



Historic West Des Moines Master Plan Steering Committee – 2021 Update

Wednesday, September 29, 2021 4:30 pm to 6:30 pm

MINUTES

I. Chair calls meeting to order – called to order at 4:35 pm

a. Attendance

i. Committee members

1. Scott Hatfield
2. Mitchell Callahan
3. Nate Hon
4. Nan Earll
5. Vince Valdez
6. Cleo Underwood
7. Meredith Wells
8. Ralph Haskins
9. Julie Eliason
10. Steph Trannel
11. Katherine Harrington
12. Scott Cutler
13. Renae Hardman
14. Vicky Long Hill
15. Debbie Westphal Swander – Via Teams

ii. Staff Members

1. Clyde Evans
2. Brad Munford

3. Christine Gordon

iii. Guests

1. MJ Hoag
2. Kay Schiller
3. Kent Kehlenbeck
4. Sarah Kehlenbeck
5. Colin McBee
6. Jason Keigley
7. Ryan Cooper
8. Nick Waage
9. Ann Au
10. Blain Hormann
11. Bruce Hollrah
12. Justin Burnham – Substance Architecture
13. Tim Hickman – Substance Architecture
14. Tim Rypma – Rypma Properties
15. 515-290 – via Teams
16. Larry – via Teams
17. Office – Via Teams

- II. **Committee Approves the Agenda** – Motion by Harrington, seconded by Eliason – all in favor
- III. **Approval of Minutes** – This has been removed from agenda and will be on a future agenda – Motion by Eliason, seconded by Harrington - all in favor
- IV. **Opening Statement is read for all in attendance** – Read by Meredith Wells
- V. **Citizen Forum**
 - a. MJ Hoag – lives on 2nd street – request renaming the master plan from Historic West Des Moines to Valley Junction Master Plan – Wells responded that it was called Historic West Des Moines because the Plan covers more than just 5th Street and extends to Grand Avenue – Westphal-Swander and Munford further explained Historic West Des Moines was used to include more than just Valley Junction.
 - b. Nick Waage – thanked Brad Munford for the email to the public – Nick would like to get an agenda and minutes in those emails

c. Jason Keigley – First National Bank – include hyperlink in the email to the agenda/minutes

VI. Review and discuss proposed building modifications and site improvements for 111- 5th Street

Justin Burnham, Substance Architecture; Tim Rypma, Rypma Properties; and Tim Hickman, Substance Architecture

Brad explained the process of approval for this proposed development. This Steering Committee is asked to make a recommendation to the Development and Planning City Council Subcommittee.

Ralph Haskins asked if Linda Schemmel has seen this proposal. Brad Munford responded it has not gotten that far yet. Haskin asked if this would be the only time this Committee would see it. Evans responded that it is.

Tim Rypma, Scott Cutler – developers on this property
Architects – Justin Burnham, Tim Hickman – Substance Architecture

Tim Hickman – the proposal in front of the group are ideas. All is open for discussion. This building was not considered a contributing building to the Historical District.

Rypma – all mechanicals need replacing, roof needs to be replaced

Eliason – when was it built?

Jennifer Hansen – via Teams – was built in 1942 – she said according to Jim Miller it was considered a contributing building

Wells – corrected that it was not a contributing building

Harrington – do we have restrictions on what can be done with contributing vs. noncontributing buildings

Munford – The city does not have restrictions. Some banks and funders do have restrictions

Justin Burnham - Leaving existing building in place. Adding brick to the front of the building to make it more consistent with existing one-story buildings along 5th Street. Looking at a proposal to open up the corner so it is more welcoming which would require changing the footprint of the building.

Burnham- Does it make sense to pull the building back from the corner? That would involve tearing down the building.

Earl – we have a moratorium in place. This is in contrast to that and it would open up for other developers to tear down other buildings.

Wells – moratorium allows for special exceptions which is why this project is before this Steering Committee.

Earl – there is no reason to have the Moratorium then

Two proposals –

Plan A - maintain west and south façade - reframe roof – on page 4 – masonry wall is taller – taking out 50% of the building to change the roof

Plan B - raze existing building and build a new one-story building

Justin Burnham – went through handout page by page

- Page 1 - site plan of existing building
- Page 2 – a site plan that includes a patio taking up existing parking
- Page 3 – site plan with footprint showing where kitchen would be located
- Page 4 – a study of the windows
 - 25' bay – most storefronts in the area have a 25' frontage along the street
- Page 5 – plan B idea – puts the patio to the south
- Page 6 – Plan B idea – shows kitchen and retail locations with patio to the south – would move existing tenant to new location/they keep the same size area

- Page 7 – shows elevation of Plan B with change to roof – pattern in upper part of brick wall to replicate/sensitive to existing structure have similar patterns above the storefront
- Page 8 – Property Line Section - left side proposed thin brick - right side alternate common brick – comparison
 - Thin brick is mortared and thinner than traditional brick – it is brick
- Page 9 – Samples of brick – architects would propose a blend of brick to mirror other buildings in area
- Page 10 – Plan A – patio space on east
- Page 11 – Plan A – elevation rendering
- Page 12 – Plan A - rendering from corner
- Page 13 – Plan B – patio on south side – retail on north
- Page 14 – Plan B – Elevation rendering
- Page 15 – Plan B – rendering from corner

Harrington – commends Substance Architecture for their work and their proven work with St. Kilda

Hickman – they set goals for this design – build up to property line – had to have insets because buildings cannot open onto sidewalk

Trannel – likes patio on the south side, supports not encroaching on **public right of way**, would also like accessibility

Wells – St. Kilda has an individual nomination for national register of historic places – commend these architects for that work.

Hardman – thanks them for being here, thoughtfulness asking for comments, the brick comparison was helpful, glad it is one story and not so tall

Evans – according to the Polk County Assessor, the building was built in 1960

Public Comments on the proposal –

- Sarah Kehlenbeck- 602 5th Street – says she doesn't trust Assessor dates
- Ann Au – 200 5th Street – exciting, likes the tear down and rebuild so patio can be on the south side, welcoming to 5th Street, all that effort into lighting Railroad Park – this would allow people to enjoy that element, more inviting to have restaurant toward the Railroad Avenue. With new building – don't lose the parking behind the building. This is the kind of development that would draw people to the area.
- Nick Waage – 136 3rd Street – if Cutler gets approval does this give him full approval to move forward? Munford – this Committee is making a recommendation to the Development and Planning City Council Subcommittee. This Committee is not doing what it was tasked to do. As soon as the Moratorium is expired, there won't be any need for this Committee. Building is okay – knee windows fit the neighborhood not floor to ceiling windows. How is approving this allow the Committee to set design standards and height limitations that were charged by City Council.
 - Project went to F&A – Trimble and Hudson laid out a process for review of projects being proposed during the Moratorium
 - Hickman - Knee wall – worth looking into – see what common heights are and see what makes most sense – helps with snow removal as well
 - Wells – other purposes for the Committee – work on the rest of the update to the Master Plan – this is an additional meeting to the regular Steering Committee meetings which are open to the public
 - Hardman – the Moratorium does not put a halt to input and discussion and possible development
 - Tranel – we are an opinion Committee, the City does not have to listen to us, as far as formal process, we give out opinions
 - Haskins – we still have an opportunity to give input later in the process as individuals in the public process. It is possible the Moratorium could get extended.
 - Hardman – it could be extended depending on City Council
- Blane Hormann – 600 6th St – echo what has already been said – father visited first time in last 18 months, he said this would be great patio space – likes Plan B
- Kay Schiller – MoMere – 138 5th Street – current building is a contributing building – current building is built in 1911 – the look of the building was questioned years ago –

today we would not question the look of her building at 138 5th Street – people who visit like the unique experiences available in the neighborhood – while people get passionate about what buildings look like, we can't stay the same. We need buildings that attract businesses and people. Great addition to the entrance of Valley Junction and reflect the work already done to the entrance by the City. Valley Junction offers a collective community of businesses working together. We need to keep building toward the future and growing to create a vibrant area.

- Jason K – 204 ½ 5th Street – beautiful presentation – in support of Plan B because there is not enough of the historical structure to save. Discussed the dates of construction of the building and its history. Lacking the entrance on the building side. The buildings lack good windows. Believes the patio would encourage people to go east.
- MJ Hoag – likes the patio on the south side – trust you'll do a good job blending in the brick. Missing opportunity to add second story office or housing space.

Two Ideas Reiterated -

- Page 2 – Calling Proposed Plan – Plan A – not demo, although changes to roof structure and many components changing
- Page 5 – biggest difference is southern wall is pulled back 10 feet to allow for patio on south – demolition and full new construction – comes within 7' of building to the east

Moratorium expires November 1, 2021.

Motion – by Callahan, seconded by Eliason to focus discussion on the Plan B option

- Haskins – thoughtful proposal to be respectful to history, does Scott own the area to east where there is existing parking – will there be an opportunity to add additional parking later? Rypma said they are open to adding parking depending on City easements. Grease interceptor? Rypma – yes as required by City. Discussion with owner to the north? Cutler – yes there have been discussions. Railings along the patio would reflect the railings in Railroad Park. Maybe too much brick in mass in one area (kitchen spot). Agrees with knee walls. Likes

transoms at St. Kilda. Likes the use of awnings in Valley Junction. Supportive of this idea. This building has lived its life, and this is great alternative for the building.

- Harrington – what restaurant is going in there? Rypma – no lease has been signed yet
- Hickman – summarizing what he has heard
 - Addition of transoms
 - Break up masonry – where kitchen is
 - Introduction of awnings
- Callahan – loves the south patio – current building blocks the train depot – this proposal opens up the train depot building – all on board with this patio. Does not like hiding the patio in the back in the Plan A. It's about getting the best site plan for the site.
- Hon – with some changes he is okay with this. We said there would be no tears down during this time. Now we are going behind their back and allowing a tear down.
 - Hickman – only 10% done with design process – two months just to complete drawings, meetings at the City to get approval – Subcommittee, possibly P&Z, plan review is 3-5 weeks typically. It is not possibly anything will happen on site prior to November 1st. We want to be respectful of the neighborhood and we want to build a consensus. This is just the beginning of conversations.
 - Rypma – the soonest something could happen would be April 1st.
- Callahan – he views the Moratorium as a way for us to give input on possible developments.
- Wells – talked to property owners/business owners near this – the majority were supportive of this proposed development, supportive of fixing ADA challenges in area.
- Mark Veiock – comments via email read by Wells – likes south side patio – opens for possible parking behind building
- Earll – glad it's a restaurant and not an apartment building

- Hardman – appreciates everyone’s comments, we are going to honor the Moratorium
- Haskins – Planning and Development City Council Subcommittee is a casual group and accessible by the public. He asks that the public is made well aware of the project going forward
- Evans – 5-6 months of review before the developers can do anything
- Westphal-Swander – believes these kinds of discussions and future developments will heal our community. It will bring us together.
- Valdez – lived here his entire life, seen many changes and developments – can take an old building with no visual historical value and build something that looks historical; that will live on and not deteriorate. We have a vehicle here, be aggressive about it, drive it!
- Hickman – they will use the minutes from this Committee as they move forward in the design and approval process

Motion – alternate plan is the preferred option by the Steering Committee - Roll call vote:

- Scott Hatfield - yes
- Mitchell Callahan - yes
- Nate Hon - no
- Nan Earll - yes
- Vince Valdez - yes
- Cleo Underwood - yes
- Meredith Wells - yes
- Ralph Haskins - yes
- Julie Eliason - yes
- Steph Trannel - yes
- Katherine Harrington – Yes – left prior to vote
- Scott Cutler - abstain
- Renae Hardman – does not vote
- Vicky Long Hill - Yes

- Debbie Westphal Swander – Via Teams - yes
- Yes - 12, No -1; Motion passes, with one abstention

Motion to recommend alternate plan to City Council - first by Hatfield, seconded by Eliason.

All were in favor, no opposed, one abstention – Motion passes.

VII. Adjourned at 6:40 pm

Handouts

- Two site design options for building modifications and site improvements for 111- 5th Street

Staff Contacts:

Community & Economic Development – 515-273-0770

Brad Munford – brad.munford@wdm.iowa.gov

Clyde Evans – clyde.evans@wdm.iowa.gov

Christine Gordon – christine.gordon@wdm.iowa.gov

Master Plan on Website: <https://www.wdm.iowa.gov/government/community-economic-development/historic-west-des-moines-master-plan>