

**Minutes
Historic Sign Review Committee
January 16, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Clancy Kingsbury, Jim Jackson, Lee Geiger, Vicky Fenhaus and Kyle Blada

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Sarah Hanzel, Patsy Horton, Carla Cushman and Jeanne Nicholson

OTHERS PRESENT: Renee Catron, Paul Bradsky, Caleb Arcenaux, Jillian Quintas, Valerie Brinkman and Bill Newhouse

Blada called the meeting to order at 8:57 a.m.

811 Saint Joseph Street (15SN001)

Hanzel briefly reviewed the application and the drawing.

Geiger moved to approve the 3' x 16' lit sign cabinet for Evergreen Office Products at 811 Saint Joseph Street. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury.

In response to a question from Blada, Newhouse advised that the current sign is made of plywood and that the new sign will be the same size and will be internally illuminated.

In response to a question from Kingsbury, Brinkman advised that both the current and proposed signs meet the Sign Code.

Geiger inquired as to whether the new sign will be placed between the window and the awning and if the new sign will be a wall sign. He expressed concern that the awning may not be able to support the weight of the sign.

Newhouse stated that the truss system for the awning can support a lot of weight.

In response to a question from Kingsbury, Hanzel reviewed the surrounding contributing properties.

Geiger advised that there is not a definition for awning signs in the Sign Code. A brief discussion followed.

The motion to approve the 3' x 16' lit sign cabinet for Evergreen Office Products at 811 Saint Joseph Street carried with Geiger, Kingsbury, Fenhaus and Blada voting yes and Jackson abstaining.

616 6th Street (15SN002)

Hanzel reviewed the application and the photographs.

Jackson moved to approve the aluminum composite panel sign (1' 4" x 5') with the new logo. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury.

Jackson expressed his opinion that the background color for the sign should blend in more with the building.

Catron explained that the new sign mimics the company's new logo.

Jackson explained that changes have been made to company logos so that the signs blend in better with the buildings in the Historic District. He suggested that maybe that the white could be a light gray instead of white.

Kingsbury stated that he has no problems with the proposed sign colors.

Geiger commented that the white on the sign and the building do not match.

The motion to approve the aluminum composite panel sign (1' 4" x 5') with the new logo carried unanimously with the stipulation that the white background on the sign be changed to match the white on the building.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

523 6th Street

Jackson shared an old sign that was on the Masonic Temple. He demonstrated how the sign worked. He briefly reviewed the types of previous and current signs that have been on the Alex Johnson.

Bradsky provided an old photograph showing tall gas pumps that were internally lit as far back as in the 1920's or 1930's. He added that an internally lit sign would be more visible than an externally lit sign. He noted that LED lighting is more economical than neon lighting.

In response to a question from Geiger, Bradsky advised that the Starbucks Corporation is not mandating an internally lit sign but are encouraging it.

In response to a question from Geiger regarding the existing Starbucks signs, Bradsky stated that the current signs will remain and that the proposed sign would be an additional sign and would be 30 feet high.

Jackson explained that this Committee cannot control square footage requirements as long as they are being met. He added that the sign industry business is going away from neon signs and moving toward LED signs because they are cost effective and are low maintenance. He commented that the neon sign on the top of the building will need to be updated and that historical characteristics will need to be considered at the time the sign is repaired and/or replaced.

Fenhaus expressed her opinion that internally lit and neon signs look the same.

Kingsbury stated that this Committee has not approved internally lit signs in the past and that allowing the proposed Starbucks sign will have an impact on future requests.

In response to a comment from Geiger, Jackson advised that there are requirements for the brightness of signs in the Sign Code. A brief discussion followed.

Hanzel advised that the next Historic Sign Review Committee meeting is on February 6, 2015. Bradsky stated that they can wait until February 6, 2015 for the Committee to take action on the sign permit.

Historic Preservation Ordinance

Cushman informed the Committee that the changes have been made to the Historic Preservation Ordinance. She advised that the Historic Preservation Commission and the Historic Sign Review

Committee will not be consolidated and that there are no changes to the review process for sign permits.

In response to a question from Kingsbury, Cushman advised that there will not be a representative from the Historic Preservation Commission on the Historic Sign Review Committee. She added that Kingsbury could be appointed as a member representing business owners in the Historic District.

MINUTES

Jackson moved to approve the minutes of the December 19, 2014 meeting. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury and carried unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:33 a.m.