MINUTES
DESIGN REVIEW STANDARDS COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
APRIL 14, 2016

The Design Review Standards Commission of the City of Joplin met in special session on Thursday, April 14, 2016, at 5:00 P.M. in the Fifth Floor Study at the Joplin City Hall at 602 South Main Street, Joplin, Missouri.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:	Robert Greer, Lori Haun, Michael Joseph, and Nancy Morton
CITY STAFF PRESENT:	Troy Bolander, Director of Planning, Development, and Neighborhood Services Taylor Cunningham, Planner Tyler Overstreet, Planner Susan Champlin, Senior Clerk
OTHERS PRESENT:	Jacqueline Hackett, 520 South Main Street

Item 1 – Roll Call:

Mrs. Morton called the meeting to order, and Ms. Champlin called the roll.

Item 2 – Old Business:
a) Review and approval of minutes from December 15, 2015 meeting.

Mrs. Morton asked for additions or corrections to the minutes from the special meeting of December 15, 2015, and none were received.

MR. GREER MOVED, SECONDED BY DR. JOSEPH, THAT THE MINUTES FROM THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 15, 2015 BE APPROVED. THE MOTION CARRIED WITH MR. GREER, MS. HAUN, DR. JOSEPH, AND MRS. MORTON VOTING "AYE"; (4 IN FAVOR, 0 ABSENT).

b) 514 South Main Street – Request for review of façade improvements – Hackett Hot Wings.

Mr. Overstreet stated the application includes photos of the façade in question and the surrounding businesses, the plat map, and the zoning map. The property is currently zoned C-2 (commercial). The proposal includes new awnings, paint colors, signage, and windows. The proposal originally contained window glazing; however, that was updated to replacement of windows following the inclement weather from late December. The building suffered damage on the interior and exterior windows, with those windows needing to be replaced.

An update on the façade improvements was sent to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), with the approval letter for the updated plans being included in the agenda packet. Mrs. Morton stated the letter does not grant approval but just states the work being done will have no adverse effect on surrounding properties.

The staff review and report was originally drafted by Ms. Cunningham on December 11, 2015. Mr. Overstreet's updates include a few clarification points. The paint chip Ms. Hackett plans to use is known as Homestead Ballroom Gold (Valspar 3003-7C). It is very comparable to the Benjamin Moore paint chip known as Richmond Gold (HC41).

The window frames are in extensive disrepair and need to be replaced. Exhibits 2 and 6 of the agenda packet contain additional information on the frames and the SHPO letter. Exhibit 2 contains the specific information the frames, with the SHPO letter being Exhibit 6.

The proposed signage is compatible with the existing façade. The sign will contain vinyl lettering. Exhibit 1 shows the proportionality of the signage, along with the sign designs.

Mrs. Morton asked if the signage also goes on the windows. Ms. Hackett replied the signage will hang down over the awning but will not be placed on the windows.

Mr. Overstreet stated the City staff does see this design as being in compliance with the current regulations and is recommending approval.

Mrs. Morton asked for a motion to open this application for discussion.

DR. JOSEPH MADE A MOTION TO OPEN THIS APPLICATION FOR DISCUSSION.

Ms. Haun asked if SHPO is agreeable with using the aluminum windows, and Mr. Overstreet replied yes.

Mr. Greer asked if SHPO received the design for the windows. Mr. Overstreet replied they received the rendering and the photos of the existing and surrounding buildings in that update, along with the packet on the windows.

Mrs. Morton asked Mr. Overstreet if the specifications for the replacement windows were sent to SHPO, and he replied yes. SHPO has seen all the documentation included in the agenda packet.

Ms. Haun asked Ms. Hackett if she is making any changes to the rear façade, and she replied no. She may paint the brick in the future.

Mr. Greer asked Ms. Hackett what work she was anticipating for the upper level windows when her previous application was tabled. He asked if she was just replacing the frames, and she replied she is now replacing the frames and the windows.

Mr. Overstreet stated one of the reasons the application was tabled is because Ms. Hackett is now replacing the frames as well, so he sent the update to SHPO for their approval on the change and scope.

Mr. Greer stated the design review guidelines specify if the original window design is unknown, to use window type and detailing sash materials and dimensions of the architectural style or period of the building. Typically the majority of the upper level windows are sash-type operational windows. That created an extra level of detail or a richness to those windows. The horizontal molding would add back a similar style that would be appropriate for the era and style

of this building. Additionally, if one of the windows would break, Ms. Hackett would only have to replace a small section versus a larger section. The cost benefit for Ms. Hackett would be improved in the event that one of those windows were damaged or broken.

Mrs. Morton asked for an example of the windows since that was the reason this application was tabled at the previous meeting. She asked for a photo showing the replacement window. She thought the style was "one over one".

Dr. Joseph asked if double-hung movable windows are proposed, of if a bar can be placed across the windows to give the appearance of double-hung windows. Mrs. Morton thought it was "one over one" but just not the one piece of glass.

Mrs. Morton asked Mr. Overstreet about the proposed window design. He has the specifications for the windows, but not a rendering of the actual proposed window frames.

Mr. Greer stated the design review guidelines draw clear illustrations showing how the upper level windows are treated as either sash-type or subdivided. Mrs. Morton thought a picture of the proposed windows would help the commissioners make a decision. She asked Ms. Hackett if she has seen the proposed windows, and she replied her contractor, Jeff Neal, handles that for her.

Mrs. Morton contacted Jeff Neal by phone and asked him what Ms. Hackett's replacement windows will look like. Mr. Greer asked if they will contain a horizontal molding to appear like a single-sash window for the upper level. Mr. Neal replied the replacement windows will look like the windows that currently exist.

Mr. Greer asked Mr. Neal if he presumed those windows were the windows that were original to that building, and he replied no. Mr. Overstreet stated the application reflects those were not the original windows.

Mr. Greer asked if there would be any cost difference in adding a horizontal molding to appear as a fake sash window, and Mr. Neal replied yes.

Mr. Greer asked about single horizontal muttons. Mr. Neal understood SHPO has already approved the plans for the windows.

Dr. Joseph asked if a strip of aluminum could be glued onto the windows. Mr. Neal stated the current windows are not the original design.

Dr. Joseph asked Mr. Neal if he has already ordered these windows, and he replied no. He must proceed through a bidding process before purchasing the windows.

Mr. Greer stated at the last meeting the commissioners were reviewing the design with the upper level windows. Ms. Hackett was going to be making repairs as needed for those windows to keep the water from coming in. It was not replacing the windows.

Ms. Cunningham stated it was discussed during the last meeting that Ms. Hackett was having to replace the frames and the glass. The original design that was submitted was for glass

replacement. At that time, it was also discussed that Ms. Hackett was also going to have to replace the paint.

Mrs. Morton stated during the last meeting Dr. Joseph asked if the glass in the windows is divided, and Ms. Hackett was just replacing the windows with what exists already. Mr. Neal concurred that is what Ms. Hackett is doing. She will be replacing the frames with metal. At the last meeting, modification of the characteristics of the windows was discussed.

Mrs. Morton did not actually have a determination on Ms. Hackett's plans for her windows during the last meeting. The SHPO report discusses using existing wood frames. Dr. Prawl with SHPO stated there were no adverse effects based on replacing the glass in the existing window wood frames.

Mrs. Morton stated there wasn't much discussion during the last meeting about the divided windows, although the divided windows were suggested by Mr. Greer.

Mrs. Morton asked about discussing the signage, since the decision for the certificate of appropriateness is based on the signage, the windows, and the paint.

Mr. Greer asked if those are all being considered separately, or as one. Mrs. Morton thought they should all be considered separately.

Mr. Bolander stated the commissioners could consider each items separately, with their recommendations being forwarded to the Historic Preservation Commission, who will make the final decision.

Mr. Overstreet stated each line item could be discussed individually during the Historic Preservation Commission meeting. Ms. Prawl stated in her second letter that it is found that replacing the top floor windows with those that match the configuration and current profile of the existing windows will have no adverse effect.

Mrs. Morton asked about the specifications for the signage. The commissioners need to know the size of the sign and the font for the lettering, if it follows the design review guidelines.

Ms. Hackett stated Sign Smith is preparing the specifications on the sign. Mr. Overstreet asked Ms. Hackett if this is the same font as her existing signage, and she replied yes.

Mr. Greer stated the only thing in the design guidelines that has specific requirements is on the size, the mounting height, the location, and the material of which it is built.

Mrs. Morton asked if this is a wood sign, and Ms. Hackett replied it is metal with vinyl lettering.

Mrs. Morton asked if Sign Smith told Ms. Hackett the projection is according to the specifications, and she replied yes.

Mrs. Morton asked Mr. Overstreet if he has spoken with a representative from Sign Smith and if he has the specifications for the signage. He has not visited with them, but he can easily obtain the specifications.

Mrs. Morton stated the commissioners do not have the information to really make an appropriate decision, so she would like to have those specifications for the Historic Preservation Commission meeting. She would like pictures of the proposed window replacement and the specifications for the signage, including the lettering and the font.

Mrs. Morton stated a recommendation is to be made on the signage that is located on the awning in two different places. The signage on the south end of the awning says "Hackett's Hot Wings" with "Sports Room" being placed on the north end. Mr. Overstreet stated the signage on the awning will be the same script as the signage on Ms. Hackett's existing awning to the south.

Mr. Greer stated there are no restrictions on the use of a font, but it just can't be over 18 inches in height. He needs to know how the signage will be mounted on the brick façade to make sure the signage is being mounted into the mortar with no grilling into the brick.

Ms. Hackett is just replacing the signage on the same bracket the Mystery Church used for their signage.

Mr. Greer stated the design review guidelines contain specific information relative to the signage, but in addition, it says the signage shall not be installed any higher than the second story window sill level. He asked how that relates to what is being proposed.

Mr. Greer asked if this would be considered a repair of an existing sign if Ms. Hackett mounts her signage on the existing bracket. Mr. Bolander stated if signage is being placed on an existing bracket, the City doesn't require all downtown property owners to move their existing signage even if it out of compliance. That signage is grandfathered in until the signage is destroyed or removed.

Mrs. Morton asked for a motion to approve the certificate of appropriateness for the windows as presented. Mr. Bolander stated this body makes a recommendation to the Historic Preservation Commission.

Mrs. Morton asked for a motion to send the recommendation for the window replacements to the Historic Preservation Commission as presented. No motion was received, so she asked for a motion to amend the recommendation of the window proposal.

Ms. Haun stated Mr. Neal suggested obtaining a bid for that center molding so the commissioners know what the price difference is, as to what the commissioners are asking Ms. Hackett to do as part of their bidding process as they proceed with their improvements.

Mrs. Morton asked for a motion to amend the application or a motion to send it to the Historic Preservation Commission as it has been presented.

Mr. Bolander discussed three options. The commissioners can recommend approval, recommend denial, or amend the request and then forward the amendment to the Historic Preservation Commission. Mr. Overstreet stated if those amendments are put in place, and the commissioners recommend approval as is or are recommending approval that the Historic Preservation Commission deny the request.

"Mr. Greer This is going to get complicated, so hang with me. **I would make a motion that we amend the motion by asking for the additional of horizontal mullion, contingent upon receipt of bid. And I know that Jeff can get us that information within a day or two. Hopefully, we can have that e-mailed to us. We can understand if the costs are negligible, that it would be worthwhile for maintaining the historic nature of our downtown fabric. If it is cost-prohibitive, then we can certainly continue our conversation.** I don't know how you nutshell that one.

Mrs. Morton That was perfect. Do I have a second?

Dr. Joseph **Second.**

Mrs. Morton Susan, you did get all of that, didn't you?

Ms. Champlin I don't know. I hope it's on there.

Mrs. Morton I think you did a very good job.

Mr. Greer I don't think anyone wants to delay you any further than that.

Mrs. Morton **Okay, let's just take a vote on—I have a motion and a second—oh, and Dr. Joseph seconded it. All those in favor? (Mr. Greer, Ms. Haun, Dr. Joseph, and Mrs. Morton voted "aye" (4 in favor)."**

Mrs. Morton stated the Historic Preservation Commission will meet on Tuesday, April 19. She asked if it would be appropriate for the City staff and commissioners to communicate by e-mail to vote, and Mr. Bolander replied yes.

Dr. Joseph thought the cost for the horizontal mullion would be negligible.

Ms. Cunningham asked who determines what is or isn't cost-prohibitive. Mr. Bolander doesn't want to apply additional requirements on Ms. Hackett, but there is an economic hardship that they can approach this body about. Mrs. Morton stated part of the due process is economic hardship. So if Mr. Neal can submit prices for the existing windows that Ms. Hackett is proposing, and then a price for the proposed windows.

Mrs. Morton entertained a motion to recommend approval to the Historic Preservation Commission for the signage and for the printing on the awnings.

DR. JOSEPH MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. GREER, THAT THE SIGNAGE AS PRESENTED BE PRESENTED TO THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION WITH RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. THE MOTION CARRIED WITH MR. GREER, MS. HAUN, DR. JOSEPH, AND MRS. MORTON VOTING "AYE"; (4 IN FAVOR, 0 ABSENT).

Mrs. Morton entered a motion to recommend the color Homestead Ballroom Gold (3003-73 Valspar) for the exterior of the façade at 514 South Main Street.

MS. HAUN MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. GREER, THAT THE PAINT COLOR AS PRESENTED BE FORWARDED TO THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION WITH RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. THE MOTION CARRIED WITH MR. GREER, MS. HAUN, DR. JOSEPH, AND MRS. MORTON VOTING "AYE" (4 IN FAVOR, 0 ABSENT).

Item 4 – Other Business:

Mrs. Morton asked the City staff to discuss changing the Design Review Standards Commission (DRS) to a subcommittee. Mr. Bolander stated the powers that the DRS currently has fall under the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). The DRS was created at the request of the previous city manager just because the City of Joplin was starting historic preservation downtown. They needed another committee to look at that downtown design and proceed through some type of approval process.

Mr. Bolander is trying to make the process more efficient. The HPC has the ability to form a subcommittee to address specific items such as design review. The advantages of proceeding that way are that the meetings don't have to be advertised, publication doesn't need to be sent to the Joplin Globe, and a quorum is not required. The subcommittee members just use their local knowledge and talent. The subcommittee may include the same people, or additional people. The HPC can call a meeting any time when it's convenient for everyone.

Mrs. Morton asked if changes to the Design Review Standards Commission must be approved by the City Council, and Mr. Bolander replied yes. The City Council created the DRS, with all the powers being vested to the HPC. They can use the same people who are present for this meeting as a subcommittee.

Ms. Haun discussed Ms. Hackett's case and understands the conversation in what is appropriate or not but expressed difficulty in communicating with the applicants. Mr. Bolander has had these issues before in that the downtown business owners don't know what is appropriate and what is not appropriate. It is best for the historic architects to be presenting the cases.

Mrs. Morton asked if it was inappropriate to call Mr. Neal. Mr. Bolander stated the best way to rectify that is to make sure that Mr. Neal knows everything was discussed is public information since Ms. Hackett is using Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding.

Mr. Bolander stated CDBG funding was used to pay for a historic architect to do the designs on the buildings in the Sunshine Lamp District. Mrs. Morton stated the historic architects are really the experts. Ms. Haun discussed the renovations to her building in the 800 block of Main Street and received historic tax credits since she didn't alter the windows on the building.

Mr. Greer stated all someone has to do is take the design review guidelines and look at them, and they can tell quickly, clearly, and easily what the expectation is. When he developed his storefront, he visited the Joplin Public Library and found historic photographs that showed the true nature of the existing windows that were in his building. Ms. Hackett or her consultants should have conducted this research. The commissioners are to read what is in the design guidelines and give their recommendation to the HPC and not give a recommendation to the owner.

Ms. Haun asked if the guidelines are available for the public, and Mrs. Morton replied they are on the City's website.

Mr. Greer asked about the enforcement process if a downtown business owner decides to replace their upper level windows with something that DRS feels is non-conforming. Mr. Bolander replied that process is handled by the Building Department. The HPC has seven days after a decision has been made to give that decision to the Building Department.

Mrs. Morton stated the HPC ordinance is also on the City's website. Mr. Bolander stated many business owners don't know anything about historic preservation. Mrs. Morton discussed making decisions based on a professional's input. Mr. Overstreet can only present what the applicants have provided him. Mr. Bolander will be procuring for a historic architect.

Mrs. Morton asked Mr. Overstreet if he can obtain the information requested by the DRS so the HPC can make a decision. He will ask Mr. Neal for cost estimates and will contact the commissioners by e-mail.

Mr. Greer stated whether or not SHPO gives their seal of approval, it does carry some weight with DRS, but they don't reference Joplin's design guidelines, so it's an additional layer of information. Mr. Bolander stated it is up to the DRS and the HPC to enforce the local design guidelines.

Item 5 - Adjournment:

Mrs. Morton asked for additional business, and none was received. She asked for a motion to adjourn.

MRS. MORTON MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. GREER, THAT THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED. THE MOTION CARRIED WITH MR. GREER, MS. HAUN, DR. JOSEPH, AND MRS. MORTON VOTING "AYE" (4 IN FAVOR, 0 ABSENT).

The meeting stood adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Approved _____
Nancy Morton, Chairperson

Approved _____
Susan Champlin, Senior Clerk