JOPLIN | HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

MINUTES
REGULAR SESSION
JULY 19, 2022

The Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Joplin met on Tuesday, July 19, 2022, at 5:00 p.m. on the Fifth Floor Informal Council Chambers at Joplin City Hall at 602 South Main Street, Joplin, Missouri.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ms. Sullivan, Ms. Frankoski, Dr. Fischer, Ms. Haun, Dr. Mountz, Ms. Detar and Mr. Huff.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Thomas Walters and Vicky Copeland representing the City of Joplin.

Items 1. & 2. Meeting Called to Order and Roll Call
Ms. Sullivan opened the meeting and Vicky Copeland called the roll.

DR. FISCHER MOVED, SECONDED BY MS. HAUN TO EXCUSE MR. BRUECKNER, MOTION CARRIED, WITH MS. SULLIVAN, MS. FRANKOSKI, DR. FISCHER, MS. HAUN, DR. MOUNTZ, MS. DETAR AND MR. HUFF VOTING, "AYE". MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 1 ABSENT).

MS. HAUN MOVED, SECONDED BY DR. MOUNTZ TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 21, 2022, WITH MS. SULLIVAN, MS. FRANKOSKI, DR. FISCHER, MS. HAUN, DR. MOUNTZ, MS. DETAR AND MR. HUFF VOTING, "AYE". MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 1 ABSENT).

Item 4. Budget
Mr. Walters stated there has been no change in the budget since last we met. There were some costs incurred but will not be presented until next month.

Ms. Sullivan read the Rules of Procedures for Public Hearings for all those in attendance:

Item 5. Public Hearings

a. Certificate of Appropriateness-826 S. Main St: National Order of Odd Fellows Lodge

Mr. Walters stated he received application and upon review the documentation was complete and sufficient for him to conduct the review. He accepted the application. He stated he would have to assign a case number and apologized for the oversight. We are having this hearing without the approval of the design review board because we did not have a quorum, so with the permission of the Director we are preceding however you can make that part of your deliberation. It is in the interest of keeping on a normal timeline we are bypassing the board which is allowed since they are a recommending body only and the final administrative authority is this commission. Immediately upon review and when it was determined that I would not have the Design Review Board to review this in a Public Hearing, I did consult with the architect from Design Review Board which is Chad Greer with Corner Greer Architects. There were three things that he mentioned that I also found in my own review. At one point along with the architect for this project, Jeff Millard we had a discussion about third floor windows. Four over one is a highly unusual configuration for windows, and we were talking for some time before I realized that they were stating they had the windows that were in there and they wanted to put them back. So, there was a plethora of photographic documentation. But I included in the packet photos of those and basically the configuration of the windows is a one over one with two transoms stacked on top. So, that is rather unique and individual to this district not typically of their era. That was pointed out by Chad immediately and is highly unusual. So, in fact he does have the original windows and therefore should be restored despite being unusual.

Ms. Haun asked if this elevation reflects the dimension of the windows that he has.

Mr. Walters stated he believed so.

Ms. Haun stated as she pointed to diagram that these are larger than these.

Dr. Fischer stated these are not the same size referring to the diagram.

Mr. Walters stated the other thing Chad mentioned was the need for additional investigation for existing defining features such as columns. Mr. Walters included photographs. Mr. Higginbotham allowed Mr. Walters to view the inside of the property and the columns appear to be almost identical to the columns we discovered behind the

facade of 211 S. Main. They appear to be identical maybe even the same manufacturer. So, they clearly appear to be exterior columns. I have requested a revision that incorporated into the façade. The revision is included in your submission following the first three pages. Chad wanted to make sure there was greater clarity on any materials and finishes on the first level storefront. He wanted to make sure those questions were asked in this hearing so we can make sure all materials and finishes were appropriate. Further, upon my review really the only thing upon the initial submittal that my finding was not in compliance was the concealing of those existing columns. Other components and configurations would be appropriate for a façade that does not exist in a contemporary design would be allowed since they are no longer obligated to go back to the original and further difficulty is according to the applicant original photography of this building is unavailable. So, the photographic documentation that we do have of this building is insufficient to hold to any exact configuration for the storefront. So, given the more general tendencies and configurations of the traditional two-part commercial resource this storefront and materials as I reviewed it was appropriate. So, the most significant changes between the initial submission and revision is that the masonry column that is next to the second-floor entrance on the south side of the building that is clearly existing in the stairwell where we looked up. It is there. There is no way that a transom window assembly could be existing right through it. It would have to be removed. It would have to be incorporated into the façade design as well as the inclusion of the cast iron columns. The completeness of my review and how I determine conformity with our code is outlined for other aspects of the storefront and the upper facades including the cornice is removed and not there. A relatively simple design of either metal or masonry could be put in and be in compliance. Staff recommends the approval of the revised plans.

Mr. Huff asked if this was originally one building or two.

Mr. Walters said he believed it was one building.

Mr. Huff asked what was the set back.

Mr. Walters stated it was built too but we do not have documentation, but he believed the storefront was set back behind the columns could have been at relative great depth. On the interior he looked at the masonry walls and so forth to look for any place where there might have been exterior attachment. The walls are very clean. So, he could not specify where the corner of the recessed storefront was on the interior wall. So, I am basing my conclusion on what was traditionally done.

Mr. Huff asked if Mr. Walters stated it was an iron column with an iron crown.

Mr. Higginbotham stated he could not tell yet because he had not dismantled anything. It looks similar to the design on the outside of the building above those windows referring to the diagram which is also the iron.

Ms. Haun asked if there were any historic photos of this building. Ms. Haun stated the building itself has an unusual window configuration if it is original and she believes they are.

Mr. Higginbotham stated he has conducted extensive research through the library, and they found information on the man that built the structure but no photos of the building itself.

Ms. Haun stated so, we do not know if this step back is original.

Mr. Walters stated he suspected the original framing is clearing original framing the way it was done. It very well could have been more substantial. The bay entrances were typically for a store front. Not always. Just generalization and without photographic documentation he is not sure.

Mr. Huff asked when the building was built.

Mr. Higginbotham stated 1891.

Ms. Haun asked Mr. Walters if he said this was done without Design Review.

Mr. Walters stated consultation with the architect did occur but not the board.

Ms. Haun asked if the materials on the storefront are aluminum.

Mr. Higginbotham asked existing or what he was proposing?.

Ms. Haun stated what you are proposing.

Mr. Higginbotham stated yes and believed he found an error. He stated you will have to tell me what you want. Yes, the aluminum dark bronzed finished storefront material is what I want to go back in with. But I did see on the far right of the proposed east exterior elevation he annotated wood frame window glass per G & H and that was not my intention. My intention was to use the extruded bronze aluminum as is typical when doing a historic replication rather than a wooden window.

Mr. Walters stated either would be an appropriate material. This would not be an issue.

Ms. Haun asked about the replacement brick at the top referring to diagram. She stated this would be very difficult to replicate what is below it. She asked Mr. Higginbotham how he was going to address that.

Mr. Higginbotham stated if he understood the rules correctly, we need to closely replicate that era, but it must be obvious that it was not original. That is the feedback I have been given. And so, what I see if you look between floor two and floor three you see that inset and see how they inset or outset some of that grit. And same thing between floor one and two. So, it is on my mind that the thing to do would be give it some detail like that and that is what we envisioned here. Unfortunately, I do not have the profile here to address your question. But when you look at what has been destroyed and fallen off it looks like as it did this as it ties in differently as it moves up the wall and ties into the main structure. So, to me it looks like we step it out and reach that cornice. Mr. Higginbotham stated he has submitted pictures. He stated the ties change as you move up the building.

Ms. Haun stated well both buildings on either side have brick detail that comes out to the cornice.

Mr. Higginbotham stated that looked like what was there. Mr. Higginbotham stated the way they tied into the buildings, and it failed but it looked like they step continually out.

Ms. Haun stated you can see the ghost of this on the diagram.

Mr. Walters stated with relative confidence that SHPO will say upon their review that the color will be impossible to match because a lot of it has aged over a century but the type of brick if available or reasonable to be similar if not the same and the masonry schedule, that is the tuck point, and how it will be done will be matching or consistent to the rest of the building.

Mr. Higginbotham stated that NTS on similar jobs and they are doing a really well matching the grout in all that.

Ms. Haun stated you will have the same issue between one and two. We had to recreate something on ours because we could not put it back the way it was originally. So, it is a challenge.

Mr. Huff asked on the top of that what they did to substantiate that structure. Did they put a wall up there and just stucco it.

Mr. Higginbotham stated they did stucco it and it is horrific. When you go inside the building and stand inside, you can see out the third floor through the brick. At one point up there is this much brick holding the whole center of the front wall. It is precariously perched. It is rotted from water damage. He stated he does not know how the front is not falling off the building. It obviously was not done well, and it has had water penetration forever.

Mr. Huff asked about the water damage.

Mr. Higginbotham stated just the third floor.

Mr. Huff asked if there was any steel or just 2x12.

Mr. Higginbotham stated no steel.

Mr. Huff asked which way the joists run.

Mr. Higginbotham stated they run east to west.

Ms. Haun asked about the lintel and whether they are stone or brick.

Mr. Higginbotham stated they look to be metal.

Ms. Haun asked if they were painted right now.

Mr. Higginbotham stated he could not tell. They look pristine. There is no flaking and no deterioration.

Ms. Haun asked if they were terra cotta.

Mr. Walters stated he assumed they were.

Mr. Higginbotham stated they are so intricately designed. He had not considered terra cotta.

Ms. Haun stated that atheistically it is out of character to have that little side light to the side. It would be better if you thickened your store front or widened your door and centered it.

Mr. Higginbotham stated he was okay with that. What we are doing is looking at what exists which is not any indication as to what was there. He stated he agreed with Ms. Haun. He stated there might be a driver there and asked Mr. Walters if he had pictures of the steel in front of the door.

Ms. Haun directed Mr. Higginbotham to the photos.

Mr. Walters stated there is one continuous steel plate that is underneath the entire façade to a great depth. That is another reason I believe the entire storefront was recessed at one point. A lot of this façade is built on top of ¼ in. steel plate that was textured for grip.

Mr. Higginbotham stated they are stamped with the date of 1891 and the builder's name. But to answer your question all you can see of that steel plate is a 4 in. reveal until we get to the door in question. But to center the door would not be a big deal. Mr. Higginbotham stated that unilateral does not make any sense.

Mr. Walters stated there is already a suggested change in the configuration if you notice the alignment between C & D with C being rather tall existing. The transom is taking up the entire width above the door and that window. So, there is already a suggested change in the configuration so a more appropriate one would be justified because we are not expanding their scope of work or adding expense.

Mr. Higginbotham stated it would sure look better.

Mr. Walters stated that could be a condition.

Mr. Huff stated so you are saying that the transom D goes all the way across in that opening.

Mr. Walters stated the existing goes all the way across but what he is proposing is for this to go higher and only of the door.

Dr. Mountz asked about the proposed modification.

Mr. Walters stated if it was proposed as a condition of approval a change in the entrance could be justified.

Mr. Higginbotham stated eliminate C and balance B & G.

Commission agreed to modifications as stated.

Mr. Walters stated that however both would be appropriate.

Mr. Higginbotham stated it would look a lot better.

Mr. Huff asked if that was the only entrance to the apartments.

Mr. Higginbotham stated that 27 is an entrance to upstairs. In the rear of the building there is an entrance that goes upstairs currently. Then the rear of the building there is an entrance that comes in downstairs currently.

Dr. Fischer asked how many units.

Mr. Higginbotham stated 9 total units with approximately 400 square ft. each.

Mr. Huff stated he assumed necessary doors for both for fire.

Mr. Higginbotham stated yes. Mr. Higginbotham stated he had already been through pre-development and looked at all of that.

Ms. Haun stated the transom above the first floor above the storefront is going to be aluminum transoms.

Mr. Higginbotham stated yes.

Ms. Haun asked if the 2nd and 3rd floor would be original wood windows.

Mr. Higginbotham stated yes.

Mr. Huff stated that is what the sashes are for, and Mr. Higginbotham agreed.

Mr. Higginbotham said unfortunately the third floor tested positive for lead. It is in bad condition.

Mr. Higginbotham stated this has not been submitted to SHPO yet. Mr. Higginbotham stated that in the other set of plans it is articulated what will be done with the brick. The actual set of plans has more detail.

Ms. Haun stated she is comfortable with that because she knows SHPO will want to take a closer look at that.

Mr. Walters stated these are not final building plans. Those will be submitted, and he will have to sign off on them in H5 and if they were substantially dissimilar to what was approved by this Commission, he stated he would not sign off on the plans. Therefore, I would resubmit to this Commission the modified plans. As long as within my discretion as a staff for this Commission the design we approve is still being upheld I would sign off without making him have to come back before the Commission. And we are adding a planning inspection to all historic buildings because technically the building inspectors are looking for compliance to building code. There is no one making sure historic buildings get built to what the design is. So, I will be coming out once they get to a certain point on the storefront and confirming that the design is being built.

Ms. Sullivan stated if there is no further discussion or questions, she would entertain a Motion regarding 826 S. Main Street.

MS. HAUN MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. HUFF TO APPROVE THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR 826 S. MAIN STREET WITH THE MODIFICATION AS NOTED TO THE DOOR ENTRANCE, WITH MS. SULLIVAN, MS. FRANKOSKI, DR. FISCHER, MS. HAUN, DR. MOUNTZ, MS. DETAR AND MR. HUFF VOTING, "AYE". MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 1 ABSENT).

Mr. Walters stated he would send the approval letter in the morning, and he would not require separate submittalt, but Mr. Walters would confirm when Mr. Higginbotham submits building plans.

Item 6. Discussion Items

a. Broadway District Nomination-Public Meeting: Missouri Advisory Council and Historic Preservation unanimously approved our nomination for the Broadway District and passed on to National Parks.

b. Public Outreach Grant-Revisions requested.

Item 7. Old Business

None

Item 8. New Business

No meeting in August.

Goals for next meeting.

Elections in September.

ITEM 9. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Sullivan adjourned the meeting.

DR. FISCHER MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. HUFF TO ADJOURN, WITH MS. SULLIVAN, MS. FRANKOSKI, DR. FISCHER, MS. HAUN, DR. MOUNTZ, MS. DETAR AND MR. HUFF VOTING, "AYE". MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 1 ABSENT).

Approved _____
Jill Sullivan, Chairperson

Approved _____
Vicky Copeland, Recording Secretary