

**Minutes**  
**Historic Sign Review Committee**  
**March 23, 2016**

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kyle Blada

OTHERS PRESENT: Sarah Hanzel, Jeanne Nicholson, Patsy Horton, Brad Solon, Chuck Janson, Jillian Steen, Dan Hop, Dan Senftner, Rick Schumacher and Karen Schumacher

**STAFF MEMO FOR SIGN AREA**

Hanzel reminded the Committee that Sign Application 16SN005 was continued at the March 15, 2016 meeting so the Committee could receive an interpretation on determining square footage for signs.

Solon reviewed the calculations that staff uses in determining square footage for signs. He explained the different square footage requirements for General Commercial properties located in the Downtown District and in other locations of the city. He briefly reviewed the Sign Ordinance definitions for sign and sign area. Discussion followed.

In response to a question about murals, Cushman advised that the Sign Ordinance does not address murals. She added that the new Downtown Plan, currently in the development stage, will address design standards for the downtown area.

Geiger expressed his opinion that this interpretation does not match the intent of the process that was established in 1978. He added that the Committee can be put in an awkward position based on the interpretation of the Sign Ordinance. He added that the intent of this Committee is to ensure that signs in the downtown area do not negatively impact the architectural features of the building. Additional discussion followed.

Jackson explained that one of the Committee's questions was to find out what is currently located behind the signs at Audra's Bridal Gallery and that the Committee requested staff to visit the site.

Janson stated that he visited the property and noted that it appears that there is painted plywood over hard plastic material behind the current signs. He added that the entire front of the building has been redone and it does not appear that there are any original materials remaining on the building.

Hop concurred with Janson and noted that it appears that there is no mullion system under the current signs. He added that he will know more when the old signs are removed from the property.

Solon stated that there was a building permit issued in 1958 to remove the top two floors that were damaged by fire.

Solon briefly addressed the United States Sign Council, 2006: Sign Legibility Rules of Thumb (page 6) and the United States Sign Council, 2011: Model On-Premise Sign Code (See last 4-5-6 pages of the document) documents as they relate to On-Premise Sign Types, Sign Area Computational Methodology and Common Geometric Shapes.

Geiger noted that the United States Sign Council is an industry council, not a governmental council and that the Historic Sign Board does not necessarily agree with or endorse the standards that are presented by the USSC.

## **SIGN APPLICATIONS**

### 601 Saint Joseph Street (16SN005)

Applicant: Unique Signs

District: Downtown Historic District (Non-Contributing) built 1950

Request: (3) Wall Signs and (1) Pedestrian Sign for Audra's Bridal Gallery, non-illuminated

**Geiger moved to approve the three non-illuminated wall signs and the one non-illuminated pedestrian sign for Audra's Bridal Gallery. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury and carried unanimously.**

### 804 Saint Joseph Street (16SN006)

Applicant: Conrad's Signs

District: Downtown Historic District (Contributing) built 1919

Request: (2) 2' x 16' Unlit Wall Signs for Love Struck Bridal Boutique

**Geiger moved to approve the two 2' x 16' unlit wall signs for Love Struck Bridal Boutique at 804 Saint Joseph Street. The motion was seconded by Fenhaus.**

In response to a question from Kingsbury, Steen advised that the signs will be lit by exterior lights.

**The motion to approve the two 2' x 16' unlit wall signs for Love Struck Bridal Boutique at 804 Saint Joseph Street carried unanimously.**

## **MINUTES**

**Geiger moved to approve the minutes of the March 15, 2016 meeting. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury and carried unanimously.**

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### 624 Saint Joseph Street

Hanzel introduced Rick and Karen Schumacher, property owners of 624 Saint Joseph Street. She advised that they are planning to make façade improvements to their building and to restore the existing Brass Rail sign. She noted that the Schumachers are concerned about whether the sign will be able to be re-installed after the renovation.

Rick Schumacher explained that the façade for the entire building will be restored to more closely resemble its original appearance. He noted that the Brass Rail will be mostly brick and that the sign will be restored and reinstalled on the building.

In response to a comment from Karen Schumacher regarding the Sign Code requirements for neon signs, Kingsbury stated that the Brass Rail sign has been grandfathered and because of that reason, the sign must remain on the property. He recommended that improvements also be made to the mounting materials for the sign.

Jackson commented that the State has encouraged the retention of neon signs. He added that he is unsure as to why the sign needs to remain on the property during the restoration and reconstruction process.

Kingsbury stated that the property owners may need to request to temporarily remove the sign from the property during the restoration and reconstruction process.

Senftner stated that when the Windsor Block building was being restored, the Gospel Gardens sign was removed from the property and returned to the site when the project was completed.

Cushman stated that she would check into removing the sign from the property during the reconstruction process.

A brief discussion followed regarding square footage requirements.

Hanzel stated that she would visit with Brad Solon about removing the sign for restoration during the reconstruction process.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:54 a.m.