THE TOPEKA LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING
Holliday Office Building
620 SE Madison Ave., Holliday Conference Room, 1st Floor

AGENDA
Thursday, May 10, 2018
5:30 PM

I. Roll Call

II. Approval of Minutes – April 12, 2018 Minutes

III. CLGR18-06 by Stephen Smith, requesting a State Historic Preservation Law review for the placement of a wall sign onto the east façade of the property located at 931 S. Kansas Avenue, within the boundaries of the South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District.

IV. CLGR18-073 by Twin Oaks Holdings, LLC. requesting State Historic Preservation Law review for interior and exterior alterations to the property located at 119 SE 6th Avenue, within the boundaries of the South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District.

V. Other Items
   1. Administrative Approvals
   2. NAPC Conference, July 18-22, 2018 in Des Moines, Iowa
   3. Annual SCHS/Landmarks Commission Historic Preservation Awards
   4. 2018 HPF Grant Awards
   5. Shiloh Baptist Church NRHP Nomination

VI. Adjournment

ADA Notice: For special accommodations for this event, please contact the Planning Department at 785-368-3728 at least three working days in advance.
Roll Call

**Members Present:** Mark Burenheide, Donna Rae Pearson, Paul Post, David Heit, Cheyenne Anderson, Grant Sourk, Christine Steinkuehler (7)

**Members Absent:** Jeff Carson (1)

**Staff Present:** Tim Paris, Dan Warner, Kris Wagers

**Approval of Minutes – February 8, 2017**

*Motion* by Mr. Post to approve; *second* by Mr. Heit. **APPROVAL** (7-0-0)

**CLGR18-02 by Downtown Topeka Foundation,** requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of 618, 630, and 632 S. Kansas Avenue, all within the boundaries of the South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District.

Mr. Paris noted that 3 buildings on the block are being treated as full demos. A fourth building will be involved but it will be considered at a future date and treated as a building modification.

Mr. Paris presented the staff report and staff recommendation for a finding that the proposed demolitions of the buildings located at 618, 630, and 632 S. Kansas Avenue without replacement of similar structures or uses will damage or destroy the historic character or the historic integrity of these properties, and the historic integrity of the surrounding South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District.

Mr. Paris noted that if the Landmarks Commission upholds the staff recommendation, the applicant can appeal to the Governing Body, who can take into account broader consideration than the limitations imposed on the Landmarks Commission by the Kansas State Historic Preservation Law, and the US Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

Zach Snethen with HTK Architects came forward representing the design team working on the Downtown Plaza. Mr. Snethen noted that also in attendance was Chuck Smith of HTK and Kurt Young with the Topeka Lodging Association. He explained that the Topeka Lodging Assn. and Downtown Topeka Foundation are co-developers of the project.

Mr. Snethen referenced a letter from himself and Kurt Young to Mr. Paris and the Landmarks Commission. This letter was included in the April agenda packet and Mr. Snethen presented the information provided therein. He then gave an overview of the proposed project using as overheads the maps and drawings included in the agenda packet.

Mr. Snethen spoke to some of the standards as covered in Mr. Paris’s staff report, adding that they’re relatively easy to apply to a building but harder to apply to an open space. He stated that the Nomination speaks to the fact that the Commercial Kansas Avenue District had seen reinvention over time, consistently highlighting social and civic functions of an urban center. He stated a Plaza, while not a commercial building, does support commercial development around it, serving as a social and civic hub in the heart of downtown.

Regarding Standard 2, Mr. Snethen stated that the existing buildings do not retain historical character in massing or materials. He referred to the rhythm meant to be created with the entrances to the Plaza and
stated that the Plaza recognizes and compliments the evolution of downtown over time. It also, he stated, shows commitment from the public and private sector to invest in downtown, which will spur further investments in the downtown area, and it could encourage people to develop properties adjacent to the proposed Plaza.

Regarding Standard 3, he stated it would mainly relate to the reconstruction of 612 Kansas Ave.

Regarding Standard 5, he stated that he likes the idea of retaining or introducing similar materials to what’s there, and this could be further developed.

He pointed out that Standards 9 & 10 have to do with reconstruction while this evening the consideration is about demolition, although much of his presentation did have to do with the development that is planned to go into the space.

With nobody else coming forward to speak, Mr. Sourk called for discussion amongst Landmarks Commissioners. He reminded commissioners that the vote this evening is on demolition; although it is necessary to take into consideration what is planned for the spaces, since it would have an impact on the decision if there were plans for similar buildings to replace those demolished.

Mr. Sourk asked Mr. Paris to review the principle goals of the Downtown Topeka Design Guidelines #1 and #3 from the staff report, which he did, along with #2 and #4. Mr. Sourk stated he believes the important thing considered this evening is the impact on the district. He also pointed out that the buildings in question are not Contributing. Ms. Pearson pointed out that the buildings could become Contributors in their own respect, in the future.

Mr. Sourk stated that he believes the Plaza concept fits Goals 1 and 3 and will bring people to the area. Ms. Pearson stated she believes it may meet Goal 1, but we’re not certain of that.

Mr. Heit stated that while the Design Guidelines are an important tool, they’re an extension of the Secretary Standards. Procedural point is that the Commission has one very simple charge, and that is to determine whether the proposal does or does not meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards. Mr. Souk added that when considering non-contributing buildings, the Commission must look at the district rather than individual addresses.

Following discussion, Mr. Paris confirmed that 628/630 could in theory become a Contributor with renovation/restoration, but it’s not certain whether anything original remains behind the upper façade.

Mr. Burenheide stated he believes the question is what the effect will be on the Downtown Historic District and he noted that the block in question is already scarred and because of the lack of contributing buildings, it is the best option for the Plaza. He added that City has already identified the Plaza as a goal, wanting it on Kansas Avenue, so this would be most logical place to put it.

Mr. Heit stated he agrees that if there’s a block in the Kansas Avenue Historic District, this is the one that will be harmed the least by demolishing the buildings. He added that when looking at the defining character, scale and rhythm of the Kansas Avenue make-up historically, there has never been a significantly sized civic open space plaza on Kansas Avenue. It has always been commercial and office corridor that maintained a distinct street wall on both sides. Ms. Pearson agreed that an open plaza is not reflective of what the commercial district has always been.
Mr. Burenheide pointed out that the way the block is now is not the traditional commercial street that the rest of Kansas Avenue does.

Mr. Paris pointed out that if the demolitions proceeded, the block could be removed from the Historic District. He explained that the block was included in the Historic District because the rhythm of commercial activity on Kansas Avenue continued up to 6th Street, and that without these buildings there is no contiguous use of commercial activity between 7th & 6th Street. The historic buildings remaining on 6th Street becomes non-contiguous.

Ms. Anderson stated she thinks that the Commission should consider what’s planned for the space and valid points were made by Mr. Snethen on the standards.

Mr. Paris reminded everyone that there are two parts of the Historic Preservation law. The Landmarks Commission is to decide whether the demolition request meets the Secretary Standards. Discussion about what follows the demotion is valid if the Landmarks Commission decision is appealed to the Governing Body. The Secretary Standards are the only factor relevant to the Landmarks Commission. The Governing Body may consider other factors.

Mr. Post stated that the point above leaves the Commission little discretion.

Mr. Burenheide pointed out that no Contributing buildings are being demolished. Mr. Paris stated that his staff report speaks to the contributing uses of the buildings in question. The use of that land has historically been commercial, and removing that commercial use is a profound alteration to the basic foundation of the historic district. Mr. Burenheide stated that if it were any other block he would agree, but this one is unique and to him, that’s a relevant factor to consider.

Motion by Mr. Post to agree with staff’s recommendation; second by Ms. Pearson. APPROVAL (5-2-0 with dissenting votes from Mr. Burenheide and Mr. Sourk).

Mr. Sourk recommended changing the order of the agenda to consider the Shiloh Baptist Church National Register Nomination next, and Mr. Paris gave a brief review of the history of the church and its nomination.

Mr. Duke Palmer came forward to speak as a member of Shiloh Baptist Church. He explained that he had helped to write the nomination and gave additional history and information on the church and its impact on the community.

Following additional discussion, there was a motion by Ms. Steinkuehler to endorse the nomination; second by Mr. Post. APPROVAL (7-0-0)

CLGR18-03 by Trails Market & Gallery, requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the placement of three wall signs onto the face of property located at 109 N. Kansas Avenue, within the boundaries of the Mill Block National Historic District.

Handouts were provided depicting proposed sign designs. Mr. Paris explained that the signs meet the zoning restrictions for the district and are in keeping with the Downtown Design Guidelines. The signs
are replacing current signs. Staff recommendation is that all three signs meet the standards and do not damage or destroy the historic integrity.

Motion by Ms. Pearson to agree with staff recommendation, second by Mr. Post. APPROVAL (7-0-0)

Mr. Post left at 7:00PM

Other Items

Mr. Paris provided information about the July 18-22 NAPC Conference in Des Moines, Iowa. He has applied for a grant to send 5 people (including 1 staff) to the conference. Decision on the grant application is expected on May 5.

Mr. Paris invited all to the Annual SCHS/Landmarks Commission Historic Preservation Awards taking place May 12.

Mr. Warner let everyone know that on May 4 SHIPO will be presenting grant applications to their board in a public meeting. Their meetings are open to the public and are tweeted.

Adjournment at 7:07PM
November 9, 2017

CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT
KANSAS HISTORIC PRESERVATION LAW
PROJECT REVIEW REPORT
TOPEKA PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CASE NO: CLGR18-04 by: Stephen Smith Gallery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address</th>
<th>Property Classification</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>931 S. Kansas Avenue.</td>
<td>Contributing Property to the South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District</td>
<td>Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Site Plan [ ] Elevations [X] Arch./Const. Plans [X] Pictures [X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSAL: The applicant is requesting a review under Kansas State Historic Preservation Law for the placement of 1 wall sign onto the east façade of the building located at 931 S. Kansas Avenue. This building is listed as a Contributing Structure the South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District.

BACKGROUND: This building was designed by the architecture firm of Hopkins and Holland, and was built in 1888. It is listed within the nomination for the South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District as the Minney Building, so named after one of its initial occupants. The property is identified as a contributing structure, meaning that it embodies the qualities and architectural character that exemplifies the historical significance of the District.

The nomination for the South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District describes this structure as follows: “This two-story Two-Part Commercial Block is divided into three storefronts corresponding to three addresses (927, 929, and 931). Each storefront has been altered in materials and/or configuration. The south storefront has ceramic tile surround. The center storefront is wood, aluminum, and brick. The north storefront has brick and aluminum with metal over the transom. The center storefront retains its historic transoms. A continuous stone beltcourse separates the two stories. Brick pilasters divide the second story into six bays. Each bay contains a paired window with a shared lintel. The two bays at the north end of the facade are smaller replacement windows surrounded by plywood infill. The four south bays each contain paired double-hung wood windows with fixed transoms. The parapet in each bay contains brick corbeled dentils and small recessed squares. The flat parapet has stone coping.”
The proposed sign measures 35 sq. ft. in size, and is to be constructed of a high-quality resin. This material, and its placement are consistent with the recommendations of the Downtown Topeka Historic Design Guidelines, and with the D-1 Downtown Zoning District design guidelines.

**REVIEW SUMMARY:** The Kansas State Historic Preservation Office requires that all projects occurring on any property listed on the Register of Historic Kansas Places be reviewed for their affect on the listed property and the surrounding district. State law (K.S.A. 75-2724) establishes that the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation be used to evaluate changes proposed to any property that is individually listed, or is located within an historic district. The following is an analysis of the application of each Standard to the proposed project.

**Standard 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.

**Analysis:** The existing tenant within this space will be adding a second, ancillary use that is consistent with the structure’s historical use as a place of retail or office business. The proposed sign will provide public notice of the new business, and will be the only external signage placed onto the façade of this address. The placement location for this sign will not require structural changes to the building, nor will it cause any permanent changes that alter its primary function as a place of public business.

**Standard 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.

**Analysis:** No historic materials will be removed from the property in association with this project. The tile occupying the lower storefront was added in the 1930s, and has attained its own historic significance. The placement location for this sign will not require structural changes to the building, nor will it cause any permanent changes that alter its primary function or appearance as a place of public business.

**Standard 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.

**Analysis:** The placement of this sign is above the transom space, and will not create a false sense of historical development. This type of sign, and its proposed location are considered appropriate by the Downtown Topeka Design Guidelines as a sign between floor levels (p. 9-4). It is Staff’s evaluation that the proposed wall sign is of high quality, and is designed in a manner that is unobtrusive, yet appropriate to the venue, and to the exterior façade of the building.

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

**Analysis:** No portions of the historic structure on the property will be affected by the placement of the proposed wall sign onto the exterior façade of this building.
Standard 5.  Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

Analysis: The placement of the signs, as proposed, will not remove or alter any distinctive features, finishes or construction techniques that characterize this property.

Standard 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.

Analysis: N/A

Standard 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.

Analysis: N/A

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

Analysis: N/A

Standard 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.

Analysis: The proposed sign and its placement are compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of this building.

Standard 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.

Analysis: The proposed sign will be attached to the façade by concrete screws placed into the mortar joints of the brick. This method will allow the sign to be removed in the future without any detriment or damage to the principle structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: In light of these standards and the preceding analysis, Planning Staff recommends to the Topeka Landmarks Commission a finding that the placement of the proposed sign onto the façade of the building located at 931 S. Kansas Avenue WILL NOT damage or destroy the historic character or the historic integrity of the structure, nor the surrounding historic district.
APPEAL TO THE GOVERNING BODY: If the Landmarks Commission determines that the proposed treatment will damage or destroy the historic integrity of the property and/or the surrounding historic district, the applicant may appeal to the governing body. It will be incumbent upon the governing body to make a determination, after consideration of all relevant factors, that: (1) there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the removal of the facade; and (2) that alternatives to the project include all possible planning to minimize harm to the property and the district that may result from those alternatives.

Prepared by: ________________________________
Timothy Paris, Planner II
CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT
KANSAS HISTORIC PRESERVATION LAW
PROJECT REVIEW REPORT
TOPEKA LANDMARKS COMMISSION

CASE NO: CLGR18-07 by: Twin Oaks Holdings, LLC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address:</th>
<th>119 SE 6th Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Classification:</td>
<td>Contributing Property to the South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards:</td>
<td>Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation; Downtown Topeka Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>Site Plan [ ] Elevations [X] Arch./Const. Plans [X] Pictures [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSAL: This proposal is to accommodate an interior remodel of the structure, and to replace the lower storefront to accommodate its use in functional association with the adjacent (east) structure. The proposed design closely reflects its documented appearance as depicted in a news photograph of this portion of SE 6th Avenue during the 1920s. This structure is listed as a “contributing property” within the nomination of the South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District to the National Register of Historic Places.

BACKGROUND: This structure is known as the D.O. Coe Building, so named after its most prominent early tenant during the first quarter of the 20th Century. The current occupant of the adjacent building to the east (123 SE 6th Ave.) is now seeking to remodel the interior of this building to combine the floor spaces of both buildings for the same use. This project will require minimal alterations to the interior of both the 1st and 2nd levels, as well as the re-construction of the lower storefront.

This building is classified within the National Register nomination for the South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District as an early to mid-20th Century minimal commercial structure. The nomination states, specifically for this building: “This two-story two-part commercial block has a modified storefront and dark tapestry brick cladding at the second story. The first story is modified with an aluminum and glass storefront with a faux stone bulkhead. A glazed aluminum entrance with a full sidelight and transom form the entrance at the east end of the storefront. Wood panels cover the transom. A steel beam with ornamental medallions spans the storefront opening. A simple stone beltcourse forms a continuous sill. The second story contains two large window openings. Each opening contains paired 1/1 double-hung wood windows with fixed transoms. Egg and dart molding ornaments the mullion between the operable windows and the transom. The windows have steel lintels with ornamental medallions. Brick corbelling forms the cornice. The stepped parapet has stone coping. The rear (south) façade is concrete block infill and painted brick with an arched window opening.”

This proposal would replace the lower modified storefront with a new façade that is based on documentation from an early 1920s photograph of this portion of SE 6th Avenue.
REVIEW SUMMARY: The Kansas State Historic Preservation Office requires that all projects occurring on any property listed on the Register of Historic Kansas Places be reviewed for their affect on the listed property and the surrounding district. State law (K.S.A. 75-2724) establishes that the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation be used to evaluate changes proposed to any property that is individually listed, or is located within an historic district. The following is an analysis of the application of each Standard to the proposed project.
Standard 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.

Analysis: No significant change in use is proposed in conjunction with this project. The use of the structure will remain as a commercial place of business.

Standard 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.

Analysis: This building is listed as a “contributor” within the South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District. As such, physical alterations to its exterior should follow strict documentation if its appearance during an earlier time-period. In this instance, documentation has been found of its original appearance. The proposed plans replicate this appearance to a very significant degree, changing the exterior character of this property from a modified, mid-century commercial to a more-intact representation of its original Victorian commercial appearance. The 2nd level façade will remain unchanged, with tuck pointing and window restoration, as needed.

The lower storefront will replicate the use of tall and narrow transoms, placed above larger sheet-glass storefront windows. Bulkheads will be placed below these windows. The bulkheads will be constructed of fiber-reinforced concrete panels. All windows and the doorway will be cased in powder-coated bronze aluminum, with glass glazed with low-e clear film.

Interior changes will also occur. Most significantly, a doorway will be cut into the east exterior wall to create a shared, functional open space with the adjacent building to the east toward the front of the building. This opening can be closed at a later date to re-secure its historical use as an independent place of business. The 2nd-level already features 2 cross-access doorways to this adjacent building. No other interior doorways or walls in either the 1st or 2nd levels are considered to be of historic contributing status.

The rear façade will also be receiving a new treatment, removing two non-historic doorways, and replacing them with a window and a new, more functionally appropriate doorway for loading and un-loading of products necessary for the function of the business. The materials for this rear façade treatment will be matching concrete block, and aluminum-framed windows and doorframe.

The Downtown Topeka Design Guidelines recommend the retention and replacement of historic display windows in their entirety, including their historic configurations, glass materials, sealant, framing, and other components. This proposal will reinstall display windows in their original locations using appropriate modern material equivalents. This treatment will preserve the original historic character of the property.

Standard 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.

Analysis: The proposed project will replace this storefront with a design based on the building’s original appearance. The Downtown Topeka Design Guidelines recommends that facades “.....should only be restored to an earlier appearance if photographs, drawings, physical evidence, or other means can adequately document their appearance at a particular time.” In this instance, documentation of the building’s appearance has been located, and incorporated within the proposal. Materials will differ from those of the original façade, thereby preventing the creation of a false sense of historical development.

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

Analysis: This building was modified with a mid-century modern, minimal commercial storefront during the late 1950s, meaning that this storefront has obtained its own historic significance within the history of this building. The Downtown Topeka Design Guidelines recommends that facades “.....should only be restored to an earlier appearance if photographs, drawings, physical evidence, or other means can adequately document their appearance at a particular time.” In this instance, documentation of the building’s appearance has been located, and incorporated within the proposal. The building’s 2nd level façade will not be altered, retaining and restoring the existing 2nd-floor windows.

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

Analysis: No distinctive features, finishes, or construction techniques will be removed or altered in conjunction with this project proposal.

Standard 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.

Analysis: N/A

Standard 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.

Analysis: N/A

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

Analysis: N/A

Standard 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.

Analysis: This building was modified with a mid-century modern, minimal commercial storefront during the late 1950s, meaning that this storefront has obtained its own historic significance within the history of this building. The proposed storefront is consistent with the original design for the building, and is also consistent with the massing, size, scale, and architectural form of adjacent properties, and with the general character of early 20th Century commercial storefronts within the historic district. The new storefront will be differentiated from older, historic storefronts by its use of modern building materials consisting of aluminum and fibre-reinforced concrete panels.

Standard 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.

Analysis: N/A

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: In the performance of this review under KSA 75-2724, Staff is recommending a finding that the proposed interior and exterior alterations to property located at 119 SE 6th Avenue IS CONSISTENT with the recommendations outlined in the Downtown Topeka Design Guidelines, and will NOT damage or destroy the historical integrity of the structure, or the surrounding South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District.

APPEAL TO THE GOVERNING BODY: If the Landmarks Commission determines that the proposed treatment will damage or destroy the historic integrity of the property and/or the surrounding historic district, the applicant may appeal to the governing body. It will be incumbent upon the governing body to make a determination, after consideration of all relevant factors, that: (1) there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the removal of the facade; and (2) that alternatives to the project include all possible planning to minimize harm to the property and the district that may result from those alternatives.

Prepared by: ____________________________
Timothy Paris, Planner II
MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS

- GLASS: 1" INSULATED, LOW E, CLEAR
- STOREFRONT: FRONTSET, POWDER COATED DARK BRONZE
- DOOR HARDWARE: DARK BRONZE
- EXISTING WINDOWS: RESTORE EXISTING. INSTALL NEW 1" INSULATED, LOW E, CLEAR GLASS
- PANELS BELOW STOREFRONT/ SIGN: SMOOTH FINISH RAISED PANEL FIBER CEMENT PANEL
- BRICK: CLEAN AND TUCKPOINT EXISTING BRICK
DOWNTOWNER BUILDING
121 SE 6TH ST, TOPEKA, KANSAS, 66603

BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN

LOWER LEVEL

SCALE: 1" = 10'-0"
REMOVE FRAME HOOD

REMOVE GLASS VESTIBULE

REMOVE STOREFRONT BELOW STEEL BEAM;
BRICK AND WOOD WINDOWS TO REMAIN

REMOVE CMU WALL UP TO BOTTOM OF STL. BEAM. REMOVE SECTIONAL GARAGE DOOR AND HOLLOW METAL DOOR AND WINDOW. EXISTING BRICK AND WOOD WINDOW; ABOVE STL. BEAM TO REMAIN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"