I. Roll Call

II. Approval of Minutes – October 10, 2019

III. Announcement of Potential Conflicts

IV. CLGR19-22 by Mike Wilson, seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness for the conversion of an empty lot, located at 109 N. Kansas Avenue, to a parking lot to be used in direct association with an adjacent loft apartment building. This property is listed as a “contributor” to the historic integrity of the Mill Block Industrial Historic District. However, the building has since been demolished due to its destruction by a fire in 2019.

V. CLGR19-22 by Shawnee County Parks & Rec., seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness for the placement of a fence to shield HVAC and electrical connections on the north side of the Ward Meade Mansion, located at 1211 NW Fillmore Street. The Ward Meade Mansion is an individually listed property on the National Register of Historic Places.

VI. CLGR19-24 by Ash Boutique & Farmer’s Market, seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness for the interior refinish of property located at 913 S. Kansas Avenue. This property is listed as a “contributor” to the historic integrity of the South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District.

VII. CLGR19-25 by Ash Boutique & Farmer’s Market, seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness for the interior refinish of property located at 921 S. Kansas Avenue. This property is considered to be a “non-contributor” to the historic integrity of the South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District.

VIII. CLGR19-26 by Debra Clayton, seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness for the refinish of the 2nd-level interior of property located at 720 S. Kansas Avenue. This property is considered to be a “non-contributor” to the historic integrity of the South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District.

IX. Kick-off Presentation of the Mid-Century Modern Multiple Property Documentation Research and Survey Project, Jaime Destefano, JLD Preservation Consulting, LLC.

X. Other Items

XI. 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: Cheyenne Anderson, Mark Burenheide, Jeff Carson, Paul Post (acting chair), Cassandra (by phone) (5)
Members Absent: David Heit, Donna Rae Pearson, Grant Sourk, Christine Steinkuehler (4)
Staff Present: Tim Paris, Kris Wagers

Acting Chair Paul Post called the meeting of the Topeka Landmarks Commission to order with four members present. It was agreed that the members would discuss non-action items until a quorum could be obtained.

Mr. Paris reviewed the Historic Houses of the Garlinghouse Company in Topeka MDPF, during which there was discussion and questions posed. Mr. Paris explained that this nomination is necessary so that individual properties can subsequently be nominated. The initial two individual properties located at 116 SW The Drive and 2532 SW Granthurst Avenue will be submitted simultaneously but individually. These individual nominations were also reviewed.

It was agreed that the initial nomination document for Garlinghouse Company in Topeka MDPF should, if possible, include a list of properties which would be deemed eligible for individual nomination.

Mr. Carson arrived at 5:59PM and a quorum was reached.

Approval of Minutes – August 15, 2019

Motion by Ms. Anderson to approve; second by Mr. Carson. APPROVAL (5-0-0)

Announcement of potential conflicts – None.

CLGR19/21 by Mike Fox, seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness for the placement of a 6’, heavy gauge, decorative aluminum fence along the south and east property lines of property located at 115 N. Kansas Avenue. This property is listed as a “contributor” to the historic integrity of the Mill Block Industrial Historic District.

Mr. Paris reviewed the staff report, explaining that the proposed fence is 6’ tall, will not be attached to any buildings and can be removed without causing damage. He noted that neither the applicant nor a representative was present for questions.

Discussion included that proposed material of the fence and Mr. Paris noted that fences are not specifically referred to in the Downtown Design Guidelines.

Motion by Mr. Burenheide to approve, second by Ms. Anderson. APPROVAL (5-0-0)

Adjourned at 6:09 PM
PROPOSAL: The applicant is proposing the construction of a vehicle surface parking lot for use with an adjacent multi-family residential building. The building located on this property was destroyed by a fire during the summer of 2019, and has since been demolished. Therefore, this property is currently considered to be a “non-contributor” to the historic integrity of the Mill Block National Historic District.

BACKGROUND: In 2015, The Mill Block Historic District was added to the National Register of Historic Places, followed by the adoption of design guidelines, specifically written for their application to this historic district, in 2016.

This property was the former location of a 3-story brick warehouse that had been converted into a multi-tenant gallery. This building was destroyed by fire during the summer of 2019, and since been demolished. The applicant is proposing to make use of the property as a vehicle surface parking lot to be used directly in association with the adjacent property to the south, which has recently been converted into loft apartments. Included with the design of this parking lot is a greenspace buffer between the parking surface and the property to the north. This area will be landscaped to complement the existing and adjacent residential uses. This proposed parking lot will have 2 points of access, one from N. Kansas Avenue, and the other from the alley along the property’s west boundary. The City of Topeka’s Traffic Engineering Division has approved both points of access.
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) dictates that the following guidelines for evaluation must be used for any property individually listed or located within an historic district:

**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:** This proposal will change the historic use of this property from an occupied warehouse to a vehicle surface parking lot. However, the property is currently vacant with no structural improvements, and does not otherwise have any functional use. This proposal will provide a functional use for the property, pending the possibility of the subsequent construction of a building at a future point in time.

**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:** The historic character of this property was lost with the fire that destroyed the building that had historically occupied this property. This proposal will, however, restore an active use of the property, albeit for a use that requires no building. This use and development will not alter the property’s current status as non-contributing to the historic character of the surrounding historic district.

**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:** This proposal will not introduce a false sense of historical development.

**Standard 4.** Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

**Analysis:** No historic physical features of this property is being removed to accommodate the proposed parking lot.

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

**Analysis:** N/A

**Standard 6.** Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

**Analysis:** N/A
Standard 7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

Analysis: N/A

Standard 8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will 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: No historic materials are being removed to accommodate the proposed parking lot on this property.

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 parking lot will not prohibit the construction of a building on this property at any point in time in the future.

Staff Recommendation: Therefore, in light of these standards and the preceding analysis, Planning Staff recommends a finding that the construction of a vehicle-surface parking lot on the property located at 109 N. Kansas Avenue, as proposed, will NOT damage or destroy the historical integrity of this property, nor the historic integrity of the surrounding Mill Block Historic District.

Prepared by: Timothy Paris, Planner II

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.

Suitable grounds for appeal under the Kansas Preservation Act include any claim that the project:

- Is a substantial, contributing use of clear public benefit to the revitalization of Downtown Topeka, either as an anchor, or as a small project with minimal negative impact;
- Enhances vitality in the streetscape, and is of benefit to adjacent historic properties;
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- Emphasizes historic character and, though not in full compliance with the Secretary’s Standards, adequately addresses the preservation and appropriate treatment of existing historic fabric;
- Exhibits exceptional design quality;
- Has no negative impacts to the building’s primary contributing historic features of high integrity; and
- Mitigates any adverse effects on other historic buildings.
PROPOSAL: The applicant is proposing the construction of 6’ privacy fence to shield HVAC and utility equipment on the north side of the Ward Meade Mansion. The placement of this fence will enable the north side of the building to be used by guests of the Ward Meade Mansion. Because of its proximity to the principle structure on the property, the proposed fence will match the historic character of the mansion, and will not mimic the Asian-style fences that are used within the adjacent arboretum to the east. This building is individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

BACKGROUND: The Ward Meade Mansion is located at the north end of the Ward Meade Neighborhood, and is situated on a bluff that offers a prominent view of the Kansas River valley located below and to the north. The original 1870 residence had no porches or ornamentation that is present today. These features were added after 1898, along with a two-story brick bedroom and kitchen addition. The City of Topeka purchased this property and mansion in 1961, and subsequently planted the adjacent arboretum to the east. In 1972, the City also constructed a 1-story addition onto the north side of the mansion to house large meetings and receptions. The property was placed onto the National Register of Historic Places in 1974.
**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) dictates that the following guidelines for evaluation must be used for any property individually listed or located within an historic district:

**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:** This proposal will not change the recent historic use of this property as a recreation and gathering facility. All proposed changes will be external to the building, and will not require attachment nor alteration to the structure. All new features will be compatible and complimentary to the historical character of the home.

**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:** The historic character of this property will not be altered by this proposal. The location of the proposed fence is to the rear of the home, and is not readily visible from the front or sides of the building. Furthermore, the proposed fence will be built in a compatible scale and style as the home, and will be constructed and finished with appropriate materials.

**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 fence will not introduce a false sense of historical development, but will be used to shield the presence of HVAC and electrical service devices that are located along the north side of the home.

**Standard 4.** *Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.*

**Analysis:** No historic physical features of this property is being removed to accommodate the proposed fence.

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

**Analysis:** N/A

**Standard 6.** *Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*

**Analysis:** N/A
Standard 7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

Analysis: N/A

Standard 8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will 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: No historic materials are being removed to accommodate the proposed fence.

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 fence will not be physically attached to the historic structure on this property, and can therefore be removed at any point in the future without irreversible harm to the property’s historic integrity.

Staff Recommendation: Therefore, in light of these standards and the preceding analysis, Planning Staff recommends a finding that the construction of a vehicle-surface parking lot on the property located at 109 N. Kansas Avenue, as proposed, will NOT damage or destroy the historical integrity of this property, nor the historic integrity of the surrounding Mill Block 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.

Suitable grounds for appeal under the Kansas Preservation Act include any claim that the project:

- Enhances vitality in the streetscape, and is of benefit to adjacent historic properties;
- Emphasizes historic character and, though not in full compliance with the Secretary’s Standards, adequately addresses the preservation and appropriate treatment of existing historic fabric;
• Exhibits exceptional design quality;
• Has no negative impacts to the building’s primary contributing historic features of high integrity; and
• Mitigates any adverse effects on other historic buildings.
PROPOSAL: The applicant is proposing a partial re-finishing of the 1st-level interior of this building, located at 913 S. Kansas Avenue. This property is currently a contributing structure within the South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District.

BACKGROUND: Although this property is listed as a “contributor” to the historic integrity of the surrounding South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District, two projects for modifications have come before the Landmarks Commission for review and approval. Both of these reviews were conducted at the same February 9, 2017 meeting of the Landmarks Commission. The first of these reviews was for the removal of the false façade covering the 2nd-level exterior. The removal of that façade was approved due to the presence of the building’s original façade underneath. The 2nd review for this building was for the refinishing of the building’s 2nd-level interior. This project was also approved by the Commission. Neither of these projects altered the status of this building as a “contributor” within the surrounding historic district.

The current proposal is for a partial re-finishing of the existing 1st-level interior. Nearly all existing features of the present interior finish will be retained and re-used.

REVIEW SUMMARY: The Kansas State Historic Preservation Office requires that all projects proposed for 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 change in use is proposed in conjunction with this proposal.

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 features within the existing 1st-level interior are original to the building. Based upon available historical documentation, it is estimated that the current interior treatment was installed during the late 1950s or early 1960s. The features within the existing finish treatments are extremely high quality, and have been coordinated to appear in precisely the same manner as they are today.

The current proposal leaves the vast majority of these finish treatments intact, and does not irrevocably alter the “theme,” or feeling currently presented by the finished interior. Most of the materials subject to change within the proposed design will be painted, as opposed to removed.

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: No changes being proposed will create 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: Although not original, the interior finish of the 1st-level interior of this building can be deemed to have acquired historic significance in its own right. The current proposal maintains the majority of these treatments within their intended and present configuration, thus preserving this interiors acquired historic integrity.

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

Analysis: No examples of features, finishes, construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship are proposed for removal in conjunction with this project.

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: N/A

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 partial re-finishing of the 1st-level interior of the property located at 913 S. Kansas Avenue **will NOT damage or destroy the historical integrity of the contributing structure.**

**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

**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 demolitions of the structures; 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.

Suitable grounds for appeal under the Kansas Preservation Act, and as outlined within the adopted Downtown Topeka Design Guidelines, include any project that:

- Is a substantial, contributing use of clear public benefit to the revitalization of Downtown Topeka, either as an anchor, or as a small project with minimal negative impact;
- Enhances vitality in the streetscape, and is of benefit to adjacent historic properties;
- Emphasizes historic character and, though not in full compliance with the Secretary’s Standards, adequately addresses the preservation and appropriate treatment of existing historic fabric;
- Is compatible with and enhances the overall character of the historic district;
- Exhibits exceptional design quality;
- Has no negative impacts to the historic district’s primary contributing historic buildings of high integrity; and
- Mitigates any adverse effects on other contributing historic buildings.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. EXISTING FLOOR TO REMAIN. WOOD FLOOR WILL BE REFinished.
2. ALL WOOD TRIM AND ELEMENTS WILL REMAIN AND WILL BE PAINTED COLOURED.
3. EXITING INTERIOR VESTIBULE STOREFRONT GLASS AND DOORS TO REMAIN.
4. ALL DISPLAY CASES WILL REMAIN.
5. DOORS REPLACED TO MEET ADA REQUIREMENTS TO FITTING ROOM AND RESTROOM. EXISTING DOORS WILL BE RETAINED ON SITE.
6. EXISTING FITTING ROOM STALLS TO BE REMOVED. CASING AROUND FITTING ROOM WILL REMAIN.
7. MIRROR AND WALL AT END OF HALLWAY TO BE REMOVED TO EXPAND SPACE.
8. WINDOWS WILL BE REPLACED TO EXISTING OPENING SIZE.
9. EXISTING DOOR TO REMAIN, PAINTED. COLOURED TO TBD.
10. EXISTING WALL ELEMENT TO REMAIN AS IS, TO BE COVERED BY WALL.
11. NEW WOOD FLOORS WILL BE INSTALLED, RUN OPPOSITE DIRECTION OF EXISTING AND STAINED SAME COLOURED.
12. EXISTING LIGHTING FIXTURES TO BE REPLACED WITH LED FIXTURES WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE GOTHIC CHANDELIER AND PENDANT WHICH WILL BE CLEANED AND INSTALLED WITH NEW LIGHT BULBS.
13. EXISTING DUCTWORK TOWER TO BE REMOVED.
14. EXISTING MIRROR CEILING TO BE REPLACED. COLOURED TO TBD.
913 S. Kansas Ave
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PROPOSAL: This proposal is to re-finish the interior first-floor of the building. This level has previously been gutted, and the storefront entrance has also been replaced. There are very few historic features remaining within the interior of the building on this level. Those few that remain will be repaired and integrated into the finished design of the interior space. 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. However, Staff believe this designation to be questionable, based upon further documentation of the building’s exterior that was not available at the time of NRHP nomination.

BACKGROUND: This Building is a two-story structure located in downtown Topeka, Kansas, near the middle of the west side of the 900-block of S. Kansas Avenue. The building dates to 1880, and as such is one of the oldest commercial structures within the S. Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District.

This building has undergone three reviews for alterations by the Topeka Landmarks Commission within the past 12 months. The first of these reviews was to accommodate the refinishing of the 2nd-level interior. The second review was for the placement of a sign onto existing mounting hardware attached to the exterior 2nd-level façade, and the 3rd review was to accommodate the installation of a new storefront. This current proposal will complete the interior renovations of this building for occupancy.

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 change in the building’s historical use is proposed in conjunction with this project. The building is currently vacant, but is proposed for occupancy in accordance with its historic retail function.

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:** There are few historic character-defining features within the 1st-level of this building. However, the existing tin-ceiling, existing plaster walls, and inlaid tile entrance will all be repaired and integrated into this level’s final design.

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:** This project will not create a false sense of historical development. No interior finishes within the interior are proposed that would mimic those from a previous time period.

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 features within the interior of this building are proposed for removal that have acquired historic significance in their own right.

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

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

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:** All interior walls and ceilings will be repaired and preserved in conjunction with this project. Existing flooring, where feasible, will also be preserved and re-used. No other features within the interior are applicable to this Standard.

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: N/A

**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, as proposed, the re-finishing of the interior of the 1st level of this building, located at 921 S. Kansas Avenue, will NOT damage or destroy the historical integrity of the structure, or the surrounding South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District.

Prepared by: ____________________________
Timothy Paris, Planner II

**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 demolitions of the structures; 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.

Suitable grounds for appeal under the Kansas Preservation Act, and as outlined within the adopted Downtown Topeka Design Guidelines, include any project that:

- Is a substantial, contributing use of clear public benefit to the revitalization of Downtown Topeka, either as an anchor, or as a small project with minimal negative impact;
- Enhances vitality in the streetscape, and is of benefit to adjacent historic properties;
- Emphasizes historic character and, though not in full compliance with the Secretary’s Standards, adequately addresses the preservation and appropriate treatment of existing historic fabric;
- Is compatible with and enhances the overall character of the historic district;
- Exhibits exceptional design quality;
- Has no negative impacts to the historic district’s primary contributing historic buildings of high integrity; and
- Mitigates any adverse effects on other contributing historic buildings.