners in the Houston Whiteside District to give them an opportunity to speak to the Commission before any changes are formally approved.

Barlow stated that another Houston Whiteside sign topper will be installed at the intersection of 1st Avenue and Plum Street.

9. Other Business

a. Tour Wes Bartlett's Downtown Historic Loft, 123 N Main St

The meeting was recessed at 4:30 p.m. and was reconvened at 4:40 p.m. at 123 North Main Street, the home of Wes Bartlett, for a tour of his recently converted Downtown Historical Lofts.

b. Open Comments from the audience.

None

11. Adjournment – Following the tour, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Stephanie Stewart, Planning Technician

Approved this 8th day of December, 2016.

Attest: 

Casey A. Jones, AICP, CFM, Senior Planner