MINUTES
EMERGENCY MEETING
DESIGN REVIEW STANDARDS COMMISSION
CITY OF JOPLIN
REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2019

The Design Review Standards Commission of the City of Joplin met on Wednesday, February 27, 2019 at 5 P.M. in the 5th Floor Council Chambers at the Joplin City Hall at 602 South Main Street, Joplin, Missouri.

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Dr. Michael Joseph, Ms. Lori Haun, Ms. Nancy Morton, and Mr. Bryan Wicklund.
CITY STAFF PRESENT:	Mr. Thomas Walters, Planning/Community Development Specialist Lindsay Dunn, Notary Public
VISITOR:	Mr. Terry Donaldson.

Meeting called to Order:

Mrs. Nancy Morton called the meeting to order and called the roll. Mr. Chad Greer was absent.

MS. HAUN MADE THE MOTION AND SECONDED BY DR. JOSEPH TO EXCUSE MR. CHAD GREER. MOTION CARRIED, WITH ALL VOTING "AYE" (4 IN FAVOR, 0 OPPOSED, 1 ABSENT) MOTION CARRIES.

Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting:

Public Hearings:

Certificate of Appropriateness-218 S Main St., Joplin, MO (Window Replacement.)

Ms. Morton stated that the reason why we are here today is to consider some maintenance and repairs that ordinarily would fall under minor works. It is in the Sunshine Lamp Historic District, it takes more appropriate decisions. The address is 218 S Main Street.

Mr. Terry Donaldson, Best Windows Best Price, Installation Contractor, 2030 E 44th Street, Joplin, MO. The owners are not present.

Ms. Morton stated that before us is a proxy from Mr. Greer, Architect, and as we move along we will insert his opinions as we discuss.

Mr. Thomas Walters, Planner, City of Joplin, MO. Mr. Walters stated that he received the application for 218 S Main that was signed on February 22, 2019. After review of the requirements for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the contractor, who did this on behalf of

the property owner, he determined there was sufficient documentation to make a determination. Window replacement is a minor work. Staff has the authority of approve minor works within the district, however, upon reviewing the documentation he found the window replacements not to meet the Design Review Standards. He also, suggest to the applicant that a change in windows would be necessary. Mr. Donaldson felt confident that the property owner would want to pursue the current proposed windows.

Ms. Morton asked if there were two groups of windows?

Mr. Walters stated that was correct. Upper façade windows.

Mrs. Morton stated there is a sash and transits is that correct?

Mr. Walters stated it was correct.

Mrs. Morton stated that there will be two discussions.

Mr. Walters stated the sash window proposed by the applicant, while it is the same configuration it does have muntin's, which is not typical style for this period.

Mrs. Morton stated this is open for discussion. The one over one sash has the divided lines in it and that is what they are asking for?

Mr. Walters stated that was correct. The contractor provided a detailed elevation to make clear that window #1 is the lower windows and #2 is for the sash windows. When looking at the quote pages that refers to which windows he intends to have for the proposed installment.

Mrs. Morton stated that (looking at the picture of the windows) this is what the property owner is proposing for replacement windows.

Mrs. Haun wanted to know about lines 3 & 4. Where are they going?

Mr. Walters stated those are not currently proposed.

Ms. Morton asked Mr. Walters about his recommendation for the sash (one over one). She asked Mr. Walters if he was not recommending?

Mr. Walters stated that was correct. Simply because the Design Review Standards show the proposed windows to be a different style and detailing even if they are similar configuration. Therefore, they are not appropriate for the period of the building.

Mrs. Morton stated the photographic evidence shows what the store front looked like, and that is another thing we take into consideration when we make our decision.

Mr. Walters stated that this address was previously requesting façade grant funding. At that time, he spoke to the property owner Colin Williams at length about proposed scope of work. Mr. Williams did previously submit a Certificate of Appropriateness with entirely different suggested

windows. I did include my emails to Colin Williams when I previously provided him the Design Review Standards for the district. Part of the discussions about the importance of meeting approval of both SHPO and the Design Review Board at the time he was receiving grant funds. We did have phone calls about the process. It was understood that even if he did not go forward with grant funding the Design Review Board would still need to review his intended work on the building. I did advise him to seek professional services of someone like Mr. Donaldson, originally that was not Mr. Williams intent. This application is much more complete than the previous one.

Ms. Morton asked if there were any other questions on this particular window? At this point we will use the Architect proxy.

Ms. Haun read the following from Mr. Chad Greer:

Since I will be unable to attend tomorrow's meeting, I would like to offer you my proxy vote for this matter. I have reviewed the applicant's submission and cannot vote in favor of allowing the proposed second story / transom windows to be installed. Based on the Design Review Standards, this window would be a significant variation to the existing windows and photographic evidence of past installations (from the period of significance).

This is not unlike the same requirements that we enforced for the window replacement at 719 S. Main and Rapha House storefront.

I offer no other proxy authority.

DR. JOSEPH MADE THE MOTION AND SECONDED BY MS. HAUN TO DENY THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR THE SASHES AT 218 S. MAIN STREET. MOTION CARRIED, WITH ALL VOTING "AYE" (4 IN FAVOR, 0 OPPOSED) MOTION CARRIES.

Ms. Morton opened discussion for the Transom windows, which is the third windows at the very top is considered the transom window.

Mr. Walters stated the proposed windows are of different configuration than the existing windows and a different style, once again they have muntin's. Looking at the original windows they have similar configuration but different style. For that reason, they do not comply with the Design Review Standards as far as appropriateness for the period of the building. Mr. Walters recommendation was denial.

DR. JOSEPH MADE THE MOTION AND SECONDED BY MS. HAUN TO DENY THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR THE TRANSOM WINDOWS AT 218 S. MAIN STREET. MOTION CARRIED, WITH ALL VOTING "AYE" (4 IN FAVOR, 0 OPPOSED) MOTION CARRIES.

Mr. Walters stated that we have not heard anything from the applicant.

Mr. Donaldson stated that he is aware that the meeting is nearly over, but there was some

confusion going into this when initially contacted by the owners. They took the original prints to Mr. Walters. Their impression was that if they went outside of the Historic Preservation guidelines that they would not be eligible for grant funding.

There was not quorum for the Historic Preservation Commission, so they will have to put this case on the agenda. They will meet on March 19, 2019 at 5:00pm.

Mr. Donaldson asked that this is really not officially denied?

Mr. Walters stated that if the property owners can withdraw their application and submit another application with within the design review standards. It is a minor works and staff has the authority to approve if appropriate. If they wish to continue with the current application official approval or denial will take place at the next Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

DR. JOSEPH MADE THE MOTION AND SECONDED BY MS. HAUN TO ADJOURN. MOTION CARRIED, WITH ALL VOTING "AYE" (4 IN FAVOR, 0 OPPOSED) MOTION CARRIES

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting stood adjourned.

Approved: _____
Nancy Morton, Chairperson

Approved: _____
Lindsay Dunn, Clerk