I. Roll Call

II. Approval of Minutes – May 13, 2021

III. Announcement of Potential Conflicts

IV. **CLGR21-12 by Thomas Adams**, requesting a review under Kansas State Preservation Law Review [K.S.A. 75-2724] for the placement of a wooden fence, enclosing the side (front) and rear yard on property located at 333 SW Greenwood Avenue. This property is listed as a *contributor* to the historic integrity of the surrounding Potwin Place National Historic District.

V. **CLGR21-14 by Greg Laird**, requesting a review under Kansas State Preservation Law Review [K.S.A. 75-2724] for the construction of an addition onto an existing detached garage located behind the principle structure located at 315 SW Woodlawn Avenue. This property is listed as a *contributor* to the historic integrity of the surrounding Potwin Place National Historic District.

VI. Other Items (if any)

VII. Adjournment
Roll Call

Members Present: David Heit, Donna Rae Pearson, Melina Stewart, Mark Burenheide, Dave Frederick, Grant Sourk, Cassandra Taylor, Christine Steinkuehler, Paul Post (9)
Members Absent: (0)
Staff Present: Tim Paris, Dan Warner, Kris Wagers

Chairperson David Heit called the meeting to order with 8 members logged into the video conference. [Ms. Steinkuehler logged in after the vote was taken for previous month’s minutes]

Approval of Minutes from April 8, 2021

Motion to approve - by Mr. Sourk, Second by Ms. Taylor. APPROVED 7-0-1 with Mr. Post abstaining.

Announcement of potential conflicts – None

CLGR21-08 by the Cyrus Hotel 926 S. Kansas Avenue, requesting the review under Kansas State Preservation Law Review [K.S.A. 75-2724] for the placement of an enclosure surrounding the exterior dining patio of the adjacent restaurant, built within the Cyrus Hotel. This property and the adjacent building are listed as non-contributing to the historic integrity of the surrounding South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District.

Mr. Paris presented the staff report and staff’s recommendation for approval. He noted that sealed plans have not yet been received so staff would need the approval of the commission to review and approve those documents as being consistent with the plans presented at this evening’s meetings. He also explained that the City’s Development Services Division will require a second ingress/egress.

Seth Wagoner was logged in representing the applicant and verified that a second ingress/egress is planned and it will be on the east side of the addition. Mr. Heit stated that placement would allow for further development on the south side of the building.

Brooke Kalvaitis, project designer, was logged in and said Mr. Paris’s report have covered everything correctly and she was available for questions.

Motion by Mr. Burenheide to concur with staff’s recommendation that for a finding that 1) The placement of the proposed patio enclosure, located at 926 S. Kansas Avenue and adjacent to the Cyrus Hotel, will NOT damage or destroy the historical integrity of the structure, nor the surrounding South Kansas Avenue Commercial Historic District. 2) At the time the final engineered drawings are submitted to the Development Services Division of the Topeka Planning & Development Department for a building permit, those plans will be analyzed by Planning Division Staff for consistency with these conceptual drawings. Second by Ms. Taylor. APPROVED (9-0-0)
Other Business –

There could potentially be an opening on the DRC, but if so it will be discussed at the next meeting.

It was agreed that the commission would hold their June, 2021 meeting in person again at 620 SE Madison.

With nothing more on the agenda, the meeting Adjourned at 5:54PM
TOPEKA LANDMARKS COMMISSION
CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT
KANSAS HISTORIC PRESERVATION LAW
PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

CASE NO: CLGR21-12 by: Thomas Adams

| Project Address: 333 SW Greenwood Avenue |
| Property Classification: Contributing Property to the Holliday Park National Historic District. |
| Standards: Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation; Downtown Topeka Design Guidelines |
| Attachments: Site Plan [X] Elevations [ ] Arch./Const. Plans [ ] Pictures [X] |

PROPOSAL: This proposal is to allow a wood, French-Gothic vertical board fence, approximately 4’ in height, to remain standing within the front, side, and rear yard of property located at 333 SW Greenwood Ave. This property had no previous fencing within these areas. This structure is listed as a “contributing property” within the nomination of the Potwin Place National Historic District.

BACKGROUND: The National Register Nomination for the Potwin Place National Historic District dates this home’s original construction to 1886. It is described in the nomination as a “Two and one-half story frame residence with an intersecting gable and hip roofs. Polygonal bay with ornamental gabled balcony angled to southeast. Shingle adorn gables. (Queen Anne/Stick Style) Above average integrity: porch alteration, addition on the south.”

The Kansas Historic Resource Inventory for this property adds that this home “Was divided up apartments at one time, also a note that it may have served as a private hospital when rented by Dr. Milo Buel Ward (later the first chief surgeon of Stormont Hospital). Served as a boarding house mid-20th century.”

The current garage on the property dates to 2001 and is not historic, nor a contributing feature to the property’s historic integrity. The driveway/curb-cut from SW 3rd Street is not currently used for access to the garage.
Among the factors to consider when determining the appropriateness of this fence in this location are 1) style, 2) materials, 3) footprint on the property, and 4) the surrounding historic district. All of these factors are relevant considerations in protecting the historic integrity of this property and the historic integrity of adjacent properties.

**Style:** The fence currently in place on this property is constructed in the French Gothic Vertical Board style. “Board style” is a reference to the adjacent placement of individual wood pickets without spacing between. This treatment results in an opaque appearance. Although this fence is limited to only 4’ in height, this style is more typically reserved for privacy fencing to enclose rear yards where the visual implications of the massing, size, scale, and materials are less important. In this case, since the property is located on a corner lot, the entirety of this rear yard is visible from SW 3rd Street. Therefore, the style of the fence, and its massing, size, scale, and materials are elevated in their visual effect on this property.

As noted above, this style of fencing is typically reserved for placement in rear yards, as opposed to front or street-facing yards. This home is constructed in the Queen Anne Victorian style of architecture, and dates to 1886. Fencing for Victorian homes prior to the turn of the 20th Century were traditionally small and ornamental, and were constructed of wood or wrought iron. These fences also were more limited in height, measuring only about 2.5’ tall. These fences were used, primarily, to visually define the property boundary without visually detracting from the architecture of the house. The style and finish of this fence has resulted in a very prominent feature on this property that is not conducive to Victorian architecture.

**Materials:** Although wood fences within the front yard have been historically appropriate for use with Victorian homes, their appearance on the property was designed to be a complimentary and compatible addition to the property, rather than a defining characteristic of the property, in and of themselves. Where used, wooden fences were traditionally painted in matching colors to the house. This treatment tied the presence of the fence to the house as a complimentary feature, rather than a competing, secondary element of the property.

The spacing of the wood pickets is also an important consideration. At present, the wood pickets within the fence in question are all placed flush to the adjacent picket with no spacing in between. This spacing allows no transparency through the fence, and in essence transforms the appearance of the fence toward privacy, rather than defining the property line. Although only 4’ in height, the opaque aspect of this fence is not traditionally used, nor is appropriate for use within the front yard of Victorian homes. Additionally, wood picket fences have not been historically used within the front yards of other properties within the Potwin Place Historic District. For those homes, specifically on corner lots, where fencing along street frontages has been placed, the materials used for that fencing has been a metal fence, mimicking wrought iron in appearance. These fences are also highly transparent, and are complimentary to the property.

**Placement on the Property:** Although this fence is limited to 4’ in height, its opaque composition renders its function and appearance to that of a privacy fence. Wood privacy fencing is traditionally reserved for rear yards, and is placed behind the front faced of the house. Within front and side yards along street frontages where taller fences are allowed by ordinance, those fences in the Potwin Place Historic District are almost exclusively faux wrought iron, and in no cases are those fences a dominant feature of the property.

**Surrounding Historic District:** Fences within the Potwin Place Historic District are nearly exclusive to the side and rear yards of all homes. The exceptions to this general rule are usually found on corner lots, where a side and/or rear yard parallels a street, and thus becomes a “front” yard. On nearly all of these lots within Potwin, the portions less than 4’ in height are usually a
basic metal picket fence. Privacy fencing, and wooden fencing are placed behind the front face of the house, and also behind the front face of any adjacent house so that it does not obscure the view of that home’s front yard.

A notable exception to this practice lies one block to the west of this property at 337 SW Woodlawn Avenue. A 6’ privacy fence is placed along this property line, parallel and adjacent to the sidewalk along SW 3rd Street. The purpose of this fence is to provide privacy for an in-ground swimming pool that is placed between the home and the street frontage. It must be noted with this example, however, that neither the pool nor the fence received a permit prior to, or after their construction in 1985. The Potwin Place National Historic District was established in 1980. Therefore, the placement of the in-ground pool and the surrounding privacy fence were subject to the Kansas State Historic Preservation Law and its required review for compliance with the US Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Historic Preservation. However, no reviews were performed at this address for either of these amenities.

**REVIEW SUMMARY:** The Kansas State Historic Preservation Office requires that all projects occurring on any property listed on the Register of Historic Kansas Places be reviewed for their affect on the listed property and the surrounding district. State law (K.S.A. 75-2724) establishes that the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation be used to evaluate changes proposed to any property that is individually listed, or is located within an historic district. The following is an analysis of the application of each Standard to the proposed project.

**Standard 1.** A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

**Analysis:** No change in use of this property is proposed in conjunction with this project.

**Standard 2.** The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

**Analysis:** No historic materials will be removed or altered in conjunction with this project. However, the placement of an opaque, unfinished wooden fence that extends from the home to the south property line adds a feature to the property that is neither complimentary nor compatible with the architectural character of the home, nor the character of the surrounding historic district.

**Standard 3.** Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

**Analysis:** No aspects of this project are proposed that will create a false sense of historic significance.

**Standard 4.** Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
Analysis: No historic features of this home or property are proposed for removal. The proposed fence can easily be removed in the future with no residual damage caused to the home or property.

Standard 5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

Analysis: No distinctive features, finishes, or construction techniques will be removed or altered in conjunction with this project proposal.

Standard 6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Analysis: No features of this home or property are proposed for removal or physical alteration. The proposed fence can easily be removed in the future with no residual damage caused to the home or property.

Standard 7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Analysis: N/A

Standard 8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

Analysis: N/A

Standard 9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

Analysis: The construction and placement of this style of fence in this location presents a new character-defining feature to the property. In its current unfinished state, and with opaque appearance without any spacing of the individual wooden pickets, this feature is neither compatible nor complimentary to the architectural character of the principle structure.

Standard 10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Analysis: The proposed fence can be removed in the future with no residual damage caused to the home or property.
**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** In the performance of this review under KSA 75-2724, Staff is recommending a finding that the fence constructed on the property located at 333 SW Greenwood Ave., does damage or destroy the historical integrity of the structure, and the surrounding Potwin Place National Historic District.

Prepared by: ____________________________________________
Timothy Paris, Planner II

**APPEAL TO THE GOVERNING BODY:** If the Landmarks Commission determines that the proposed fence will damage or destroy the historic integrity of the property and/or the surrounding historic district, the applicant may appeal to the governing body. It will be incumbent upon the governing body to make a determination, after consideration of all relevant factors, that: (1) there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the placement of the fence as proposed; and (2) that alternatives to the project include all possible planning to minimize harm to the property and the district that may result from those alternatives.
FENCE PERMIT APPLICATION

Owner of Property: Thomas Adams

Fence Address: 333 SW Greenwood Ave

Legal description: Lot: 9 Block: N/A Subdivision: CW Ruhin Sub

Address of owner (if different):

Contractor: Davis Fence Company

Contractor Address: 6001 SE Mercier Street, Topeka, KS, 66609

Type of fence material: [ ] Wood [ ] Chain Link [ ] Plastic [ ] Split Rail

[ ] Other – description of fence:

Proposed height of fence: Front: 4' Side 1: 4' Side 2: 2' Rear: 4'

Is this fence located on a corner lot? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Is the property located in a Designated Historic District or Neighborhood Conservation District (NCD)? [ ] Yes [ ] No

If yes, what Historic District / NCD?

Please provide a site plan on an 8.5 x 11 sheet of paper indicating property lines, dimensions and locations of fence, buildings, rights-of-way, utility, drainage or other easements, scale and north arrow.

- Maximum height limitation of fence – front – 4 feet & rear 8 feet
- Fence is to be placed on private property and may not be placed in the city’s right-of-way, which is approximately 1 foot back of an existing public sidewalk.

* on corner lots, fences cannot be placed in the 40 foot sight distance triangle.

The City will require the immediate removal of any fence placed or located within drainage, utility or other easements, which materially interferes with the use of the easement. Upon notice by the City, the owner at the owner’s expense shall remove the fence. If the owner fails to remove the fence, then the City shall cause its removal and the property owner shall be responsible for all removal costs.

The City shall not be responsible for any damage caused to a fence or its removal, which may result from the repair or maintenance of any drainage easement or the repair or maintenance of any utilities located in utility easement.

The property owner understands and agrees to indemnify and hold the City harmless for damage, claims, costs, suits, judgments and expenses specifically including attorneys' fees of any nature whatsoever arising out of or in connection with the construction, repair or maintenance of a fence. The city’s failure to immediately enforce its rights in relation to its easements shall not constitute a waiver of its right to do so and shall not prevent the City from causing the removal of a fence, which materially interferes with the use of a City easement.

In consideration for the permission to construct the fence specified in the fence permit application, the undersigned property owner hereby agrees to be bound by all the terms and conditions contained in this fence application:

Signature of owner

APPROVALS:

Traffic: Approved _____ Date _____ Disapproved _____ Date _____

Engineer: Approved _____ Date _____ Disapproved _____ Date _____

Planning: Approved _____ Date _____ Disapproved _____ Date _____

Historical (if applicable): Approved _____ Date _____ Disapproved _____ Date _____
333 NW Greenwood Ave
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TOPEKA LANDMARKS COMMISSION
CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT
KANSAS HISTORIC PRESERVATION LAW
PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

CASE NO: CLGR21-14
by: Greg Laird

Project Address: 315 SW Greenwood Ave.
Property Classification: Contributing Property to the Potwin Place National Historic District
Standards: Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

PROPOSAL: This proposal is for the addition onto a 2-car garage to the rear of the property at 315 SW Woodlawn Avenue. This property is listed as a “contributor” to the historic integrity of the Potwin Place National Historic District.

The proposed addition will double the square footage of the existing garage, extending the building’s footprint end-to-end, as opposed to side-by-side. This addition will extend the building’s footprint toward the alley to the west, and will not be visible from the front of the home, nor the street. The addition will replicate the design, appearance, and materials of the existing structure. A rear entrance facing the alley will be included into the structure’s west-facing façade. This entrance is not anticipated to be used for vehicles at the present time.

BACKGROUND: The home on this property was constructed in 1909. The National Register nomination for the Potwin Place National Historic District states that this property is a “Two and one-half story frame residence with front gable roof, one story porch with small entrance pediment across the east façade. Average integrity: major non-historic alterations include alteration of the front porch, palladian window in east gable, application of window shutters.” These shutters have since been removed, and are no longer present on the building’s exterior.

The existing garage is not listed as a feature, contributing or otherwise, to the historic integrity of this property.
REVIEW SUMMARY: The Kansas State Historic Preservation Office requires that all projects occurring on any property listed on the Register of Historic Kansas Places be reviewed for their affect on the listed property and the surrounding district. State law (K.S.A. 75-2724) establishes that the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation be used to evaluate changes proposed to any property that is individually listed, or is located within an historic district. The following is an analysis of the application of each Standard to the proposed project.

Standard 1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

Analysis: No change in use is proposed in conjunction with this project. The proposed structure is designed to be complimentary to, and compatible with the architectural style of the existing structure, with minimal effect on the property’s defining characteristics.

Standard 2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

Analysis: This project will not remove any historic materials from the property. The placement of the addition toward the rear of the property will not detract from the general character of the property, nor the surrounding historic district. This addition is also designed to replicate the architectural style, and utilize identical materials present on the existing garage.

Standard 3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

Analysis: The construction of this garage will not create a false sense of development. The existing garage is not a character-defining feature of the property, and this...
addition will be placed to the rear of, and away from any other such character-defining features present on the principle structure.

**Standard 4.** *Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.*

**Analysis:** This proposed garage addition is designed to be fully compatible with, and complimentary to the existing structure.

**Standard 5.** *Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.*

**Analysis:** N/A

**Standard 6.** *Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*

**Analysis:** N/A

**Standard 7.** *Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.*

**Analysis:** N/A

**Standard 8.** *Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.*

**Analysis:** N/A

**Standard 9.** *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

**Analysis:** No historic materials will be destroyed within the boundaries of this construction project.

**Standard 10.** *New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

**Analysis:** Removal of this addition, and restoration of the existing west wall to be removed in conjunction with this project, would restore the existing accessory structure to its current state. This structure, however, is not a character-defining feature of the property.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: In the performance of this review under KSA 75-2724, Staff is recommending a finding that the proposed construction of the proposed garage, located to the rear of the main structure on property at 315 SW Woodlawn Avenue, will NOT damage or destroy the historical integrity of the structure, or the surrounding Potwin Place National Historic District.

Prepared by: ____________________________
Timothy Paris, Planner II

APPEAL TO THE GOVERNING BODY: If the Landmarks Commission determines that the proposed garage addition will damage or destroy the historic integrity of the property and/or the surrounding historic district, the applicant may appeal to the governing body. It will be incumbent upon the governing body to make a determination, after consideration of all relevant factors, that: (1) there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the removal of the facade; and (2) that alternatives to the project include all possible planning to minimize harm to the property and the district that may result from those alternatives.
1 & 2 FAMILY RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION

PROJECT ADDRESS: 315 SW Woodlawn
Square Footage of Impervious Surface: 400
Estimated Construction cost: $30,000
Legal description: Lot(s) 13 Block Subdivision: CIN POTW

PROJECT/DESCRIPTION:
☐ New Single Family Residence
☐ New Duplex
☐ Detached Garage
☐ Attached Carport
☐ Basement Finish
☐ Detached Carport
☐ Other Detached Structure
☐ Open Porch
☐ Attached Deck
☐ Canopy
☐ Enclosed Porch
☐ Interior Remodel
☐ See Attached

☐ # of Bedrooms

Please provide footing/foundation/pier/slab plans, building plans and elevations with notes and details describing building materials - size and spacing of framing materials - for floors, walls and roof construction, support posts, decking, railings, stairs, a dimensioned site plan indicating property lines, easements and public-right-of-ways, location of proposed structure, related paving such as sidewalks, driveways.

Services to property:
☐ City water service
☐ Rural water district
☐ Requesting City service
☐ Septic system
☐ Public sanitary sewer
☐ Other:

NOTE: I OWN & OCCUPY THIS EXISTING STRUCTURE (ownership & occupancy must be verified):
☐ Yes, I plan on doing:
☐ Plumbing Work
☐ Mechanical Work
☐ Electrical Work
☐ Other

I understand that if I do the plumbing, mechanical or electrical work, I will need a separate permit for each.

APPLICANT:
☐ Property Owner
☐ Contractor

ROBERT BERRY
(Please Print)

PROPERTY OWNER:
Name: GREG LAIRD
Mailing Address: 315 SW Woodlawn
City: TOPEKA State: KS Zip: 66607
Phone #: 785-232-1135
Fax: 785-232-1181
Email: RJBALL@ATT.NET
City License #: RIC0200900002469

BUILDING / GENERAL CONTRACTOR:
Company Name: RJB HOME BUILDER
Address: 2030 NW SILVERLAKE RD
City: TOPEKA State: KS Zip: 66618
Phone #: 785-232-1135
Fax: 785-232-1181
Email: RJBALL@ATT.NET
City License #: RIC0200900002469

Electrical Contractor:
Company Name / Phone

Plumbing Contractor:
Company Name / Phone

Mechanical Contractor:
Company Name / Phone

I understand location of the structure is the responsibility of the contractor and/or owner and that said structure shall be placed in accordance with the approved plan and Topeka zoning regulations. I certify the information provided to be true and correct and agree to comply with all pertinent City of Topeka codes, ordinances and regulations. By the execution of this application, I understand the contractor am/is responsible to call for all required inspections and also consent to have the City of Topeka personnel enter onto the premises legally described herein for the purpose of inspecting the premises for compliance with all applicable City codes, during normal business hours. I understand all inspections must be completed and all work approved.

Applicant/Owner Signature:
Date: 9/30/21

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION REVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building review:</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site review:</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning review:</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water review:</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment(s):
LARGE GARAGE ADDITION

WEST ELEV.

SHT 3 of 4

W/ WINDOWS 9.47 x 16.79
0.81Teel Steel 0.11 Doors
0.81Teel Vain Doors
0.81Vinyl Windows
0.83 Tile Asbestos Shingles
0.81 P Shakes Siding & Trim

NoThermal:
Will receive New Exterior EnTe STructure (Outside)

Notes:

SOUTH ELEV.

SCALE: 3/4" = 1'-0"