

*Minutes of the Hammond Historic District Commission*

*March 21, 2018 11:00 AM*

***Hammond City Council Chamber- 312 East Charles***

* Meeting called to order by Chairman, Mr. Ryan Faulk, at 11:00 am.
* Verification of meeting notice given by Administrative Director, Ms. Leah Solomon.
* Roll call taken:
  + Present: Ryan Faulk, Jessica Shirey, Howard Nichols, Jen White, Marguerite Walter, Shauna Seals, and Susan Seale
  + Absent: N/A
* Motion to approve the minutes from January 12th, 2018 by Mr. Nichols. Second by Mrs. Shirey. Vote taken with unanimous approval.
* Motion to approve the minutes from January 26th, 2018 by Mr. Nichols. Second by Mrs. Walter. Vote taken with unanimous approval.
* Old Business:
* 205 E. Thomas (Our Mom’s) – Paint & Lighting
  + Application represented by project architect, Tom Pistorious, and applicant Trent Fresina.
  + *The restaurant had a soft opening the day before and had some finishing touches that the applicants did not realize they needed to come back before the commission to approve until Ms. Solomon reminded. This application deals with first story light brown color to blend in with the second story brick. After removing the aggregate stucco from the first story brick, too much of the adhesive was left behind to salvage the naked brick. Also added to the exterior were three can lights to each awning. Mrs. Seale asks about the remaining aggregate stucco that lines the first story awning. Mr. Fresina responds that it will be removed and that awning will be re-wrapped to match the second story awning. This is intended to match all the commercial doors with anodized aluminum. Mrs. Shirey states that she sees nothing in this application contradictory to the guidelines. Mr. Faulk takes issue with the garage door-type opening installed on the second story balcony window as this did not come before the Commission. The appropriateness of a garage door in the district is arguable. Mr. Faulk recalls the prior discussion with the applicants about making said second story window operable, but believes a garage door and an operable window are two different items. Mr. Pistorious claims that operable windows are allowed downtown, so he does not perceive the distinction. Mrs. Shirey asks for specification on if it is a door or a window. Mrs. White reads the notes from previous meeting minutes which mention that a part of a prior approval was specifying that the applicants did not need to return before the Commission to make the window in questions operable. Mr. Pistorious explains that they got the same types of muntons as proposed and the same materials that matched the proposed. Mr. Faulk states that he likely would’ve had a different opinion if the option was brought up that this window could be a garage door, however it appears as though the consensus is this is not an issue. Mr. Nichols agrees with Mr. Faulk’s objection in that it sets a dangerous precedent. Appearance-wise, Mr. Pistorious asks if the closed window creates a design problem because this is something that’s going to start being seen. He agrees that if this were installed on the first story, it wouldn’t be appropriate, but since it is not seen from the sidewalk, he believes it not the same issue.*
  + Motion to accept the application for lighting and paint as submitted by Mrs. Shirey. Second by Mrs. White. Vote taken with unanimous approval.
  + *Mr. Fresina brings up the installation of a fire box on the façade of his building, which is something that the fire marshal is requiring now. It is small and will hold a master key to the building so that the fire department does not need to break glass to enter in case of a fire. Lacy Landrum, Director of Administration for the City of Hammond, recommends this be installed per the fire marshal in the same location at each entity so they don’t have to search. Same height and location at every building. Mrs. Walter asks if this has to be secured by screwing in through the brick. Mr. Fresina will use existing holes where possible.*
* 110 N. Cate (Courtyard Cafe) – Awning
  + No application representative present. The application was tabled for the April 18th meeting. If no representative is present once again, Mr. Faulk says the application will be rejected.
* New Business:
* 125 E. Thomas (Rustic Treasures) - Signage
  + Application presented by Kim Dixon, Sign Designs & More
  + *This application is for vinyl window signage and a hanging pedestrian sign. All measurements are checked to be within the 20% window signage limit. Mrs. White asks which direction the pedestrian sign is hanging. Mr. Dixon responds that it will be at a 45 degree angle since it will hang in the corner of the awning, facing two directions of sidewalk. Mrs. Shirey confirms that the bottom of that sign is at least 7’ from the sidewalk. Mr. Faulk states that there are a lot of signs proposed. Mrs. Shirey asks if the Central Rexall signs are landmark signs. Mr. Faulk says that the neon sign is, but the Commission is unsure about band sign above the awning. Mr. Nichols states that the proposed window signage seems cluttered. Mr. Faulk asks if the applicants are amenable to taking off one of the several business name signs – the one on the transom above the door specifically. Mrs. White asks about the “chalk paint” signs on the angled entryway windows. Mr. Dixon explains that the applicants have a contract with that chalk paint company and they must advertise those products in that way. Mr. Dixon will be taking down the Rexall vinyl window graphics. The size, composition, and location of the window signage is discussed. Ms. Solomon reminds both the Commission and the applicant that the conversation about style is opinion-based and not guideline-based. Applicants with a landmark sign on the property are permitted 1 hanging pedestrian sign, 1 decorative store name, up to 20% coverage of window signage on first floor, 1 open signs, and 1 hours/address sign. Mrs. White adds that the applicants also accommodated the design guidelines in that there is not consecutive repetition of logos on the same elevation. Each window has a little bit different signage. It fits within the guidelines. Mr. Faulk points to the 1 decorative store name guideline and shows how it is repeated in the design. The applicant is open to changing the design. More design changes are discussed. The versatility of a Sandwich Board sign is discussed. New sizing and signage composition is assessed. Lettering height guidelines are discussed – 12” per letter – and applied to the proposed signage. Some compromises are found and Ms. Solomon asks if there are any other questions or comments based on design guideline concerns. Mr. Nichols states that the Commission must consider the whole district, which overrides an individual application. The application meets the guidelines, but that does not mean it is appropriate to the downtown because of the clutter. Mrs. Seale remarks that NextHome signage is the only other similar proposed and it is not ideal. Mr. Faulk reads the ordinance where it discussed what a business may advertise. Advertisements for products or commodities sold on the premises should not exceed 50% of the signage. Ms. Solomon applies that to this situation in stating that while certain signs in the proposal are wholly advertising products or commodities, it is not 50% of the category of window signage. Mrs. Seals remarks that this application is within the guidelines, but what is proposed, what sticks out most are the two logos for the chalk paint. Removing the logos but keeping the wording is discussed.*
  + Motion to amend the application for changes as follows by Mrs. Shirey: vinyl logo on left will have only the chair (no business name) with “shabby chic furniture and gifts” below; the name above the address will be removed; the Cypress elevation’s phone number will be reduced in size; to removed phone number but increase lettering size on the Thomas elevation; and remove chalk paint logos, leaving the lettering below. Second by Mr. Faulk. Vote taken with unanimous approval.
  + Motion to accept the application as amended by Mrs. Shirey. Second by Mrs. Seals. Vote taken with unanimous approval.
* 200 E. Morris (Wells Fargo) – Signage
  + Application represented by Trevor Davidge of Arms Signs
  + Mr. Faulk recuses himself from the discussion because of his association with Holly/Smith architects. Mrs. Shirey takes over duties of the Chairman.
  + *The proposal is for a window graphic, pedestrian sign, and primary sign. Mrs. Shirey asks where the other tenants on this building will be able to place signage as she’s pretty sure that the guidelines prohibit signage above awnings. It is suggested that one monument sign could list all three is a good alternative to placement above awnings, per the guidelines. Mr. Davidge says the applicant discussed a multi-tenant sign instead of the primary sign if the Commission prefers. The Wells Fargo sign (as proposed) would be 18” tall and the two tenant signs would be shorter underneath. Ms. Solomon relays that the guidelines say multi-tenant signs must be uniform in size. Mrs. Shirey clarifies that if the building in question was the “Wells Fargo Building” it could have a bigger sign than the other tenants, but otherwise all business tenants have to have the same size sign for a multi-tenant building. Mrs. Seale asks if the Commission can vote on the other two signs – pedestrian sign and door vinyl. Mrs. Shirey states that a precedent has been set for applications like this that it is not considered a multi-tenant building because each storefront has its own address. Similar to the building that Shea Tyler Salon and the law firm as well as the SuperKing building and the Envoc building. Mr. Davidge says that it’s common for anchor stores to do that. Mrs. Shirey asks if we are looking at this as an address instead of a whole building. Mrs. White agrees that this should be considered as individual storefronts and not multi-tenant businesses. Now the primary signage is acceptable and the linear footage versus sign size is confirmed. The application also proposes lighting, which is a couple of gooseneck lights over the primary sign. Mrs. Seale believes that this lighting fits the guidelines and asks about the color. Mr. Davidge answers that the lighting will be black. Mrs. Shirey ensures that the sign will be bolted through mortar and not brick.*
  + Motion to accept the application as presented by Mrs. Seale. Second by Mrs. White. Vote taken with five approvals – Mr. Faulk still recusing. Mr. Nichols abstained as he stepped out for the vote.
* Updates From Director
  + Hammond Mid-Century Modern Home Tour Update
  + Pre-Tour Lecture Series Announced, March 29th & April 11th
  + The Highwaymen Filming – Temporary Signage COA
  + Enforcement Update
  + 113 N. Oak Paint Samples Sent In – In-Kind & Administratively Approved
  + *Mrs. Shirey asks about 226 N. Cate’s application for the work done without a COA. Ms. Solomon will send another reminder.*
  + Budget Update
* Public Input
  + Melanie Ricketts
    1. *Mrs. Ricketts states concerns over the upcoming Community Pavilion proposed by the Downtown Development District for the land adjacent to their current offices at 2 W. Thomas. Mrs. Ricketts believes the project will hit a financial hiccup as she thinks they have to borrow or bond to complete the construction budget. Mrs. Ricketts appreciates the design of the proposed structure, but the placement is an issue as the location has always been open green space and moving the Stewart Monument could injure it. She remarks on concerns about the drainage and the accuracy of green space shown in the drawing as well. A more appropriate space should be found. She requests the Commission keep all of this in mind when this comes before them again and also consider that the City doesn’t actually own that land.*
    2. *Mr. Nichols adds that the current monument was actually cut down in size to repair it when it was moved.*
* Motion to adjourn by Mrs. Shirey. Second by Mr. Nichols. Vote for adjournment was taken with unanimous approval.

*NEXT MEETING: April 18th, 2018*