

Washington Historic Preservation Commission Meeting
Council Chambers of City Hall
405 Jefferson Street
Washington, Missouri 63090

Monday, August 19, 2019 at 5:30 PM

Minutes

Call to Order – Roll Call

Present

Carolyn Witt, Chairman
Steve Strubberg, Vice-Chairman
Bryan Bogue
Rick Hopp
Jamie Holtmeier
Andrew Clary
Joe Holtmeier, City Council Liaison
Greg Skornia, City Council Liaison
Sal Maniaci, City Planner/Economic Developer

Absent

Danielle Grotewiel
Bridgette Kelch
Mark Hidritch, City Council Liaison
Tom Neldon, Building Official

Pledge of Allegiance

Approval of minutes from Monday, April 15, 2019 (May 20, 2019 meeting was canceled). Motion made by Steve Strubberg. Seconded by Rick Hopp. Passed without dissent.

New Business

1. Landmarks – Phase III final public hearing

Sal Maniaci:

Everyone knows this is a requirement of our grant – to have a public hearing before and at the end. This is not only the end of our survey, this is the end of all three phases. Katie with Landmarks is here to go over the whole thing.

Katie Graebe:

I am here for Phase III. I was also here for Phase I & Phase II. This is over all phases. This is Phase III, the area outlined here below the International Shoe Factory. It covered 141 properties. We condensed it to 131 survey forms though because I consolidated the apartment complex on the southern side because they are all pretty much the same building so they are on one form. For Phase III, we had 89 contributing and 113 non-contributing. So not fantastic if we were going to list it on its own, but it's not on its own – it's with Phase I & Phase II. With this one, this section here – only the northern portion, the northwestern portion was identified as being constructed in correlation with the factory. Whereas, the Stafford eastern side was constructed prior. A lot of them are earlier brick buildings and are already listed in the Stafford/Olive Historic District. There were

some factory workers who lived there and there were some scattered throughout. Not as heavily as Phase I and Phase II – which are concentrated closer to the factory because people walked for the most part to get there. This area was also developed a lot later than the rest, as you may or may not know. High and Stafford were in existence since at least 1860-something – since the birds eye map – as main thoroughfares with Horn and James coming later and Frank not platted until 1929. It was more of a gravel walk-through. A lot of the homes here, as you can see listed, are frame 1.5 dwellings. There weren't really any commercial buildings – institutional or industrial. There was one commercial on the corner of James and High, which is the northwest corner, which was a grocery store that didn't last very long. Then it became a residence. As you can see, most of them were homes and dwellings. We've had a lot of buildings that have been altered, hence a lot of the non-contributing. A lot of buildings, too, were built past the period of significance which was established as the factory operation (1907-1960). A lot of these in the core area were built in the 1980's to 90's, so they cannot be contributing to this at all. You can see the rest on the front page of this of what goes into Phase III. At the bottom is the resource count and it's broken down into primary buildings, so that is your house and secondary buildings (garage, shed, etc.). Then a structure – there aren't any in this one. Sites – there are five vacant lots that were surveyed into this – the majority were never really identified as a lot on their own. They were like someone's back yard and have been parceled out as a separate lot. So, most of them have always been vacant for the most part and never really had a building on it. The only one that I was unclear on was the one on Frank off the corner of Frank and James. I think it's 175. That one, since Frank was developed so late – there were no addresses indicated in that area. I considered that as to be always vacant because there was no indication of anything being there during the period of significance. The second page goes over all of the phases of development – Phase I, Phase II and Phase III, kind of highlighting when buildings were constructed. Also when they were constructed in correlation to the factory development. You can see a lot of them were built as the factory grew, primarily from the 1920's to the 1940's. Phase III was 1910 to 1940. On the third page are the recommendations that I came up with at the end of this. As I mentioned, there is Stafford/Olive Historic District – this doesn't have to be followed through, but if someone wants to do it in the future it would be a short thing. It's just reconcile properties that have been altered since the listing of the district. There are many that were altered (not too many) on the western side of Stafford. There was a brick dwelling that has had its front entrance relocated and has been clad in stucco since 2013 – so it's no longer contributing. Some have been demolished and some have been altered. The second nomination would be the potential national register nomination of a stand-alone district, just of the shoe factory. I think that would be pretty strong. It would follow any of the other international or just shoe factory nominations. It also maintains a lot of its architectural features. The third nomination would be the potential nomination of a shoe factory neighborhood district. The other map is what we developed as the potential boundary line for a potential national register district. It took a while and we went over at least five different suggested boundaries. This is the one we finally came up with, just because it is the most consolidated area with the most contributing contiguous buildings. There's not as many gaps. There are whole street blocks that have contributing buildings. A lot of the area was developed due

to the factory. We thought about going further south, staying in the core central area – at least going to James, but there were some gaps in there and some buildings that had been demolished or newer buildings in there. We decided to keep it more consolidated as an easier boundary line that we could contest as an area. Everything in there that is highlighted green are the buildings that are contributing. Further south there were some non-contributing buildings, but since they're not in the boundary line I don't have them highlighted on this map. The fourth potential suggestion is I suggested maybe two buildings that could be listed individually that aren't within this proposed boundary line – they're on Fifth St. They're both okay examples of craftsman. I'm not sure if the 905 would be listed individually – I'm not sure if they would accept it. It was one of the buildings within Phase III that looked pretty good. The state can be kind of picky though on how stringent they are on the high style they want versus a more relaxed craftsman bungalow. The other one I thought was interesting because of not only the architecture, but of the person. The person is not hugely prominent, but he was interesting for this area because he built several buildings along with a factory warehouse for the shoe factory within the area and I think he built his own home. That is 821 W. Fifth St. for H.H. Buschmeyer. It's the green tile roof at the corner of Fifth and High. He's fixing it up right now, he was doing some soffit work last time I surveyed.

Carolyn Witt:

I think before the current owners, one of the original Buschmeyers – the daughter or granddaughter was still living there. I delivered Meals on Wheels and she was living in three rooms on the first floor. It was amazing. It's one of those people that slips through the cracks that you wish you had sat down and talked to.

Katie Graebe:

It's an interesting house. Once again, I asked the SHPO – I have new SHPO contacts. The person before kind of shot down a lot of my individual suggestions. This person didn't make any comments, so I don't know. It would have to be proposed first and they would have to see before anything would go through. The windows on this have been altered. Not all of them, but some primary windows had been altered. I know the windows in the garage had been altered, and the garage door – but they aren't as stringent on garages.

Carolyn Witt:

I'd love to see that roof worked on. They recently did the fascia and soffit. It's looking better. They also did landscaping.

Katie Graebe:

Okay. I hadn't seen all of that. Last time I went around, there was a storm – so there were a lot of tree limbs down.

Carolyn Witt:

This has been pretty recent. Thank you. This is such a humongous amount of work. Really, it's much better to have a consolidated area that has a better chance, then trying to expand it too big.

Katie Graebe:

There was a lot of deliberation just because it is a worker town. As I was telling Sal, there's not as many high style buildings. Meaning there's not a lot of high style construction materials, so over time things change more often. That's why we have a lot of non-contributing buildings because there have been a lot of vinyl salesman and new windows. It happens and this is more of the development around the factory as a worker area.

Carolyn Witt:

I was at some workshop. I think it was the CLG workshop. I was wondering, do you think you would be willing to come back sometime if we try to have an open house and invite the residents for them to see this because they saw you, they saw the pictures. I don't know whether we'll be able to follow through on that cause we're not really good at that, but I think it would be really neat if we could get if they had an interest – to see what was compiled.

Katie Graebe:

Sure. Let me know you want. If there is an interest. I've had maybe two people talk to me throughout this whole time. One lady was great, she grew up in the neighborhood and her father was a Parmentier.

Carolyn Witt:

I can't thank you enough. It's been great dealing with the same people throughout this process. It really has been painless for us. We just sit here and look interested. Thank you so much for all the effort.

Andrew Clary:

The history, and I guess it's been three years that I've been on this board, that you've uncovered and shared with us has been phenomenal. Thank you. Does it help or hurt you to have a smaller district?

Katie Graebe:

I think it helps make a stronger one. This is the district boundary that I came up with my executive director. When working with Allison, I had one that continued all the way down to Phase III. It was not stronger, per say, it just had more buildings in it. It was just bigger. I also had it continue down to James St., which kind of followed a boundary line that was suggested in the 1992 survey. Same thing, it was just more buildings. It still worked out in favor. There were still more contributing, in a way, then there were non-contributing. I think the smaller kind of works in its favor. As I was saying, there is more contributing together. In the past, you could kind of gerrymander a boundary line and go around properties that were not contributing. You can't do that now. They don't want that. They want it to follow street lines or a clear cut property line. This helps it in a way because it's a stronger representation. The further south you get, the houses were built a little later. Late 1950's to 60's. Then you also have a larger new duplex that I believe there was a parking lot or parking garage there.

Carolyn Witt:

That was the city shed.

Katie Graebe:

The section around Stafford, Roberts, Johnson and Third is not very strong either. There was one primary contributing building and the rest were 1980's. It's harder because the further south you go, the further you get away from a core downtown area in a way. It's newer construction.

Carolyn Witt:

What is the next procedure with this?

Sal Maniaci:

We have to wait a full year before we can even apply for the district. So it will be in the 20-21 budget. We'll apply for the grant to get it nominated.

2. State Historic Preservation Office in-depth evaluation

Sal Maniaci:

September 25th, we have the State Historic Preservation Office coming to town to do our evaluation for our CLG (Certified Local Government). We have to be one of those in order to receive grants. I know Carolyn said she would be available. If anyone else would like to be available, it is 11-12:30, I believe. I'm not entirely sure what all it entails because I have not sat through one of those yet, they do it every three years. If you are available that day, I think it would be nice to have a good showing. We'll probably meet here and then if she wants to go offsite for lunch or something, we will do that.

Carolyn Witt:

That's great. I've made a copy of that and I'm counting on Jamie and you to have a lot of the information.

Sal Maniaci:

Right, we'll make sure beforehand that we have everything.

Carolyn Witt:

Looking at this, I think we cover most of these bases. If anyone can attend, Jamie will send out a reminder when we get closer.

3. 201-205 Elm St. - design review for facade changes

Sal Maniaci:

This was completed via email. We did it via email, but they are going to be submitting an application for the small TIF. This will be in a more official capacity with mandatory review/mandatory compliance. It is for the Schroeder's building at 201-205 Elm St. Multiple addresses there. Ed Schmelz is here to talk about the project. It will be residential on the top floor and commercial on the ground floor.

Ed Schmelz:

My name is Ed Schmelz. I'm with ELS Properties. I purchased the Schroeder building approximately a month and a half ago. Obviously, Schroeder's is building

a new building there on East Fifth. They are just now finishing their move out, so we are finally able to get going. The upstairs is going to be seven residential units. The lower level will be two commercial units. We're here to propose painting the building white. Then painting the dentil molding, which is about two thirds of the way up and then again at the top - we're wanting to paint that black. Bridgette had provided me some pictures a few months ago of where the building used to be white. I don't know exactly what time frame that was. It was after the top floor had burned down and they took that off. I guess they added a layer of brick on top of it at a later date. To me, it's just a really dated style of brick. I don't really like it. I think going back to something similar like this, color wise, would be a really good look. We are wanting too - on the south side of the east side of the building we're wanting to add a commercial ADA entrance, so we'll be adding some glass there to make that entrance separate so you don't have to go in through the little side corridor.

Sal Maniaci:

I was going to ask that. You are planning to have an additional opening on this elevation?

Ed Schmelz:

Not that elevation, right there. Those three large windows and the door are not currently there.

Andrew Clary:

Is it straight up white, or have you looked at an off white or cream color?

Ed Schmelz:

It won't be just a bright shiny white, but it won't be cream. It will be kind of in between. Almost like an antique white.

Carolyn Witt:

I think initially when it was white, it was that glazed tile. Like what was on the Farmers' Market years ago. There is some historic precedent for this - to a point. I know generally speaking, the attitude is that everyone cringes with the brick, but this isn't an original brick building. This is brick that was put on at a later date. I feel it is not as big an issue as it usually is with painting brick.

Andrew Clary:

I think that brick was put on in the 70's.

Bryan Bogue:

I think it looks great. I think the color will make the building look a lot more appropriate for the area and the larger windows will be good for the businesses and buildings.

Carolyn Witt:

Thank you for discovering downtown! This isn't your usual modus operandi. We are thrilled because that building had the potential and we needed somebody to see it.

Ed Schmelz:
It has a lot of potential.

Andrew Clary:
I'll make a motion for this review.

Jamie Holtmeier:
I second that.

Carolyn Witt:
All those in favor, signify by saying I. Opposed? Motion carried and thank you very much. We wish you well.

4. 309 Market St. - design review for shed (completed by email - on agenda to go on record)

Sal Maniaci:
This was completed via email.

5. 120 Elm St. - design review for sign (completed by email - on agenda to go on record)

Sal Maniaci:
This was completed via email.

Old Business

1. International Shoe Factory Historic District Survey

Carolyn Witt:
We covered this already with the public hearing.

2. Education/Conferences

Carolyn Witt:
I went to the CLG. It was excellent. They had a camp which was through the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions. It was one of the best CLG's I'd ever been to. It was excellent. I could recommend it. I don't know what other conferences are upcoming at the moment.

3. Curb Appeal Award

Jamie Holtmeier:
There is a still a pause on curb appeal. I want to look at that again next month and we'll probably have three or four properties.

4. Creating New History Award

Nothing new.

5. Budget Report

Jamie Walters-Seamon:

I just made the third payment to Landmarks.

Carolyn Witt:

I know Sal has us in good hand for next year's budget which will start October 1st.

6. Information Plaques for Historic Buildings

Nothing new.

7. The Jasper House, 320 Lafayette St.

Carolyn Witt:

If anyone has noticed the Jasper House, it is miraculous. I didn't see that there was hope of it turning out as wonderful as it has.

8. The Calvin Theatre

Carolyn Witt:

How is the tarp?

Sal Maniaci:

Any time we get a call about it, John is on top of it.

Other Business

Bryan Bogue made a motion to adjourn and Rick Hopp seconded the motion. A vote was taken and unanimously approved. The meeting of the Washington Historic Preservation Commission ended at 5:57 PM.

The next scheduled meeting of the Washington Historic Preservation Commission will be held Monday, November 18, 2019 at 6:00 PM in the Council Chambers of City Hall.