

**DESIGN REVIEW STANDARDS COMMISSION
602 S. MAIN ST., CITY OF JOPLIN
5TH FLOOR, STUDY
REGULAR MEETING
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2020**

The Design Review Standards Commission of the City of Joplin met on Tuesday, September 14, 2020 at 4:00 P.M. in the 5th Floor Study at the Joplin City Hall at 602 South Main Street, Joplin, Missouri.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ms. Jill Sullivan, Ms. Lori Haun, Mr. Chad Greer, and Mr. Bryan Wicklund.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Mr. Thomas Walters, Planning/Community Development
Lindsay Dunn, Notary Public
Patty Heagel, Assistant Director

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Charlie Kuehn, Representing the applicant, Sooner One

Meeting called to Order:

Ms. Lori Haun called the meeting to order and called the roll. Ms. Emily Frankoski and Dr. Michael Joseph were absent.

MR. GREER MADE THE MOTION AND SECONDED BY MS. SULLIVAN TO EXCUSE DR. MICHAEL JOSEPH AND MS. EMILY FRANKOSKI. MOTION CARRIED, WITH ALL VOTING “AYE” (4 IN FAVOR, 0 OPPOSED, 2 ABSENT) MOTION CARRIES.

Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting: -

MS. SULLIVAN MOVED AND SECONDED BY MR. GREER, THAT THE MINUTES FROM THE MEETING OF JULY 29, 2020 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. THE MOTION CARRIED, WITH ALL VOTING “AYE” (4 IN FAVOR, 2 ABSENT).

New Business:

A. Case No. 2020-01- Review of Façade Design changes for 702 S. Main Street. Mr. Walters stated that following the denial of this Certificate of Appropriateness from the last meeting staff carefully reviewed the changes not only from the last design but for the façade as a whole and in consideration of the entire standards, from a fresh perspective. Mr. Walters reminded the board that the standards state that the original storefront is long removed and is now a guide for a contemporary façade, appropriate in configuration and style and including appropriate materials of the building as a whole. Previously, based on inaccurate information it was believed a brick band was beneath the removed EFIS and a priority was its preservation or restoration. Since this feature is missing the applicant has proposed a header appropriate for the building for it hearkens back to the placement and configuration of the original, staff recommendation for the proposed header is approval especially since materials are consistent

with the previously approved materials and finishes for the framing of the storefront and transform windows.

Further appropriateness is improved with the proposed design by ensuring brick is being preserved on the columns and the limestone footers are now exposed. While the footers and have been chipped and damaged to be covered by inappropriate brick façade previously, a limestone finish EIFS, restricted to only fill in the location of where the placement of the existing footers used to set further returns the façade to an original configuration. The only alternative to the EIFS would be a limestone veneer which would be a significant change in cost.

General Standards

- 1.1 Preserve (maintain or restore, not removed or alter) **existing original storefronts** and storefront details. **Finding: Does Comply. Decorative brick band to be restore. Much of the original storefront has been altered.**
- 1.7 When planning a storefront rehabilitation, always remember that the storefront is part of a larger structure and its design should be related to the building's overall character. **Finding: Does Comply. Proposed storefront incorporates elements and removes EIFS exposing features that are part of the buildings overall character.**

Doors

- 1.4 For replacement doors, generally use glazing proportionate to display window glass and kick plate panels proportionate to bulkhead panels. Although wood is preferable, metal with a dark or bronze anodized finish and with a wide stile may be substituted. Raw (silver-colored metal is never appropriate. **Finding: Does Comply.**
- 1.5 Do not use solid doors on front facades. **Finding: Does Comply.**

Entrances

- 1.2 New entrance openings on storefronts should not be added. If an additional entrance is required by codes, it should be placed on the rear or side façade. New entrance openings should be simple in design and match the design of the original door. **Finding: Does Comply.**

Display Windows

- 1.2 Preserve (maintain, restore, or replace, not remove, reduce, cover, or alter) original display windows. **Finding: Does Comply. Facing brick removed to restore display windows as part of new storefront. Original display windows are non-recoverable and therefore new display windows and storefront of correct configuration is appropriate.**

Belt Courses/String Courses

1. Preserve (maintain, restore, or replace, not remove, conceal or alter) original belt/string course where they exist or existed. **Finding: Original beltcourse is missing, replacement is warranted that is appropriate for the building.**
2. If replacing a missing belt course, closely match or imitate the original type in design, location, materials, detailing, and scale. **Finding: The beltcourse has gone thorough several iterations throughout the life of the building. It was believed that a brick beltcourse from a "more recent" restoration was underneath the EIFS, however the feature is missing. The original beltcourse was thicker height than the existing**

brick beltcourse and a limestone colored masonry finish. The location was connected to the existing belt course on the northeast corner and continued along the east façade of the building. The proposed replacement belt course matches the location and scale of the original façade. Materials are of metal clad to match header and window frames as part of previously approved storefront and transform windows frames and finish. Since original and replacement masonry belt courses are removed, replacement belt course of similar scale and placement but using replacement materials to match and incorporate other elements of the new storefront. This will aid in the overall new façade design maintain the appearance and placements of removed features while creating common features in the new façade that meet the standards.

Materials

1. Replacing in kind an entire masonry feature that is too deteriorated to repair, if the overall form and detailing are still evident, using the physical evidence to guide the new work. Examples can include large sections of wall, a cornice, balustrade, column, or stairway. If using the same kind of materials is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered. **Finding: 1) Belt course is not evident but is missing. Replacement material chosen is to match appropriate materials already approved elsewhere in the facade. 2) Limestone base at corners and column has been chiseled and removed to nominal extend. Restoration is not feasible. EIFS base with limestone finish is to match look of the original base with available materials to imitate the original.**

Discussion and recommendation

Steps for determination:

Identify, Retain, and Preserve

Examining the building in the current state is necessary as the first step for all review. Historical features to be preserved can be identified, but also alterations that have become historic in their own right, cannot be reviewed using historical and archival research. Careful review of the building as it currently exists is also critical in identifying missing historical features upon review of the documentation of the building at the time of historical significance.

Protect and Maintain

After identifying important historic features, narrow acceptable scope of work to those that do not compromise the character defining historic features, and work required to repair at risk historic features.

Repair

Review guidance on appropriate methods for repairs recommended based on existing historic features.

Replace

Review historic features identified for repair that due to deterioration can only be preserved through replacement.

Design for Missing Historic Features

When an entire feature is missing, it no longer plays a role in physically defining historic character of the building unless it can be accurately recovered in form and detailing through the process of carefully documenting the historical appearance. Features cannot be recovered or replaced in part, and an acceptable option for the replacement feature is a new design that is compatible with the remaining character-defining features of the historic building. False historic appearance is not to be created.

These steps narrow acceptable works and generate preferred, allowable and not allowed alternatives. At this time, the scope of work detailed in the property owner's application is compared to the alternatives generated through review of the property and historic documentation available or provided by the property owner. The local Design Review Standards are used to make determination on the case/building specific features being affected or new designs being proposed. New designs that would otherwise be allowable must first not exceed the narrowed scope of work intended to prevent character defining features from being compromised.

Upon review of the existing façade brick facing has been added that does not match the rest of the building. EIFS is concealing features of the building, as evidenced by the presence of a decorative brick band on the north façade, and display windows are absent presenting the current façade as more of a commercial office than retail storefront.

Upon review of the historic photo, significant alteration is confirmed. The property was previously the Joplin Furniture Company. The original façade is known, and features are present to be preserved. Any new façade should restore elements that are compatible with the preserved features original storefront. However, the original storefront no longer exists in any integrity, and therefore a compatible new storefront that is appropriate is appropriate.

The applicant proposes removal of EIFS and facing brick, restoring/exposing decorative brick band and restoring display windows for a new storefront. Display windows and transforms will be separated by a header and column system. Proposed doors are more appropriate in style and location of entrances are unchanged from existing. Recessed entrance is not being restored but this feature was previously removed as noted in the grading of the historic integrity as part of the National Register eligibility assessment prior to nomination.

The proposed storefront incorporates from the original display windows and transforms, appropriate doors in configuration and style and exposes the decorative brick band.

Staff recommends approval.

September 14, 2020 Update:

The entirety of the updates has been reexamined as part of a new storefront design. The original storefront is non-existent and a new but compatible storefront is allowed. Previously entrances and windows have been reviewed and the placement and configuration was deemed appropriate within the context of the original storefront. Detailing and finishes for the entrances and windows was deemed appropriate for the district. The new proposed beltcourse is appropriate location and scale based on the original. Materials do not match original but instead use materials and finish to match other features of the new storefront design to create continuity and consistency with the new design elements previously approved. Corner and column bases cannot be repaired due to substantial amounts of material being shipped away for a former façade to be placed over the limestone. Available materials, EIFS with limestone finish, will be used to restore where limestone was removed and create look of original materials.

Staff recommends approval.

MS. HAUN MADE THE MOTION AND SECONDED BY MR. GREER TO OPEN CASE 2020-001 - 702 S. MAIN STREET NEW FAÇADE REQUEST BE OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. MOTION CARRIED, WITH MS. JILL SULLIVAN, MS. LORI HAUN, MR. CHAD GREER AND MR. BRYAN WICKLUND VOTING “AYE” (4 IN FAVOR, 2 ABSENT) MOTION CARRIES

Mr. Greer stated that the design was a good balance in being in conformance with the code while making wise economic choices. He asked the representative of the applicant what the plan was for the brick to be preserved?

Mr. Kuehn stated they were cleaning the brick with low pressure power was and cleaning as best they can. Sealer will be applied to prevent water getting in, the grout is still hard.

Mr. Wicklund asked what is going in at the recess entrance where the Tyvek is now.

Mr. Kuehn stated that on the Olsson entrance there is enough space for windows and on the second entrance a small anodized bronze finish panel since the space does not provide area for windows.

Ms. Haun asked if this departs from what has been reviewed by SHPO and Mr. Walters that this façade does not compared to the last proposal, and the required masonry schedule from SHPO is being used.

Ms. Sullivan asked to clarify that EFIS would only be used on the limestone base?

Mr. Walters said yes and only used to fill out the shape of the base that was removed and to that extent restore them.

MR. GREER MADE THE MOTION AND SECONDED BY MR. WICKLUND THAT CASE 2020-001 BE FORWARDED TO THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION WITH THE RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL FOR 702 S. MAIN STREET NEW FAÇADE REQUEST BE FORWARD TO THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION FOR THEIR APPROVAL. MOTION CARRIED, WITH MS. JILL SULLIVAN, MS. LORI HAUN, MR. CHAD GREER, AND MR. BRYAN WICKLUND VOTING “AYE” (4 IN FAVOR, 2 ABSENT) MOTION CARRIES.

New Business:

None.

Other Business:

None.

Adjournment:

MS. SULLIVAN MADE THE MOTION AND SECONDED BY MS. HAUN TO ADJOURN. MOTION CARRIED, WITH ALL VOTING “AYE” (4 IN FAVOR, 2 APBSENT) MOTION CARRIES

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

Approved: _____
Lori Haun, DJA President

Approved: _____
Lindsay Dunn, Senior Clerk