

MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP: HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING: Thursday, April 29, 2010, 1:30 p.m., Conference Room 203, 2nd Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Tim Francis, Jim Johnson, Berwyn Jones, Jim McKee, Greg Munn and Bob Ripley; (Cathy Beecham absent). Ed Zimmer and Teresa McKinstry of the Planning Department; and other interested citizens.

STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING: Regular Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Chair Bob Ripley called the meeting to order and requested a motion approving the minutes for the regular meeting held March 18, 2010. Motion for approval made by Jones, seconded by Johnson and carried 6-0: Francis, Johnson, Jones, McKee, Munn and Ripley voting 'yes'; Beecham absent.

The opportunity was given for persons with limited time or with an item not appearing on the agenda to address the Commission. No one appeared.

APPLICATION BY SCOTT SULLIVAN AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ON BEHALF OF "COSMIC COW" FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR A SIGN AT 6136 HAVELOCK AVENUE IN THE HAVELOCK AVENUE LANDMARK DISTRICT
PUBLIC HEARING: April 29, 2010

Members present: Francis, Johnson, Jones, McKee, Munn and Ripley; Beecham absent.

Scott Sullivan appeared as applicant. He presented a rendering of a sign for "Cosmic Cow" and a sample of the type of backlit sign being asked for

Ed Zimmer believes the historical character here is different from the Haymarket. This is and was a retail district and a newer time period.

Jones likes the look of the facade.

ACTION:

Motion for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness made by Jones, seconded by Munn and carried 6-0: Francis, Johnson, Jones, McKee, Munn and Ripley voting 'yes'; Beecham absent.

APPLICATION BY URBAN DEVELOPMENT FOR A CERTIFICATE OF “EXCEPTION ON THE GROUND OF INSUFFICIENT RETURN OR HARDSHIP” FOR DEMOLITION OF THE HOUSE AT 1114 C STREET IN THE EVERETT LANDMARK DISTRICT

PUBLIC HEARING:

April 29, 2010

Members present: Francis, Johnson, Jones, McKee, Munn and Ripley; Beecham absent.

Olga Kanne and Steve Werthmann from Urban Development were present to answer any questions.

Zimmer stated that this house is across the street from Everett Elementary School. The building is well documented in the late 1880's. It was the home of a photographer named Hayden and his family. They moved to Los Angeles around 1910. The porch originally only infilled the little “L”. The present porch was installed by 1903. This was purchased about five or six years ago by some folks who expressed interest in putting up apartments. They are no longer the owners. This is becoming city property. Rehabilitation is not feasible or practical. There is some very expensive water damage to the walls and foundation. It is a shame. There will be review steps after this one. The Everett Landmark District is a local landmark district. There is a logic to the local designation since there is such a mix of buildings in this area.

ACTION:

Motion for approval of a Certificate of “exception on the ground of insufficient return or hardship” for demolition made by McKee, seconded by Francis.

Jones wondered if the city has a plan for salvage of anything in the house.

Steve Werthmann replied yes. Olga Kanne stated that any salvage must be done with great care as the building is in such terrible shape, but they will do what they can with salvage.

Werthmann stated that worst case scenario, they would go to the Eco Store and see if they would be interested in salvaging anything.

Zimmer does not know if this is a candidate for “deconstruction” or not.

Jones is frustrated that the City allowed an owner to let the building get in this shape without doing anything. Zimmer stated that this building has been empty for about five or six years. As awful as it is now, he is not sure the building was salvageable five or six years ago.

Motion for approval carried 6-0: Francis, Johnson, Jones, McKee, Munn and Ripley voting ‘yes’; Beecham absent.

ENDORSEMENT OF NOMINATION TO THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES OF "PARK HILL", THE YOUNG-FAULKNER HOUSE AT 1913 S. 41ST STREET
PUBLIC HEARING: **April 29, 2010**

Members present: Francis, Johnson, Jones, McKee, Munn and Ripley; Beecham absent.

Zimmer stated that this property is Park Hill, the Young-Faulkner house. Dr. Faulkner founded a major insurance company (Woodman Accident) in Lincoln. He didn't build this house. He occupied it for almost 25 years. This property is clearly significant in the area of architecture. There is an inscription from 1896 on the interior wall. Louis Young, who built the house, was first in Lincoln around 1880, operating a women's boarding house near the University of Nebraska. He was later a real estate developer and manager of the street railway system. He built a different house and lost it in 1894. He moved to his father-in-law's house and then built this house. Two years later, he sold this house. This is a hard house to read because the previous owners had considerable amounts of money. There was a fire around 1910. You don't see any remnants of it. There is some nice early documentation. The garage is a contributing structure. It is early 20th century. The road and bridge are also mentioned.

Kathy McKillip stated that they are redoing the bridge as we speak.

Zimmer stated that amongst the interior projects, the McKillips have been refinishing the wood and the walls.

McKillip stated that the curving of the road continues along with the gas light posts.

ACTION:

Motion for endorsement of nomination to the National Register of Historic Places made by Munn, seconded by McKee.

McKillip stated that she greatly appreciates Ed Zimmer's expertise and the work of this Commission.

Motion for approval carried 6-0: Francis, Johnson, Jones, McKee, Munn and Ripley voting 'yes'; Beecham absent.

APPLICATION BY CRAIG SMITH ON BEHALF OF B&J PARTNERSHIP FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR WORK AT 800 Q STREET IN THE HAYMARKET LANDMARK DISTRICT
PUBLIC HEARING: **April 29, 2010**

Members present: Francis, Johnson, Jones, McKee, Munn and Ripley; Beecham absent.

Dallas McGee appeared. He stated that some initial plans were presented a few months ago. Zimmer stated that a project concept was previously approved by Historic Preservation Commission that included features of the Tool House building on "Q" Street including the demolition of the rear addition. This application will focus on the north part of the 1890 building.

Craig Smith stated that the initial discussion and engineering found that due to the snow load requirements, the north part of the "Tool House" structure would need to be completely rebuilt. Initial estimates were around \$400,000.00, then the estimates increased. There were negotiations with the neighbor regarding the trash compactor. Those negotiations fell through. They had always planned a driveway to the basement. The second doorway will provide trash removal for all the retail shops, the hotel, all the micro loft units and restaurants and retail spaces. This has some interesting structure. The columns don't align with the originals. There are some support beams that are about three percent out of vertical. The current request is to remove another 32 feet of the north end of the building, salvage the brick, and rebuild. They would reface the reconstructed portion with the salvaged, original brick.

Ripley inquired about the two doors shown on the drawing. Smith replied that one door will be the entrance to the trash compactor. The other door will be the entrance to the parking for the micro lofts.

Jason Suelter with Structural Design Group stated that the north wall appears to have the most damage and water damage. The wall was in quite bad shape. Smith added that when you add the snow load and the new building codes requirements, retrofitting seemed out of the question.

Smith stated that when they first presented this to the Commission, they were looking at retail in the first bay. They had initial thoughts of excavating everything and then putting it back in at grade. They soon discovered there wasn't any good way to put the structure back in.

Munn wondered if they considered the entry doors to be in the new portion instead of the old. Smith replied that they are trying to put in the ADA ramp to the north. There also is no room to put in the transformers. They are going back to LES to see if they can put them in a vault. He also has to stay away from the power pole. They are required to have an ADA ramp into the basement.

Zimmer wondered about the character of the overhead doors. Smith stated that they envision some kind of frosted translucent material. Zimmer suggested those should be brought to the Commission for review.

McKee isn't clear when the discussion went from stabilizing the facade to replacing the back wall. He sees this block slipping away piece by piece. Suelter stated that a large portion of the facade would need to be taken down and redone.

McKee questioned if the applicant does not think it is possible to redo the facade. Smith replied that they should have enough bricks from the demolition to redo the facade after the back is rebuilt.

Jones understands that the north wall is in the worst shape. Suelter agreed. Smith noted that the hotel would be on one separate parcel and the other three buildings will be another separate parcel.

Munn understands that once everything is taken away, there is nothing left to hold the building up. Suelter stated that once you try to tie the new structure into the old structure, it can be difficult. There is a difference between tuck pointing and rebuilding a wall.

Ripley questioned if there are any overhead doors that are being taken down on the current main level. Smith said no, that there is a ramp and a walk door.

Ripley questioned the integrity of the bricks. Suelter replied that the north wall that connects to the other building and various others have extremely soft mortar. The plan is to leave the interior brick wall exposed.

Suelter noted that the structure needs to undergo some changes to accommodate everything that is going in.

McKee wondered from a historic preservation perspective, what is the difference between taking down the brick, building a new wall and putting the brick back up versus tuck pointing?

Zimmer stated that the Haymarket preservation standards are the Secretary of the Interior standards. They acknowledge that changes must sometimes occur, with a preference for the least alteration possible. The ideal solution is to transition smoothly between uses. The other end of the spectrum is taking off one end of the building and rebuilding it with existing brick. A request can be made and denied and the applicant waits three months and does what they want without any approval needed.

McKee knows that this is one of the older buildings in the Haymarket and wondered where it fits in the chronology. Zimmer replied that this is about the fifth or sixth oldest building. This is late 1880's. First it was a cracker bakery, then a hardware store until this project.

Ripley questioned the condition of interior floors. Smith replied that they are in pretty good condition. There are wood floors on the upper level. Sound proofing would be done. They plan to try and leave as much of the old wood structure exposed as possible.

Jones asked about the mortar that needs to be replaced. Is the mortar in the rest of the building just as bad? Smith reiterated that the back wall is the worst. That is where water ran down the wall and did the most damage.

Munn inquired if the design changes to the hotel will come back before the commission. Smith replied that they are still working on the architect and the design, but it will be back before Historic Preservation Commission as soon as they have something.

Zimmer clarified that the demolition of the north portion of the building and the general rebuilding concept is what is being asked for approval today.

ACTION:

Johnson moved approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the back wall and replacement with existing brick, seconded by Munn.

As Ripley looks at this as, he has seen too many building that the water has come inside and the bricks are sliding out of the walls. To do repairs that are necessary would take a colossal amount of shoring while the material is being pulled out. The building seems to be structurally questionable as it sits. Cutting two enormous holes into this building after you stabilize it seems very messy.

Zimmer offered an approach the Commission could consider; this may not be the preferred preservation solution, but you feel you have received enough information that this is necessary for preservation of the remainder of the building. The rebuilding with the same materials is different from building with new materials. This could be considered under a Certificate of Exception.

McKee recalled The Townsend building. The brick was taken down one at a time and put back up.

Jones wondered if there is any question the bricks will have enough strength to be reused. Ripley replied that the brick is now being used as structure. In the new structure, the brick will be veneer only.

McKee questioned if the rest of the building needs to be tuck pointed. Smith replied that around and under the windows have some issues. The brick is the worst on the inside of the building.

Motion for approval carried 5-1: Francis, Johnson, Jones, Munn and Ripley voting 'yes'; McKee voting 'no'; Beecham absent.

Zimmer stated that there is additional design work to be done for the hotel and this building. Those will be before this commission. They will have designs for the rails and outdoor seating also.

MISCELLANEOUS:

Havelock Avenue Streetscape

Members present: Johnson, Jones, McKee, Munn and Ripley; Beecham and Francis absent.

Scott Sullivan stated that he will present a concept for streetscape improvements on Havelock Avenue from Cornhusker Highway to 61st Street. Ornamental lighting is desired. The plan also includes removal and replacement of trees. General landscaping and district signage is desired. The blighted area does not include west of the Overpass. Current funding does not cover that area. They are looking at some separate signage opportunities for that area, possibly a changeable banners and permanent aluminum district signs. There would be some landscaping improvements to that area also. The initial entry into Havelock is still residential houses. The corners will have more trees. A specific species has not been picked yet. He located some five globe lights for two of the intersections. Single globe fixtures would be on the rest of the street. The Isles has taken over the Tobacco Hut. Part of it will become part of their kitchen. Trees from 63rd St. to 64th St. would be on private property for lack of space. They are talking to Russ's Market about doing some screening or berming of their parking lot. Sullivan showed two different sketches of possible district signage. LES has a formal banner policy that banners must be two feet back from the street. These signs would be on the street name poles.

McKee approval of the concept, seconded by Jones and carried 5-0: Johnson, Jones, McKee, Munn and Ripley voting 'yes'; Beecham and Francis absent.

Pole Sign

Sullivan presented a drawing of the existing pole sign. The intent from the Havelock Business Association is to redo the sign and have advertising as a means of fund-raising for the neighborhood. The intent is to reuse the same two poles that are there today. It would have portions of non illuminated, LED video and static copy. This would be on the corner of Havelock Avenue and the Highway.

Zimmer stated that this is a complicated sign in terms of ownership and regulation. The poles remain to grandfather the sign.

Jones thinks this is a marvelous revitalization of Havelock.

Ripley believes this will establish a standard of continuity for the street.

McKee moved approval of the sign, seconded by Munn and carried 5-0: Johnson, Jones, McKee, Munn and Ripley voting 'yes'; Beecham and Francis absent.

- Zimmer spent yesterday at the Veteran's Administration. They have a program where they try to capitalize on land or buildings that they own. They would like to have a clinic on I-80 via a lease. It would have to meet Section 106 Historic Standards. It would also need new zoning. There will be a request for interest and then a request for proposals.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.