

**Minutes
Historic Sign Review Committee
March 22, 2017**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vicky Fenhaus, Jim Jackson and Clancy Kingsbury

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kyle Blada and Lee Geiger

OTHERS PRESENT: Sarah Hanzel, Jeanne Nicholson and Carla Cushman

Jackson called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

SIGN APPLICATIONS

913 Mount Rushmore Road (17SN003)

Applicant: Rosenbaum's Signs

District: West Boulevard Historic District, Non Listed - built c.a. 1954

Request: Install 4' x 4' Wall Sign for Dark Canyon Coffee Company – Non Illuminated.

Jackson advised that he would be abstaining from voting on this item.

Hanzel reviewed the request and noted that the wall sign will be for Dark Canyon Coffee Company.

Fenhaus moved to approve the installation of the non-illuminated 4' x 4' wall sign for Dark Canyon Coffee Company at 913 Mount Rushmore Road. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury.

A brief discussion followed regarding the location of the proposed sign.

Hanzel informed the Committee that the structure is located in the boundary of the historic district but is not listed as a contributing or non-contributing structure.

Discussion followed regarding lighting for the proposed and existing signs on the structure.

The motion to approve the installation of the non-illuminated 4' x 4' wall sign for Dark Canyon Coffee Company at 913 Mount Rushmore Road carried with Fenhaus and Kingsbury voting yes and Jackson abstaining.

MINUTES

Kingsbury moved to approve the minutes of the March 8, 2017 meeting. The motion was seconded by Fenhaus and carried unanimously.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

Cushman briefly reviewed the background for the adoption of the Conflict of Interest Policy and noted that the policy is based on State law and general due process requirements. She explained that the policy requires appointed officials to identify their personal interest in the request and to recuse themselves from the request.

In response to a question from Jackson, Cushman explained that if a sign contractor, who is an appointed member of a committee, submitted a bid on a sign and was not awarded the contract, there would be no conflict of interest in voting on the request. She added that it would not be required but there would be no harm in disclosing the information to the committee.

Jackson requested clarification about whether it would be a conflict of interest if a sign contractor, who did not get the contract, continues working for the client on an advisory basis.

Kingsbury expressed his opinion that a conflict of interest exists if an individual benefits financially from a working relationship with a client.

Cushman stated that a conflict of interest could be construed if the committee member is not objective about the request. Additional discussion followed.

Jackson suggested that the Committee's membership be reviewed to determine if additional members are needed to have more diversity to ensure that fair consideration is given to the sign applications.

Cushman responded that the Historic Sign Review Committee membership is determined by the Sign Code and that the Sign Code would need to be updated to add additional members to the Committee. Discussion followed.

Hanzel stated that the Committee could schedule a work session to discuss guidelines that could be used to review sign applications on historic property by either staff or the committee. She added that the work session could be scheduled on a regular meeting date when there are no sign applications. The Committee concurred.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:25 a.m.