

Minutes
Historic Sign Review Committee
October 27, 2006

MEMBERS PRESENT: Norm Nelson, Craig Stump, Kyle Mattison, Lee Geiger

STAFF PRESENT: Karen Bulman, Rodney Proffitt, Brad Solon

OTHERS PRESENT: Leslie Rutter, Audra Saylor, Mike Willey from Rosenbaums, Tony Marshall, Brendan Casey, Pat Roseland, Mike Pelly, Jean and Bill Kessloff, Nick Lucas, Mary Ann Maylan, Gene Jackson, Lila Doud, Cheryl Chapman, Rose Marie Steward

Call to Order

Nelson called meeting to order at 8:30 am.

605 St. Joseph Street – Pedestrian and Window signs

In response to a question by Nelson, Rutter stated that the applicant has changed the pedestrian sign by eliminating the specific names of businesses, but listing the type of business on the sign. **Mattison moved and Stump seconded to approve the pedestrian sign at 605 St. Joseph Street.** Stump stated that the sign needs to indicate the specific lettering. Rutter revised the sign application by changing the word “music” to “DJ music”. In response to a question by Rutter, Nelson stated that the words on the sign could be rearranged to fit the sign, but the new layout of the sign must be submitted to the Growth Management Office prior to obtaining the sign permit. **The motion to approve the pedestrian sign at 605 St. Joseph Street passed unanimously.** In response to a question by Nelson, Rutter stated that the specific businesses detailed in the window signs are all located on site. Solon clarified that all businesses identified on the sign must be conducting business on the site. **Stump moved and Mattison seconded to approve the four window signs at 605 St. Joseph Street.** In response to question by Stump, Saylor clarified that all four businesses, Carol White Fitness Specialist, Lasting Memories Photography, Table 4 Décor Reception Rentals, and Mary Maisey Ireland Officiant, are located on site. **The motion to approve the four window signs at 605 St. Joseph Street passed unanimously.**

909 St. Joseph Street – Ground Sign

Mattison moved and Stump seconded to approve the ground sign at 909 St. Joseph Street. Mattison stated that the motion was for discussion purposes. Stump explained the criteria for reviewing a sign in the historic districts. Stump stated that the electronic message center sign is newer than the date of the building and signs are to match the era of the building for historic review approval. Casey stated that the sign matches the more modern style of the building and will include all tenants of the building, thus eliminating other signs that may be requested for tenants of the building. In response to a question by Nelson, Casey stated that the sign will be an on-premise sign only. Roseland, Chair of the Historic Preservation Committee, stated that LED signs do not belong in the West Boulevard area, as it is not appropriate adjacent to the museum or as the entrance to the West Boulevard District. Roseland stated that he has had phone calls from West Boulevard citizens opposed to the sign. Pelly, President of the West Boulevard Neighborhood Association, polled the Association Board and the Board overwhelming opposes the sign. Pelly stated that the sign is adjacent to the West Boulevard Association sign and the gateway to the West Boulevard Historic District and believes it is not needed to advertise the building. Pelly stated that the West Boulevard Neighborhood Association requests to go on record that the sign is not appropriate and the

Association is opposed to the sign at this location. Rose Stewart, Treasurer of the West Boulevard Neighborhood Association, stated her opinion that there are other ways to advertise the building and there are many people in the District against this sign. In response to a question by Marshall, Stump stated that neon may be located on the building if it fits the era of the building or environs. Lucas, member of the West Boulevard Neighborhood Association stated that he will be aware of the electronic sign and it will ruin the ambiance of the area. In response to a question by Stump, Pelly stated that if the sign was closer to the building in the northeast corner of the parking lot, the West Boulevard Association Board would approve the location for public safety reasons, as it is no longer near the intersection. Roseland concurred with Pelly. Geiger stated that the building was constructed in 1978 and signage was available for time/temperature capability but not with the brilliance and graphics of today. Geiger further stated that moving the sign to the other end of parking lot and closer to the building is a better spot for a building directory. Geiger requested a static sign, listing tenants, and located in the proximity of the building. Marshall stated that the sign is not a building directory. Casey stated that this is an on-premise sign to be used to promote businesses in the building and will not be used to advertise community service. Mattison indicated that realtors will use the sign to advertise properties for sale. In response to a question from Nelson, Solon stated that this review is in the environs and the Committee needs to review the sign for the time period when the building was built. Discussion followed on the time frame when LED was available and the original signage for the property that included time and temperature. In response to a question by Geiger, Marshall stated he would consider moving the sign farther east on the property. Geiger stated that the Committee reviews static signs, including the name of the business and the business interest, and this type of sign is a departure from the ordinary sign review. Marshall stated that the sign will include properties for rent, advertise businesses, promote businesses, promote specials, and include a for rent sign for locations within the building. Nelson stated that the Committee typically reviews a sign application for the sign itself and the message of the sign, including the font style; however, this sign is constantly changing. Stump stated he supports LED signs, but cannot approve this sign at this location due to the review requirements for signs within an historic area. Nelson relinquished the gavel and stated that he is a Charter member of the West Boulevard Neighborhood Association and does not feel that this modern sign is appropriate for this location next to the West Boulevard District. Nelson further stated that the environs are there to protect the ambiance of the historic building or district and moving the sign back out of the historic area rather than at the intersection is a better location. The gavel was returned to Nelson. **The motion to approve the ground sign at 909 St. Joseph Street failed.** In response to a question by B.Kessloff, Nelson clarified the motion for those in attendance.

(Audra Saylor, Tony Marshall, Brendan Casey, Mike Pelly, Bill Kessloff, Nick Lucas, Mary Ann Maylan, Gene Jackson, Lila Doud, Cheryl Chapman, Rose Marie Steward left the meeting)

612 St. Joseph St. – Two Awning Signs and Pedestrian Sign

Stump moved and Mattison seconded to approve the two awning signs and the pedestrian sign at 612 St. Joseph Street. In response to a question from Mattison, Rutter explained the canopy signs and the color selection. **The motion to approve the two awning signs and the pedestrian sign at 612 St. Joseph Street passed unanimously.**

607 Main Street – Wall Sign and Pedestrian Sign

Nelson indicated that this was a late submission and agreed to hear the application only if time allowed. **Stump moved and Mattison seconded the wall and pedestrian sign for 607 Main Street.** Willey explained the sign application stating that the wall sign is being moved from the

former location on 7th Street and the pedestrian sign is new. In response to a question from Nelson, Solon stated that the sign meets the Sign Code regulations. Mattison stated that the sign is visually in line with the adjacent sign next door. **The motion to approve the wall and pedestrian sign for 607 Main Street passed unanimously.**

Minutes

Mattison moved, Geiger seconded and motion passed unanimously to approve the October 13, 2006 minutes.

Other

Solon stated that the Committee set standards for reviewing historic signs, including colors and fonts, and he believes the Committee violated those standards at their last meeting. Solon stated that at the last meeting, a sign application was approved for a revised sign design that was submitted during the meeting. Nelson stated that minor changes are made at times during the meeting for the benefit of the applicant. Nelson further stated that any change made at a meeting requires that the applicant sign the revised changes for the files. Discussion followed regarding the standards for making minor changes during a meeting and the deadlines for submittals. Mattison stated that the issue is inappropriate signs, reviewed by the Historic Sign Review Committee, must either be allowed to make changes at the meeting, or must be denied, approved, or continued to the next meeting to allow changes to be made. Stump stated that if the committee cannot make adjustments, then the application would need to be continued. Discussion followed on the process of meeting the regulations of the Historic Sign Review Committee. Solon stated that if we are allowing the Committee flexibility, than we need to add that to the review process. Stump requested clarification of the sign application deadline. Discussion followed on the regulations for LED signs within the historic districts and the application deadline. Nelson stated that these discussions need to be continued for two weeks, so the Committee can firm up the standards and make any ordinance revisions. Nelson further requested that the Committee review the current requirements in the ordinance.

Sign Board Review: Nelson deferred the discussion of the proposed Historic Sign Ordinance until the entire Historic Sign Review Committee could be in attendance.

Nelson adjourned the meeting at 10:12 am.