
MINUTES**HUTCHINSON LANDMARKS COMMISSION**

City of Hutchinson

Thursday, May 20, 2021 – 4:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
125 E. Avenue B, Hutchinson, Kansas

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM.

Members present: Joel Haag (5/5), Shannon Whetzel (5/5), Gale Wall (5/5), Jo Higgins (5/5) and Chelsey Dawson (2/5).

Planning Staff present: Ryan Hvitløk, Director of Planning and Development; Amy Allison, Senior Planner; and Charlene Mosier, Planning Technician.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Haag made a motion to approve the minutes from May 13, 2021, seconded by Higgins, passed unanimously.

3. WRITTEN REPORTS

a. Projects Approved Administratively

Project #	Address	Description	Local Landmark	District and Contributing Status
			-	

- b. Projects Approved by the SHPO
- c. Projects Approved by the City Council – None
- d. Other Reports – None.

4. NEW BUSINESS

a. **LM21-000003 – 225 S Main Street – Request to add an 800 square foot pool in the side yard**

Whetzel asked the applicant for his presentation.

Scott Cooley said his family plans to move into the building addressed at 227 South Main as their home later this year. He would like to install a 20' x 40' pool on the south side of the

building. He would like to replace the existing corrugated tin roofing and replace the siding on the south addition with 29-gauge steel roll-formed panels. He said the current condition of the roofing causes water to flood in the basement. The front windows will be the living room and he is proposing to convert two garage bays and install French doors opening to the pool. The five west garage doors will be closed off and used as a drive-in garage. The doors are 70 years old with holes in the metal and are not functional. The five corrugated tin garage doors will be framed in. Cooley said these improvements will make the building look nice. The shipping container will provide an industrial look and serve as a pool building. The look of the building will be the same along Main Street. There is a planter as a barrier to keep cars from driving along this area.

The roof will be roll formed steel not corrugated. Haag said a corrugated metal roof would look industrial and be less costly. The corrugated will be stronger and not show hail damage or wear and tear. Colley said this building is currently the oldest commercial structure in Hutchinson. This project has been a labor of love and very costly. He said some requirements of the State would not be feasible financially.

Higgins said she is happy to see improvements being made to this structure.

Whetzel asked Allison for the staff presentation.

Allison said the applicant, Scott Cooley, is requesting historic review for the addition of an 800 square foot pool. The building is located in the Downtown Core South District and is a contributing structure. The zoning is C-5 Downtown District. The setbacks for the pool are approvable and the pool is considered an accessory structure. Allison presented a Powerpoint showing photos for the project. She reviewed the following standards required for Landmarks Commission approval:

Analysis of Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation Required for Landmarks Commission Approval:

Addition of Swimming Pool

Factor	Analysis	Met Not Met
<p>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.</p>	<p>The proposed pool addition will be located in an unused loading yard to the south of the building. The current use, retail/services, does not require the use of such a large loading area. The pool will be located behind an existing brick fence which is not proposed to be amended. The pool will not change any historic characteristics of the building and does not significantly change the historic characteristic of the site.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The applicant is not proposing to change the historic character of the property with the addition of the pool. As previously stated, the pool will be located in an unused loading area that no longer serves a purpose. No historic materials will be removed with the addition.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The applicant is not proposing to embellish the pool as to create a false sense of history. The pool will be screened from Main Street by an existing brick wall that is not proposed to be amended.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.</p>	<p>The pool will not destroy any features of the property that have acquired historic significance.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.</p>	<p>The applicant will be using a licensed pool installer to install the pool. All work should be performed in a manner that will not destroy in character defining features of the property.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>

Analysis of Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation Required for Landmarks Commission Approval:		
<p>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.</p>	<p>There are no historic features of the building or site where the applicant is proposing to install the pool. As mentioned previously, the pool will be screened from Main Street by an existing brick wall.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The applicant does not plan to use any cleaning or abrasive treatments as part of the project.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.</p>	<p>There are no known significant archeological resources at the project site. If any archeological features are found, the applicant must mitigate the disruption.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<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 applicant is proposing new additions to the property but by the nature of the site, the addition will be screened from Main Street by an existing brick wall. The wall is not proposed to be amended but any alteration to the wall will require further review.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</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 proposed pool will be located on a vacant side yard and will not be constructed in a manner that will alter the historic building. If the pool was removed in the future, the removal should not impact the historic features of the property.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>

Allison said all factors have been met.

Wall asked about fencing the pool. Allison said the fence must be at least four feet to enclose a pool. Cooley said the brick fence is four feet from the ground and with a four foot fence there would be an 8 foot barrier. Cooley said the shipping container will also enclose the space and look more industrial than a vinyl material fence.

There were no comments from the audience.

Motion by Higgins, seconded by Wall, to approve the request to add an 800 square foot pool in the side yard at 225 S Main Street because the project does meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and would not damage or destroy the historic significance of the structure and the Downtown Core South National Register District. The motion passed with the following vote: Yes – Wall, Haag, Higgins, Whetzel.

b. LM21-000003 – 225 S Main Street – Request to replace metal siding with 29-gauge sheet metal

Whetzel asked Allison for the staff presentation.

Allison said the applicant, Scott Cooley, is requesting historic review to replace metal siding with 29-gauge sheet metal at 225 S Main Street. The building is located in the Downtown Core South District and is a contributing structure. The zoning is C-5 Downtown District. Allison presented a Powerpoint showing proposed photos of the 29-gauge sheet metal for the project. She reviewed the following standards required for Landmarks Commission approval:

Analysis of Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation Required for Landmarks Commission Approval:

Replace existing corrugated metal siding and roofing and replace with 29-gauge steel rolled panels

Factor	Analysis	Met Not Met
<p>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.</p>	<p>The proposed exterior siding replacement does not change the use of the property.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The applicant is proposing to replace the existing corrugated metal siding with a different style of metal siding. The materials are similar (metal) but different in style.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met/ Not Met</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The applicant is not proposing to embellish the enclosed loading dock by adding additional features. The proposal is to replace the existing metal siding with a different style. The existing brick along the front façade and east side of the south façade will remain.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.</p>	<p>The applicant is not proposing to change any features that were not a part of the building when it was listed.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.</p>	<p>The proposed material has a different finish than the existing siding. The style of metal siding will not be preserved with the change.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Met</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The applicant has indicated that the siding is beyond repair and will need to be replaced. The proposed material is not of a similar visual appearance to the existing metal siding. The proposed material will change the visual appearance of the enclosed dock.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Met</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The applicant does not plan to use any cleaning or abrasive treatments as part of the project.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.</p>	<p>There are no known significant archeological resources at the project site. If any archeological features are found, the applicant must mitigate the disruption.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<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 applicant is proposing to amend the siding material. No new additions, exterior alterations or new construction is proposed.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</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 proposed siding will be an addition to the structure and not a new addition or adjacent project.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>

Allison said all factors have not been met. Factors #2 and #5 were not met based on the style.

Haag suggested revising the proposed material to cover the garage doors with a galvanized corrugated tin metal siding. The modification would be a replacement with a like material and should meet the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation.

Cooley said the west five doors will remain in place and are not functional. They propose to cover and frame in to insulate and keep weather tight and will look clean and smooth. This could also be reversible.

There were no comments from the audience.

Motion by Haag, seconded by Higgins, to deny the request to replace metal siding with 29-gauge sheet metal at 225 S Main Street because the project does not meet the Secretary of the

Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and will damage or destroy the historic significance of the structure and the Downtown Core South National Register District. The motion passed with the following vote: Yes – Wall, Haag, Higgins, Whetzel.

- c. LM21-000003 – 225 S Main Street – Request to frame in seven garage doors and install French doors in the east two bays along the south façade.

Whetzel asked Allison for the staff presentation.

Allison said the applicant, Scott Cooley, is requesting historic review to frame in seven garage doors and install French doors in the east two bays along the south façade of 225 S Main Street. The building is located in the Downtown Core South District and is a contributing structure. The west 5 doors will be covered and the eastern two doors would be framed with French doors. The vinyl trim is not typically an approved material. Allison presented a Powerpoint showing photos for the project. She reviewed the following standards required for Landmarks Commission approval:

Factor	Analysis	Met Not Met
<p>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.</p>	<p>The proposed garage door replacement will be used as part of a residential use in the building. The proposed use, by itself, will not create a change to the appearance of the building, but the proposal to frame in the garage doors and replace with French doors does change some defining characteristics of the building</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Met</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The proposed garage door replacement will affect the character of the building, as it was listed, by removing seven garage doors. By framing in the garage doors and replacing two with french doors, the structure will lose the appearance of a loading dock which speaks to the intent behind its listing (as an early representation of an industrial building).</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Met</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The proposed amendments would not add a false sense of historical development by including additional features, but it will take away from the historical appearance of the structure.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.</p>	<p>The garage doors were listed in the original nomination form. The applicant is not proposing to amend a feature that has become historic since the listing.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.</p>	<p>As mentioned previously, the garage doors along the south façade of the property are a distinctive feature to the building and was important to its historical listing as an early example of industrial buildings. The applicant has indicated a willingness to keep the transom windows above the garage that will preserve those features, but the garage doors will be amended to no longer preserve the character that is currently there.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The applicant has indicated that the existing garage doors are no longer operating and will need to be replaced. However, the proposed replacement will not match the existing design.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Met</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The applicant does not plan to use any cleaning or abrasive treatments as part of the project.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.</p>	<p>There are no known significant archeological resources at the project site. If any archeological features are found, the applicant must mitigate the disruption.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<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 proposal will alter the exterior of the structure that will destroy historic features of the structure.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Met</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 proposal will add steps along the base of the foundation for the two east garage doors (leading from the enclosed dock to the pool courtyard). The steps, as presented, if removed would not affect the essential form or integrity of the historic building.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>

Allison said Factors #2, #6 and #9 have not been met.

The Commission recommend repairing the existing garage doors or replacing with garage doors that match the existing style. An entry way can be framed inside the garage doors to allow for the French door install but will not damage the appearance of the existing garage door per the State Historic Preservation Office examples. The modifications should meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

There were no comments from the audience.

Motion by Haag, seconded by Higgins, to deny the request to frame in seven garage doors and install French doors in the east two bays along the south façade at 225 S Main Street because the project does not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and would damage or destroy the historic significance of the structure and the Downtown Core South national register District. The motion passed with the following vote: Yes – Wall, Haag, Higgins, Whetzel.

d. LM21-000003 – 225 S Main Street – Request to add a 40 ft shipping container to side yard

Whetzel asked Allison for the staff presentation.

Allison said the applicant, Scott Cooley, is requesting historic review to add a 40 ft shipping container to the side yard at 225 S Main Street. The building is located in the Downtown Core South District and is a contributing structure. The shipping container is considered an accessory structure. The zoning is C-5 Downtown District. Shipping containers are not currently permitted in the C-5 District. The shipping container is not attached to the structure and could easily be removed. Allison presented a Powerpoint showing photos for the project. She reviewed the following standards required for Landmarks Commission approval:

Analysis of Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation Required for Landmarks Commission Approval:

Install 40 ft. Multi-Modal Shipping Container in side yard

Factor	Analysis	Met Not Met
<p>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.</p>	<p>The addition of a shipping container will not change the historic use of the building and would complement the original industrial use.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The applicant is not proposing to remove any historic features of the property. The historic character of the property will not be impacted with the addition of the storage container.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The proposed shipping container would be an addition to the historic property. The applicant is not proposing to amend the container in a way that would create a false sense of historical development but rather complement the original use of the property. However, by removing the garage doors on the enclosed loading dock and replacing with siding and french doors, the nexus between the loading dock area and the proposed shipping container would be lost visually.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met/ Not Met</p>
<p>4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.</p>	<p>The proposed shipping container would not affect any feature that has acquired its own historic significance.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.</p>	<p>The proposed shipping container will not affect any distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or craftsmanship.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The proposed shipping container is an addition to the site and will not impact any existing features.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The applicant does not plan to use any cleaning or abrasive treatments as part of the project.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<p>8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.</p>	<p>There are no known significant archeological resources at the project site. If any archeological features are found, the applicant must mitigate the disruption.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>
<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 proposed shipping container is a new addition that will not destroy any historic materials or character of the property.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</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>Based on the site plan provided, the proposed shipping container could be removed in manner that will not affect any historical features on the property.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met</p>

Allison said all factors have been met.

Whetzel asked the applicant for his presentation. Cooley said he committed to making the building look better and is asking for some assistance to complete the project. He is going to live there and has spent a lot to get to this point. He plans to construct steps from the wall to the pool however it needs to be done in order to meet the requirements.

There were no comments from the audience.

Motion by Higgins, seconded by Haag, to approve the request to add a 40 ft shipping container to the side yard at 225 S Main Street because the project meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and would not damage or destroy the historic significance of the structure and the Downton Core South National Register District. The motion passed with the following vote: Yes – Wall, Haag, Higgins, Whetzel.

5. OLD BUSINESS

a. None

6. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Upcoming: None

b. Open comments from the audience – none.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m. The next Landmarks Commission meeting is set for June 10, 2021.

Respectfully Submitted,

Charlene Mosier
Planning Technician
Approved this 8th day of July, 2021.

Attest:  _____

Ryan Hvitløk, AICP, CFM
Director of Planning & Development