

LIBERTY HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMISSION
Meeting Summary
July 5, 2022
5:30 pm
City Council Chambers

Roll Call: Matt Grundy, John Carr, Vern Drottz, Aimee Gray, Matt Grundy, Dail Hobbs, Kathy Chelton, Brett Rinker, Doug Wilson

Present: John Carr, Matt Grundy, Kathy Chelton, Brett Rinker, Doug Wilson

Absent: Vern Drottz, Aimee Gray, Dail Hobbs

Staff Present: Jeanine Thill, Community Development Manager

Guests Present: Mr & Mrs. Robinette, owners of 111 Moss Ave; Jerry Lindsay, contractor for 10 W Kansas; and Brandi Atwell and the lighting contractor, representing HDLI.

Chairman Grundy called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Approval of Meeting Summary: May 17, 2022 HDRC Meeting Summary

A motion was made by Commissioner Rinker to approve the May 17, 2022 meeting summary as corrected. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Carr. The motion passed 5-0-0.

Current Business

HDRC Case #22-004PH Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations and a privacy fence in the rear yard at 111 Moss Ave., Prospect Heights Historic District. A 353 Project:

- Mrs. Robinette said they recently purchased the home and didn't realize there was a preservation guideline and didn't realize there were restrictions. They decided against painting the brick because it wouldn't allow the brick to breathe. The proposed tinted sealant doesn't hinder the brick. They thought the tint would be nice to tone down the red brick color.
- As for the proposed wood surrounds to encase the iron columns, the applicant said that they wouldn't be a permanent fixture and can easily be removed to expose the existing iron columns. They tried to get ahold of the archives to see if these iron columns were original to the home but they didn't have any luck. Mr. Robinette added that there are cracks in the brick on the carport side; they can do repairs easier and if they stain it, they can maintain the color.
- Commissioner Rinker asked if they have a photo of the proposed privacy fence. The applicant said they do not, but they are proposing all of the wood boards be outside facing, with the smooth side facing toward the street.

- Commissioner Wilson asked for the size of the posts. The applicant said 4X4's and the lateral 2x4's. Pickets are 1x4's they have chamfers on the edges, with flat on the top. It is a treated wood.
- Vice Chairman Carr said he is comfortable with the description. He asked the applicant to provide a photo of the fence materials.
- Vice Chairman Carr said the product they chose for the brick sealant is not a paint, so in his opinion applying the tinted sealant is an appropriate thing to do. He added that a few years ago at 246 W. Mill Street the Commission approved the brick to be stained and it he is comfortable with it.
- For the wrought iron posts, the proposed wood columns will probably be too massive. The applicant said the wings/arms are screwed on and asked if they can at least remove those from the existing iron posts. Vice Chairman Carr commented that the concrete bases under the iron may have been put there because of rot.
- Vice Chairman Carr said he drove around the area to look for similar homes and their features. He said there are only a few homes like this 1950's ranch in Liberty: on Ridgeway, at 1115 Ridgeway and 1001 Ridgeway, there are similar homes, but after seeing several homes that are the same vintage, he realized that maybe the iron columns are original elements. He added that he doesn't know how firm we are on applying standards on the non-contributing homes. Staff commented that because it is in the district, the standards should be applied.
- Commissioner Rinker asked if the sealant was the same as what was used on Mill Street.
- Commissioner Wilson said that on the Mill Street building the stain on the brick was approved because it was non-contributing. But the 1950's homes begs the question if we need to protect the mid-century modern homes. This circumstance doesn't happen very often.
- Commissioner Wilson said if he's hearing the Commission right, the distinction is the stain versus the paint. Commissioner Wilson said it is a stretch to interpret the guidelines that we can allow them to stain the brick. We don't get to pick and choose which brick homes are painted. He thinks the intent of the guideline is to keep the brick original.
- Chairman Grundy commented that the brick is not meant to be painted. Once you change the color you can't go back.
- Commissioner Chelton said she did some research. This is a mid-century ranch; some are tan, some are light colored brick and, in her opinion, it doesn't have to stay red. As for the iron columns, she said she supports the proposed wood column surrounds because she doesn't think there is significance to the iron as she thinks they are massed produced.
- Commissioner Rinker said he feels the stain product for the brick is better than the paint, and we allowed it on the building on Mill Street. Where he was struggling is if someone wanted to do it on an 1800's building. He can support the tinted sealant because the home is non-contributing and thus different. For the wrought iron, within the historic district we don't have a lot of ranches or a lot of iron work, so he was leaning toward

saving the iron supports. If we did another historic inventory today, we would want to preserve the 1950's homes. He is leaning toward voting yes on the brick stain and no on covering the iron columns.

- The applicant said the iron work doesn't have significance and it is the only ranch that looks like that. The applicant asked what the Commission would suggest. Vice Chairman Carr said he would suggest the bottoms be cut and an L-shaped flat steel bracket put in. He added that the leaf motif is decorative and a significant feature. He said that his perspective regarding the iron columns changed once he drove around and realized there are one of three homes like this.
- Commissioner Wilson asked if the other homes that are similar had the extra triangle supports at the top of the iron columns. Vice Chairman Carr said he observed only two homes in Liberty that had them. It would tone it down if they were able to take them down, as long as they are preserved. Vice Chairman Carr said he is comfortable with removing the triangle supports. The applicant said they will save them and keep them with the home.
- Chairman Grundy summarized that the Commission is okay with removal of the iron triangle supports at the top of the iron columns, so long as they are preserved and as for the grey tinted brick stain, they are comfortable with it.

A motion was made by Commissioner Rinker to approve the application as presented, with the stipulations that a diagram of the wood privacy fence be submitted to Staff, that the iron decorative columns remain but they may remove the triangle supports, and the grey tint brick sealant may be applied because this is currently assessed as a non-contributing home. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Carr. The motion passed 5-0-0.

HDRC Case # 22-006LS Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness for permanent lights affixed to the building rooflines, Liberty Square Historic District:

- Ms. Atwell said that the proposed lights for the roofline of the buildings around the square are usable year-round and with the approval from HDRC, they will pursue approval from the individual property owners. They like the feature that there can be custom colors for events. She said that they understand there is a stipulation in City Code that they can't have attention grabbing flashing of the lights and they will comply with that requirement. HDLI would have control of the app that controls the lighting.
- Commissioner Rinker asked for clarification on how they are attaching the lights to the buildings and asked about the long-term impact. Ms. Atwell said that option one would be using the existing holes of the current lights or there is a tape that has been used in the past. These lights are proposed to be every 5-6 feet at the roofline. The existing lights are at the end of the life span and need to be replaced. For those buildings that have stone work they will either omit them or get creative on how to attach them. They will blend in, there are three different colors brown, grey or clear depending on the color of the façade.
- Commissioner Rinker said his only question was about any damage but it sounds like they have addressed that.

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Carr to approve the application as presented, the motion was seconded by Commissioner Chelton. The motion passed 5-0-0.

HDRC Case #22-005LS Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations at 10 W. Kansas, Liberty Square Historic District:

- Commissioner Grundy asked what the building was originally used for. In the historic survey it said it was a restaurant. Vice Chairman Carr said it is an infill building and there is a lot of brick damage, therefore the stucco is a logical solution.
- Vice Chairman Carr said he did have a brief discussion with Mr. Lindsey and Mr. Todd prior to the meeting regarding the two options to try to repair the brick or the stucco. There is probably a large number of holes in the bricks and it appears that the façade was severely compromised. From the historic survey it looks as if at one time the storefront was bricked in. Most of the original façade appears to be missing. Vice Chairman Carr said it is likely that at least 70% of it is missing or compromised.
- Commissioner Rinker said it has obviously been compromised and by the time you remove the existing material, it would have to be re-clad.
- Vice Chairman Carr said it would be nice to see the type of stucco they would like to use. Commissioner Rinker agreed, the Commission would like to know what it looks like. The applicant said it will be authentic stucco. The owners want to do the right thing and if there is preferred stucco, they will match it. The Commission wants to see the finish. Mr. Lindsay said he will email Staff a picture of the texture of the stucco.
- Commissioner Wilson pointed out that the extent of the missing original brick and it appears to be no longer feasible to maintained.

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Carr to approve the application as presented predicated on the sample of the stucco finish is submitted to Staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Chelton. The motion passed 5-0-0.

Other Business

Administrative Approvals since the May 17, 2022 meeting:

- HDRC Case #22-004LS: 10 W Kansas St - removal of non-historic materials
- HDRC Case #22-008D: 503 W Kansas St - like in kind soffit repairs

Miscellaneous matters from the Commission:

- Vice Chairman Carr said he would like to thank Commissioner Chelton for joining the Commission.
- Commissioner Wilson said he probably needs to get off of the Commission by September as he will be moving.
- Commissioner Rinker said we might want to look at getting another Historic Survey done. It might be worth preserving the 1950's era homes. He asked if there are grants from the state that would pay for a survey. Ms. Thill said that there are grants available

and she could certainly apply, but the staff time to oversee the project might be a challenge.

- Vice Chairman Carr said we need to become literate and educated about preserving a mid-century modern house. Ridge is a good example of housing stock that isn't too generic.
- Matching the 353 to the historic districts would be a carrot for bringing in new districts. Commissioner Rinker said if neighbors have to maintain a standard, it maintains the value of the homes.
- Chairman Grundy asked if we can re-inventory the non-contributing structures in the district.
- Vice Chairman Carr said that there is slow progress with the siding at 226 N Jewell. The north side is about 90% done but the other three sides are not done.

Miscellaneous matters from Staff:

- Staff reminded the group that Commissioners are required to do training to maintain our CLG Status and that an email was sent with online training opportunities. Staff will re-send the email from Friday with the online training links.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:55 p.m.