



HAMMOND HISTORIC DISTRICT

Minutes of the Hammond Historic District Commission

February 20th, 2019 11:00 AM

Hammond City Council Chamber- 312 East Charles

- Meeting called to order by Chairman, Mr. Ryan Faulk, at 11:00 a.m.
- Verification of meeting notice given by Director, Ms. Jennie Garcia
- Roll call taken:
 - Present: Jessica Shirey, Shauna Seals, Howard Nichols, Susan (Seale) Owens, Marguerite Walter, Ryan Faulk, and Jen White
- Motion to approve the minutes from January 16th, 2019 by Mrs. Walter. Second by Mrs. Seals.
 - Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Shauna Seals (Y), Howard Nichols (Y), Susan Owens (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), Ryan Faulk (Y), and Jen White (Y)
 - Motion Approved: 7-0
- **New Business:**
 - **200 E. Charles (Realty Executives)– Signage**
 - Application presented by: Kim Dixon, Sign deSigns and More
 - *The project will include new signs to be located on the door, one window on East Charles, one window on North Cypress, and on the existing hanging sign bar located on the corner of the building. The hanging sign will measure 24" X 30", door graphics will measure 20" X 20", and both window graphics will measure 21" X 36"*
 - *Kim Dixon –the one thing that might throw a wrench is the sign, Mr. Sam is wanting to upgrade the sign to a dimensional sign. It will be exactly the same size, same graphic, it will just be a 3D sand blasted as opposed to a flat sign.*
 - *Ryan Faulk asks what the material will be to the upgraded sign.*
 - *Kim Dixon confirms it will be HDU – High Density Urethane that will give the 3D affect with a wood grain background. Mr. Dixon passes out an updated picture of the new sign. Confirms that the sign is the same size but the new material will give it the old fashioned wood look. To do a wood sign it would expand and contract over time and will crack and split. Using this material the sign will last many years.*
 - *Jen White – The hang bar is already on the building? Kim Dixon confirms the hang bar is already attached to the corner of the building and will not be mounting anything new.*

- *Ryan asks for any comments or questions. Shauna states that she needs to know if we can approve the material – HDU. Commission confirms there are no issues with the new material.*
 - *Ryan calls for public input – there is no input.*
 - *Motion to approve application as presented, by Jessica Shirey. Second by Ryan Faulk.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Shauna Seals (Y), Howard Nichols (Y), Susan Owens (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), Ryan Faulk (Y), and Jen White (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved: 7-0*
- **207 E. Thomas (Mojitos) – Window Signage**
 - *Application presented by: Jennifer Valencia*
 - *The building located at 207 E. Thomas is seeking approval to add vinyl window signage to the front of the building. Romano Promo is the company who will provide the proposed new signage. Vinyl lettering will be added to the two front windows and the door. The right and left window decal will measure 34" X 30" and the center door decal will measure 13" X 16".*
 - *Jennifer Valencia states that the final lettering will be from Romano Promo who will be producing and installing the decals.*
 - *Jennie Garcia – States the proposed signage exceeds the 20% max front window coverage but comes close. Double checked the math this morning. The total area of the front glass is 10,088" and 20% of this is 2,017.6". The proposed signage area is at 2,248" making it just slightly larger than the 20% allowed coverage.*
 - *Shauna and Jen state then the signage needs to be reduced just a little.*
 - *Ryan confirms that these changes were made after he printed out the work session application. Jennie states the dimensions had to be updated since she forgot to add the second signage to the total area.*
 - *Jennie Garcia states that the proposed signage is over by about 240 inches.*
 - *Ryan confirms that the signage can be easily adjusted.*
 - *Susan asks if the changes are on the application. Jennie confirms that no, they are not.*
 - *Jen White confirms that the current window signage will be coming down and replaced with the new signage. Jennifer Valencia confirms that yes the old signage will be removed.*
 - *Motion to amend the application as presented by, Ryan Faulk. Second by Howard Nichols.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Shauna Seals (Y), Howard Nichols (Y), Susan Owens (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), Ryan Faulk (Y), and Jen White (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved: 7-0*
- *Motion to approve the amended application as presented by, Jessica Shirey. Second by Ryan Faulk.*
 - *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Shauna Seals (Y), Howard Nichols (Y), Susan Owens (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), Ryan Faulk (Y), and Jen White (Y)*

- Motion Approved: 7-0

- **123 S. Cate (Cena) – Signage**

- Application presented by: Trevor Davidge of Arms Signs Incorporated.
- *Essentially 123 S. Cate is being turned into a new restaurant and requires new signage. The proposed signage will be placed on both facades of the building located on the corner of S. Cate and E. Morris. The proposed signage will be made of brushed aluminum and be lit by an external light bar. The new signage will be mounted to the building using existing screw holes.*
- *Jen asks and confirms that we now have an owner signature on the application.*
- *Trevor – basically the sign will be similar to what was up for the Iron Horse except the letters will be a little different. The letters will be standoff brushed aluminum.*
- *Susan asks if the letters will be standing off the sign. Trevor confirms that the letters c, e, n, and a will be standing off a little bit by about ¼ inch and the rest of the letters will be too small to stand off so they will be directly applied to the panel.*
- *Trevor confirms that the panel will be similar to what is already on the building and the same holes will be used to mount the new sign.*
- *Ryan confirms that there will be a background panel. Trevor states that yes there will be a background panel and it will match the existing bronze color of the current fascia.*
- *Ryan asks about the lighting of the signs. Trevor states he is not doing the lighting but the external lighting that is up now on the Cate Street side is still there – the light bars – the lighting on the other side will be taken care of by Chanc Kinchen at another time. Trevor is not providing the lighting for the signage.*
- *Ryan states that he (Chanc) will need to come before the commission if he wants to provide lighting to the signage on the Morris side and confirms that he will maintain the current lighting at this time for the Cate façade.*
- *Ryan asks if anyone has any questions. Jen asks if we need to amend the application to address the lighting. Ryan states that lighting is not part of this application.*
- *Ryan calls for public input – none is given.*
- Motion to approve application as presented, by Ryan Faulk. Second by Howard Nichols.

- Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Shauna Seals (Y), Howard Nichols (Y), Susan Owens (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), Ryan Faulk (Y), and Jen White (Y)

- Motion Approved: 7-0

- **118 N. Cate (Pita Pit) – Signage**

- Application presented by: Trevor Davidge of Arms Signs Incorporated.
- *Essentially 118 N. Cate is seeking to add a projection sign and a pedestrian hanging sign. The sign will be lit with exposed red and white neon lighting and made of aluminum. The projected sign will be mounted to the building through mortar joints and centered above the awning. The current signage located on the awning will be removed when the new signage is added to the building.*

- *Trevor states the signage was already approved back in June but work was not completed in the 6 months a COA is valid for so he is resubmitting the application. Nothing has changed it is the same exact signage, one pedestrian and one neon sign.*
 - *Jessica Shirey states that we need the owner's signature. Trevor confirms that he has the owner's signature on the application.*
 - *Ryan asks for public input – there is none given.*
 - *Motion to approve application as presented, by Jessica Shirey. Second by Ryan Faulk.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Shauna Seals (Y), Howard Nichols (Y), Susan Owens (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), Ryan Faulk (Y), and Jen White (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved: 7-0*
- **101 S. Spruce (Restoration House) – Foundation**
 - *Application presented by: Jeff Darouse.*
 - *Essentially the building located at 101 S. Spruce an 1880s two story Queen Anne house now used by the Restoration House Pregnancy Resource Center is seeking approval to have foundational repairs. Work is needed to re-level the building due to the ground settling from water sitting underneath the structure. Basically work will consist of pushing segmented concrete piles to refusal approximately every 6 feet under the main 2-story structure. Repair any sills or joists as discovered during the leveling process. Add piers or address existing piers as discovered during the leveling process. Level the structure according to compu level readings as close as possible without incurring excessive damage and as close to level as the structure will allow given its condition. Remediation plans will involve two days of pumping water from underneath the building and pushing segmented concrete piers every 6 feet under sills of the original structures. This will ensure that the building is stabilized and prevent future settling as long as the moisture issue is addressed. This may involve a pump truck to pump sand under the structure. Ongoing water saturation issue will need to be addressed through possibly plumbing repairs and sand, then the pile pushing will address the soil issues. The final outcome will be positive, no more sinking. As far as the masonry piers, it is difficult to assess each one until the water is pumped out to examine them closely. It may be necessary to pour footings in some areas where existing piers are damaged, and add concrete filled piers. In other areas, mortar repair may be the solution. Interior pillars will be poured footings and cinder blocks reinforced with rebar and concrete. On the exterior to build more masonry over the piles that are pushed but that becomes an extra cost. Sills, joist, and other subfloor members will be addressed and changed out or sistered as necessary either upon visual discovery or by the subfloor members inability to handle uplift pressure without cracking, etc.*
 - *Basically to reapply for a permit to address foundational issues and to answer any questions you might have.*

- *Jess – my understanding after reading the application is that we are not really sure what the issue is if its water damage causing the foundation problems.*
- *Jeff Darouse states that most of the underside of building is not accessible. He will need to dig some holes and pump out water out first. Then he will assess the wood underneath the building.*
- *Jess – states that what was discussed in our working session is that this might have be done in parts and come back once we get a hard line at what we are looking at.*
- *Jeff states that in order for him to want to push piles he wants to make sure the wood members are in good enough shape. You cannot always tell by discoloration but he will want to do the repairs at the same time he is pushing the piles.*
- *Ryan confirms that these are structural repairs underneath the house.*
- *Susan asks if piers are visible to the street. Jeff confirms that they are not and there is duct work all the way around the building. Ryan states there is also a frieze board shielding the piers.*
- *Jess asks if the water issue has been taken care of which Jeff states it has not.*
- *Jeff states that the plan is to pump all the water out from underneath the house and then to turn all the water on inside the building, have the toilets flushed to see if there is leaking. From there we can determine if it is a plumbing leak or if its rainwater.*
- *Jess asks if the water bill has been outrageous and Jeff states he does not know. Jess states that the water bill could give insight to whether or not it is a plumbing problem.*
- *Ryan states that at the end of the day you will be raising the house to do some work. Jeff states that the house level will not be changed; he will be doing some leveling and shoring. Ryan confirms that he will not be raising the level of the building.*
- *Jessica asks, where are we stopping with this today? Ryan states that for them to repair structural issues – structural framing underneath the house, a structural component of the house and is replaced in-kind that is acceptable.*
- *Jessica states that yes in-kind but if you look at what is under there, it is probably not what it should be. Ryan states that there appears to be roughly placed piers that were done at some point.*
- *Ryan asks Jeff to describe what he means by “adding piers for support” means and what that would entail. Jeff states that if we dig and water comes up they will push piles back to below the surface. If we can get piles that will support the building from sinking even when it is wet underneath. We push the piles as the weight of the structure till refusal. Ryan confirms that the piles will be below grade and will not be seen. Jeff states that above grade we do shim them up to the structure – to the sills.*
- *Ryan – the finished pier, what we will see and that there are brick piers on the perimeter will be replicated. Jeff states what he can do is the piles are pushed first and at some point go back and build some columns and build some brick piers. This is a possibility and is not in the scope of work – this is certainly a possibility.*

- *Ryan states that the put back is not part of this application and will have to come before us to review. Just putting in concrete piers to refusal is not going to be acceptable and will have to go back with brick piers on the visible section.*
 - *Jeff confirms that he will have to come back after completing the first part of the work. Jess states that if it is something that needs to be approved faster we can hold a special session to accommodate the project.*
 - *Jen states that they do not want to slow down any progress.*
 - *Ryan confirms that the scope of work submitted only addresses the repairs of sills and joists and bowing. It is adding piers or repairing existing piers during the leveling process. So we need to be clear that adding piers, primarily if you are adding them to the perimeter will need to be addressed in another application.*
 - *Jennie Garcia states that the additional information sent through email was added to the application's scope of work. Jeff asks if the pushing of piles is in that and this is confirmed. Scope of work talks about your remediation plans involving two days of work pumping water from underneath the building and pushing segmented concrete piers every 6 ft. underneath sills of the original structures. Jeff adds that any sills and joists that are being replaced will be upon discovery.*
 - *Ryan calls for any public input – none given.*
 - Motion to approve application as presented, by Ryan Faulk. Second by Jessica Shirey.
- Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Shauna Seals (Y), Howard Nichols (Y), Susan Owens (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), Ryan Faulk (Y), and Jen White (Y)
 - Motion Approved: 7-0
- **207 & 211 W. Morris – Relocation**
 - Application presented by: Jennifer Lee representing the owners of 207 & 211 W. Morris
 - *Essentially the applicant is requesting to relocate the two buildings located at 207 & 211 W. Morris Avenue. These buildings are circa 1930s American Small Houses. The work that is being requested is to move and relocate both buildings to 42260 & 42276 Warren Drive, Ponchatoula. This proposed work will be completed by Davie Shoring an experienced house moving company. The relocation and moving of the two buildings will allow the applicant to redevelop the property to include 4 new residential duplexes.*
 - *Jennifer Lee – we have an application for relocation of the existing homes to 42260 & 42276 Warren Drive. In summary Georgetown Row has been proposed for development at the site and we have previously submitted plans and you can see what that looks like. The owners are requesting that this commission to issue a COA approving the relocation of the homes so that Mr. Rossie can proceed with the construction and development of that site. And as you know Georgetown Row will consist of four buildings with residential use with eight units and the National Register Coordinator, we provided that email to you previously, suggested that a smaller scale development with one to two stories will be most appropriate in terms of the site's relationship to the Historic District because it faces it and*

Georgetown Row fits that bill. So the homes that are currently there, Mr. Rossie the applicant and his family who have owned the homes for decades, they are Minimal Traditional Houses with a plain design and no architectural significance other than their minimalism. As Ms. Garcia stated with her research earlier this type of housing was popular after the War because it encouraged and allowed for affordable housing and to home ownership and those homes would be analogous to today's DSLD or DR Horton tract homes. They again have affordability in mind and not necessarily the architectural design or the materials. So in order for Georgetown Row development to possibly happen much thought was given to the current houses and what will happen to them and some considerations were (1) preservation and rehabilitation and we talked about that at length previously. The homes are around 1,000 square feet each. They have four rooms and a half bath which is a toilet and a sink only. And the original intended use which is for residents was changed long ago. So they have been used for commercial properties for quite a while. The homes are inadequately laid out in size for most businesses or residents today – in modern day. So perspective tenants, current tenants have voiced anecdotally - voiced their concerns that they just don't work. So the first rule in doing any work on the property as you know is do no harm. And the homes we thought about and considered changing them and preserving them and rehabilitating them and they would have to be substantially modified or added on to, to be most useable for either residents or businesses today. If that was done the historic value of the small minimal traditional homes with a plain design and no architectural significance would be lost. So the owner determined that total rehabilitating and changing the minimal traditional homes to something bigger and something that is suitable for today's standards would be doing harm. The second thing that was looked besides preservation and rehabilitation was demolition and you know for once he has gone through trying to locate someone to relocate the homes and finally after I think after fifteen people he was able to find someone able to do that. The third item that was considered was relocation on the property and that was just maybe moving the property and building something new and consideration was given to that and we discussed before that the new properties would be substantially different in terms of layout and size and the aesthetic differences between the old and the new would be different. So I think aesthetically it would look kind of like a hodge podge like the owner was just trying to salvage and cheapen the project instead of preserve them. And additionally the owner would probably be unable to comply with the city's requirements for setback and etc. if the structures were relocated. So for these reasons relocation of the houses on the property was decided that it probably wouldn't work. So the next consideration would be relocation of the homes off of the property and we discussed this at length at the last working session. The owner met with thirteen different individuals and companies with each performing a site visit over the past four months. And today we applied a scope of work for relocating those two homes to 42260 & 42276 Warren Drive in Ponchatoula. And that is a site that is owned by Warren Davie and other

historically preserved homes are also located on that same site. So the HDC Design Guidelines and I think we mentioned this last time that the Guidelines regarding relocation states a couple of different things in addition to the Guidelines. So I went through those and just analyzed them according to our situation. The first thing is that relocation of historic building or any building within the Historic District should be carefully deliberated and again that is deliberating carefully thought about that is mindfully considering what we are going to do not kind of a check the box approach. And then second that sentence relates to buildings or historic buildings within the Historic District and I would note that while this is in the jurisdiction of the Commission cause it faces the District the buildings are not in the District per se. The second sentence was a historic building should be moved only if all other preservation options have been exhausted. And as discussed before modifying or adding onto the homes to make them desirable and usable for businesses and residents in modern day would ruin the historic value of the small minimal traditional homes with a plain design and no architectural significance and it would do harm. The third sentence in that Design Guideline that was discussed that relocation often results in a loss of integrity, of setting, and environment that compromises the significance of the relocated buildings. And here we believe that relocating the buildings would actually enhance the significance of the buildings. They would be around other similarly situated historic homes and not commercial properties and historically they were residences so they will be around other residences not commercial buildings. Finally, relocation of the building or portion of the building can be a desirable alternative to demolition and in the past we talked about demolition that is something that we, or that Spencer, has really spent some time in finding someone to relocate them instead of demolish and he was failing for a while and then continued on that effort and found someone and that is something that the Historic District Commission has kind of really pushed and that was in finding someone for relocating and not demolishing these historic homes. So that has been done. And other considerations are whether the proposed relocation will adversely affect other historic buildings in the District and it will not and whether it will affect the overall characteristic of the District and it will not. So that's just the sentences that were precursors to the actual Guidelines and we submitted with the application in that analysis that relates to the Guidelines and one documenting the original conditions, which has been done. Assessing the structural condition of the building to make sure it can be moved – that has been done. And Warren Davie who has moved a lot of properties and has also preserved historic properties has inspected and implied that they are in a condition that they could be moved. Three, work with contractors successfully – experienced successfully of moving them was submitted many letters of reference, which can also be seen on his website, that locally Warren Davie is the person to be moving historic homes and also preserving them he has done it he actually is on national television show doing it. So finally it was protecting the buildings from weather damage and vandalism during the relocation and since the purpose will

be to move them and reuse them and rehabilitate them and use them – of course he will be doing that. He will be protecting them from weather damage and vandalism. So in summary, the owner has gone through an exhaustive review and process for months of how houses can be preserved, relocated, and reused so that Georgetown Row can be developed in their place and further enhance the Historic District regarding preservation the termination was made that substantially modifying or adding on to the homes would change the minimal traditional residence style and would do harm. Instead relocating the homes appears to be the best manner of preserving them as minimal traditional homes and to promote homeownership in a location to where they are proposed to be moved is a location of smaller homes that are affordable and that is sometimes first time homes for families. The Historic District Design Guidelines state that non-contributing properties about them that each case must be evaluated on an individual basis to determine any proposed work or impact on the property as well as adjacent properties and the street scape as a whole and here we feel that the proposed redevelopment and relocation would enhance the adjacent properties and the street scape and the Historic District by adding newly constructed beautiful homes that would increase property values and visual interest of that corner. So the owner has positively met the intent of the Historic District Commission’s factors described in the Design Guidelines relocation section and has met all of the guidelines for relocation. And besides with complying with all of those guidelines the proposed relocation, the construction would improve property values, and foster economic development in the affected areas. So in light of this specific facet of this situation and the proposed redevelopment enhancing the district the owner requests that the Commission issue a COA permitting the relocation of the homes located at 207 & 211 W. Morris so that Georgetown Row development can proceed.

- *Ryan – asks for any comments or questions for discussion from the Commissioners*
- *Jessica – recaps the discussion work session review; we basically discussed that there is limited inventory of this particular type of home especially within the Historic District. If the relocation is approved once it moves at all it’s no longer protected so the proposition of where it is going to go it loses the significance even if it meets the Guidelines for relocation but it is still not protected. And these were things that were discussed. Jen White adds we also discussed that we would be losing our historic stock. This is confirmed by Jessica.*
- *Marguerite states that the overall project is good and ya’ll have done a great job on that. Unfortunately it does set a precedent that is a little bit worrisome and we have to be very careful of that kind of precedence set.*
- *Ryan – If it is inconvenient for a building, a certain type of building to be on your site for which can tell you what you can do with that property. And just allowing it to be moved because of that it does set a bad precedent. Which Marguerite is right, we have to weigh this very, very carefully.*
- *Jennifer Lee – And the purpose of it is just inconvenient, consideration was given to whether it could be moved on the property and we could build new construction*

around it but aesthetically I think that would detract from the Historic District, not enhance it.

- Ryan – Another point by the way, it's not so much that those buildings are under our jurisdiction they are actually part of the ordinance and part of the Historic District not just under our purview.
- Jennifer Lee – Because they face it? Ryan confirms that yes, the two homes are in the Historic District.
- Ryan asks Howard if he has any input.
- Howard – Well, we have actually gone over this ground repeatedly and Mrs. Lee, I think you are a fine advocate for your client. But, I believe that much of your argument is based on your aspects and vision of pro-business development and I don't argue with any of that except that you do not have a responsibility that we do. And it is, I mean we go to an annual training session and we have session after session where we have looked at communities across the country where there have been struggles between maintaining modest buildings and economic imperative and I for one really find it possible to maintain my integrity of a member of the Commission and vote to in effect yield to historic properties that are outside of the purview of my role of Commissioner.
- Ryan calls for public input.
- Jennie Garcia asks to share some information. C.C. and I have been working really hard with Spencer trying to figure out the site. One of my concerns was, what are our guidelines for developing on the site for new construction? One of the things it says, site guidelines for new construction – setback of proposed building must be consistent of the setback of adjacent district buildings or nearby district buildings fronting the same street. The distance between the proposed building and adjacent district buildings must be compatible with the spacing between existing district buildings fronting on the same street. So, yesterday we were out measuring and trying to figure out what that distance was and C.C. will tell you I was ready to go back out to measure this morning in the pouring rain. But, using that information what you are trying to propose I couldn't quite make it fit. Because that is something else we will have to address if they leave and if they don't fit then it is kind of hard to let them go – Spencer asks, the new buildings don't fit? – Jennie confirms that the new buildings don't fit Historic District site guidelines for new construction. The other thing is if these buildings get moved and rehabilitated on another location after you are saying that they are not rehabilitatable on their current location, then why are we moving them if someone else is going to rehabilitate them elsewhere and use them for single family homes. It is a very tough thing, I know I have been going back and forth with and trying to figure out some kind of middle ground.
- Susan – One thing I recall many years ago probably before Spencer was born, there was move by a property owner to tear down the J.C. Penney's building which is adjacent to the Columbia Theatre. There was also talk about selling the Columbia Theatre for bricks and the Historic District failed the proposal not even knowing exactly the use would be long-term for the Columbia Theatre. And so my

concern is the precedent we will set if we allow those buildings to be removed then what if down the street they really want to remove a corner and build a service station. We've studied this before and I can see the Rossie's point of view, I understand it, I wish they wanted to do it somewhere else, but the precedent is the problem.

- *Ryan asks if someone would like to make a motion. Ryan asks the applicant if they have something else to say.*
- *Howard Nichols offers a motion – on the basis of the shared and expressed concerns of the commission, I move that we deny the application.*
- *Motion to deny the application as presented, by Howard Nichols. Second by Shauna Seals.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Shauna Seals (Y), Howard Nichols (Y), Susan Owens (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), Ryan Faulk (Y), and Jen White (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved: 7-0*
 - *Jennifer Lee thanks the commission; as I have said before I appreciate your efforts.*
- **2 W. Thomas (Market Pavilion) – New Construction/Change in Materials**
 - *Application presented by: Tom Pistorius*
 - *The proposed Market Pavilion is resubmitting an application to the Historic District. In an effort to reduce costs, new color scheme, and revised design trusses have changed the original plan. An elimination of painted steel support curves has been made due to cost. A proposal of brown shingle roof is being made to match the roofs of the two adjacent buildings. Currently, this space is an open green space situated between the Downtown Development District Building and La Carretas restaurant.*
 - *Jessica Shirey – I believe Jennie Garcia (director) reached out to you that this is a new application and starting over. We are getting lost between what was accepted and what was approved and changing and kind of going back and forth. So just more for clarification.*
 - *Tom Pistorius – The only thing that is changing, we went to bid last year and the structure came in a little higher than we had anticipated. It was really based on the steel frame – the steel cost was just extraordinary. So all we are really doing is changing to timber framing of the building, the footprint is exactly the same. The height, the whole look of it is the same. No more metal roof it will be a shingle roof it is just a matter of changing materials. No more red brick – in fact what we are trying to do is to step back and make it blend in a little bit more with the old chamber building, which is the DDD office and La Carreta; and I think Mr. Howard will appreciate this but I think we are going towards a painted white brick and with wood and darker tons and the roof will all blend. In terms of the site and the footprint it is exactly the same. Some of the amenities we were doing before like all of the pavers that was all out front, that put us over the top. So we are bringing all of that back and actually do it as a green space as Melanie Ricketts always had talked about in a previous rendering is that there was always sod out there. We are actually going to bring that back. We are going to turf this area. The Stewart*

monument is still going in the same location. So we are just simplifying the front entrance.

- *Jen White – I think that was kind of what we were saying. There’s nothing on the application about the green space and if I remember correctly the Stewart monument was supposed to go up by the DDD building but now it’s back – we just got lost in what was on a previous application. There has just been so many tiny nuances.*
- *Tom – If you look at the rendering, the Stewart monument is still back in the front which is on the site plan. The previous rendering never showed it because it was an earlier version. We do have the Stewart going in the front in between the DDD and the pavilion. The design is – there is a lot more wood and tapered wood beams.*
- *Ryan confirms that the change is from the steel members to wood beams.*
- *Tom – Yes we eliminated all of the steel brackets. This is kind of the new look. We are trying to get within the budget. The brick pillars and all of that are the same. And like I said we are just matching that to the other buildings and paint it. Yes painted brick like Jeffery Smith recommended. That is fine if you need to treat it as a new application.*
- *Jen White – I think that just simplifies it. We are not talking about what an amendment to an old application now and what isn’t. Just everything as shown now.*
- *Ryan – Is this technically a new application? There is an application here.*
- *Howard – Do you still have to move the monument?*
- *Tom confirms that yes the monument will have to move. The monument is still going to the proposed new location this remains the same from the previous application. The monument is still going between the two buildings. So we are relocating it 50 ft. over because we couldn’t put it under the trees if you remember that. I have not changed the location of this at all. All we have done is remove all of the pavers.*
- *Howard – What I am asking is, in order to construct the market building do you have to move the existing monument from its current location? Tom confirms that yes, the monument will have to be moved from its current location.*
- *Tom – It (monument) will not be moved until we get it within the budget when the project can actually move forward. So today, that is what I am here for because of the changeover materials, colors. I brought roofing shingle samples and the paint samples and that to me, other than the look of the building they are a little different but all in all it is still the same pavilion.*
- *Ryan confirms that they are not changing the footprint.*
- *Tom – Instead of changing the square footage, as an architect, we decided to VE, value engineer, all of the materials. And so we can actually save about a \$150,000 just by going to a tapered glue lam system instead of with all of the custom steel brackets.*
- *Howard – But your steel brackets were very attractive and I am sorry to see them disappear.*

- *Ryan – I believe that the application that is presented here talks about what exactly he is doing.*
- *Jen White & Jessica – It doesn't say anything about the pavers and this is where some of the confusion comes from.*
- *Jessica – One of the things we discussed in the working session is where are we; I don't think that any of us as a whole can say and that is where the confusion was because I know they come back with certain things. So what is checked off on that, pavers are checked off, it is just really part of it. It is not for arguments sake it is for clarification of what we are doing. Because we had pavers on it and now we don't – that is not on this application but then we are changing, at this point I am lost and I am not the only one. What we have on there and what we have off of there...*
- *Tom – Ryan can we just have a material update and say that the pavers are not there anymore.*
- *Ryan – That is the point that I am getting at. When we voted last time, the point of the construction of the building, the size, orientation, the amenities that was all preapproved. They came back to us...*
- *Tom – We had to come back because of the colors and materials.*
- *Jessica – So where was the monument? What stage was that?*
- *Ryan – It is in the exact same spot as in the rendering.*
- *Jessica – Was that the very first? Cause in the first it was going to be moved under the trees and now it is back. That is where I am lost.*
- *Tom – The last time we had a special meeting.*
- *Jen White – And that is what I am trying to look up, that special session. And I don't think that was on the application. The pavers were on the application and I wasn't there for that one so I am just going by reading.*
- *Jessica – And that is what is confusing, what's been approved and what hasn't been approved.*
- *Chelsea Tallo (DDD Executive Director) – I can clarify some of what has been approved. So the first time we ever came to the Historic District was for, by the way I am Chelsea Executive Director of the DDD. We came to you to move the monument and that ya'll were ok with moving the monument before we even started this construction. Originally it (monument) was up front by Thomas Street and when we met with you guys, Mr. Nicholls actually made a comment about keeping it closer to the current location. So that is when we moved it back. We tried to put it between the trees. So your first approval to move the monument we didn't set a location we just said it was going to be moved on site and kept on site. Ya'll actually did not approve the location. The second time we met at the special meeting it (monument) was where it is now. And I don't know if it was a part of the application but the application was approved.*
- *Tom – And a copy of the site plan was submitted but we never updated the rendering.*
- *Ryan – I remember the drawing cause it was in the packet that showed that Location.*

- *Jessica – Just because a picture has it in there does not mean that is where it is going.*
- *Ryan – No I am talking about the...*
- *Tom – Whoa, Whoa, Whoa! Yes it does! If you submit a drawing and it shows it is in a particular location, the drawing is part of the package then yes it absolutely does.*
- *Jen White – We have gone over this before at meetings before that it needed to be detailed in the application.*
- *Tom – Listen, are we supposed to list every single aspect on a building? The set of drawings is part of the construction documents. Everything that is in that package including everything on the site plan, I don't think that we need to list everything that is going to happen. It is an updated site plan with a highlight of a change of materials and colors. I mean that is all you really need to state on this. We already approved the location, we approved the Stewart monument. I am not about to go through all of this again.*
- *Jen White – No one is trying to make it harder.*
- *Jessica – We are trying to clarify what we are approving.*
- *Tom – Let's clarify it now. There are no more pavers in this front area that is the only thing that has changed in terms of ground paving. There is still a sidewalk that wraps in front of the building. I am talking more about the building today. We reduced the amount of hardscape around the monument.*
- *Ryan – Now the extension of the streetscape, I think was touched on but it was not part of that application last time. Is that correct?*
- *Chelsea Tallo – That is correct. We just approved the building. The pavers...*
- *Ryan confirms that the streetscape was not part of this or the previous application.*
- *Chelsea Tallo confirms that it is just the structure that has been approved.*
- *Ryan states that it is just the structure and the adjacent site that includes the monument location.*
- *Tom – But it is all in the same project.*
- *Ryan agrees with Tom's statement.*
- *Tom – All of this, the parallel parking on the front, the sidewalk gets expanded, all of that was part of the previous site plan. You don't have a copy of that from a previous submittal?*
- *Jen White confirms that we do have it electronically.*
- *Susan – Can we have a discussion on where the garbage trucks are going to be?*
- *Tom states that they will pull in straight forward and the trash enclosures will go here with the restaurant.*
- *Marguerite – They will share it with the restaurant trash?*
- *Tom confirms that yes they will share it with the restaurant and that it will not be a big, big yard. It will be two kind of like what is at a 113. So it is a brick wall.*
- *Susan – So the garbage truck will back in?*
- *Tom – Nope. It will pull forward like it does currently. And a helper will pull them (dumpsters) out, lifts it, dumps it, and keeps on going. It never backs up.*

- *Marguerite – I have mentioned this before, vendors have complained about the smell. Is there a brick wall around it?*
- *Tom – There is, it will be an enclosed brick area with gates.*
- *Marguerite – Is it enclosed now?*
- *Tom – It is barely enclosed now with a wood fence. So it is going to tuck into the side. I think it will be better and it will be screened a lot better.*
- *Chelsea Tallo – They actually clean their dumpsters pretty regularly. The smells are coming from the pot holes that are in the alleyway which will actually be covered with the project.*
- *Tom confirms that they are rebuilding to trash standards for enclosures and that this is a requirement. This is the new color of the brick, the color of the trim, and we are proposing a weather wood shingle.*
- *Ryan calls for public input.*
- *Melanie Ricketts – For the record, my name is Melanie Ricketts and I am a former preservationist and sometimes local historian. In your approval of the pavilion project, the last information that I have from the minutes of the meeting on last year of December 17, 2017. At the end of the application it said a motion to approve the application as presented except for the new monument placement and arborist recommendation so that further research could be done.*
- *Ryan asks for the date and Melanie states it was December 17th and that there was a special meeting somewhere in there but no specific information about the relocation of the monument.*
- *Melanie Ricketts – If you are determining the future of the monument I think it is very important for you to understand ones past. I have some information that I have brought on that. I also had a consultation with two cemetery preservation companies. Something else that hasn't been discussed is how the monument will be moved, how it will be anchored, and I have been told consistently that there is insurance on the monument but it hasn't been really clear on what kind of mitigation will happen if the monument is damaged. Do ya'll mind if I go into the history of it? Let me talk about this first. Let me read you this letter from the Oak and Laurel Cemetery Preservation Company and NOLA Cemetery Renewal. To Whom It May Concern, several weeks ago it was brought to our attention that the Francis Stewart monument located in downtown Hammond is slated for relocation in preparation of the upcoming community pavilion project. We are writing to respectfully ask that the Hammond Downtown Development District and other community leaders to reconsider the decision to relocate. As preservationists who specialize in monuments, our work is centered on respect for historic memory. The Stewart monument is such an example, it represents not only approximately 800 pounds of granite it also represents the memory of those who erected it. We understand that the Stewart monument has been compromised over time by reconstruction, re-inscription, and relocation but do not find this compromise to be an adequate justification for eliminating that integrity the monument still retains. Relocation out of site of the public does not honor the memory of Francis G. Stewart or the community that erected it. While*

we respect the DDD and that they consulted the state's historic preservation office, in relocation, we believe that moving the monument would not be cohesive to the spirit of the secretary of interior's standards for historic preservation. Specifically the relocation of the monument will remove important context. We are also concerned for the safety and preservation of the monument in the process of relocation. As monument experts we believe that this historic monument was reconstructed in the 1960s using modern cement and likely metal pins. The presence of these materials will complicate disassembly and likely to cause an element to be dropped or broken. If the monument is safely relocated we fear the new position will put it at constant risk of being toppled in the event of a storm or fallen limb. This is a safety issue that must be taken seriously. We believe the Hammond Downtown Development District may be missing an exciting opportunity to integrate the Stewart monument into the new community pavilion. From the current architect's renderings available online the ceiling height of the pavilion appears to be more than adequate to integrate the monument allowing it to be placed in a central location. In this configuration, the monument will retain its current position and continue to memorialize Stewart and keep its context be it in a safe and sheltered location and be part of a landscape where the old is not forsaken for the new. We appreciate your consideration and thoughts on this matter, Emily Ford owner of Oak and Laurel Preservation, LLC in New Orleans and Nick Black of NOLA Cemetery Renewal in LaPlace. The monument, we really haven't talked about how the monument will be moved, where it will be replaced, it is 800 lbs. of gray weiblen granite that was quarried in Stone Mountain Georgia. If you are familiar with Stone Mountain, and the sculpture that is there. The guy who did the sculpture was actually a quarry man and a lot of the marble that is in the cemeteries in Hammond and in New Orleans, is from that area. And you cannot get that marble today. So if we move the monument and the monument is broken and we have insurance it doesn't really matter because you will be replacing something and once something is gone, it is gone forever. So, where it is moved and how it is moved will be very important. The company, I believe Alfortish Marble a wonderful company and very reputable if you die tomorrow or ten years ago. But if you died more than 100 years ago they are not necessarily preservationists and they do not necessarily have the information on having the monument located and that really concerns me.

- *Ryan – Tom we had a special session where we had the actual mover of the monument come before us.*
- *Tom confirms this and that Alfortish is one of the biggest companies out of New Orleans. Ryan also confirms that Alfortish has experience in moving monuments of this size.*
- *Melanie Ricketts – Do they have experience in moving monuments that have been previously moved and damaged?*
- *Ryan – I do want to mention one thing. I appreciate your input Melanie, thank you. Speaking as someone who spends a lot of time on construction sites, I will tell you having the monument stay in place and building around it is a bad idea.*

- *Melanie Ricketts agrees with Ryan's statement.*
- *Jessica – Where is it going to go during construction?*
- *Tom – We are going to put it in place and build a foundation for it. They are going to come in and do that. The structural foundation of that is about 4 by 6 slab by 8 inches thick and at each corner there is a 9 inch round concrete pier that goes down.*
- *Jessica – So that (monument) is going to be on top of a foundation?*
- *Tom confirms that the monument will placed on top of a foundation to create a stronger base.*
- *Ryan confirms that the current foundation for the monument is currently placed underground and that is why you cannot see it.*
- *Tom – You are actually not going to see what is below grade because our pavers will come up.*
- *Jen White – Just around the base – regarding the pavers.*
- *Melanie Ricketts states that Alfortish is a reputable company but they are not preservationists and there is no way to know how the monument is reattached. And I have the information on that if ya'll want me to go over it.*
- *Tom states that they can have them (Alfortish) come back out if it would make Melanie feel better about the moving process. There are two to three different scenarios that could happen as they do not know what they are getting into until they start moving the monument.*
- *Melanie Ricketts – But they (Alfortish) don't know about the repair. If this was a regular monument and because the monument has been misinterpreted, and misunderstood, and that's why I think if ya'll are determining the future of this monument it is very important to understand the past. I would like to go through a really quick PowerPoint presentation that I have about the past if we have a couple of minutes.*
- *Ryan – Melanie, I appreciate your input but we have already been through a history of this monument with you and with others.*
- *Melanie Ricketts – No, I have never given a history of this monument and others don't know the history of this monument is. And if you don't want to hear about the past, that is fine, but I think it is very important for you to understand where the monument was originally, how it was moved, what happened when it was moved, and...*
- *Ryan – We have heard the history but maybe not to the level of you telling it but we have heard this in the past.*
- *Melanie Ricketts – If you do not want to hear it that's fine but you will be making a decision based on something that you don't understand and that is troublesome.*
- *Tom states that today is not about the monument it is just about a change of materials and the color of the pavilion.*
- *Shauna – I would like to hear what she is saying, the amount of time we spent, she (Melanie) could have been finished. That's just my opinion.*

- *Tom – Ryan, could I ask that we move forward with the application contingent on the method and procedure on how the monument is moved? We can come back to another meeting to explain that with the monument company.*
- *Jen White states that you are correct in referencing the special session stating that the monument will now be relocated between the DDD office and the pavilion on the Railroad Avenue side.*
- *Howard – Well if it was a work session it wouldn't be approved.*
- *Jen White – No, this was a special session where we vote and approve on applications. Jen continues to state that today's application has extra stuff not on the application and that is where her concern is as she is not totally positive what all of that extra stuff is.*
- *Tom states that the commission does not want to know all the details that are changing such as items hidden behind the walls as all of that is value engineering.*
- *Jen White – I am trying to mentally walk this line between what has been changed and being comfortable on making a decision about something and making sure that I clearly understand what's happening without taking eight pages for you to detail every single thing. To me personally, removing the pavers is a big change that I am surprised is not on the application. So when we get to deciding about it that should be amended and added to the application but I am also trying to figure out if there is anything else that is a big enough thing that needs to be detailed on the application. I'd hate to make a decision on an application when there is something in a picture that I wasn't aware of and is of substantial change because we didn't mention it on the application. The pavers definitely need to be mentioned on the application.*
- *Tom – points out other areas where pavers were going and are no longer going to be placed.*
- *Ryan confirms that they are moving pavers from underneath the tree.*
- *Jen White – It is important to know what we are detailing.*
- *Tom – Again it is the building is what the Historic District should be concerned with.*
- *Jen White – We absolutely have guidelines about green space and so pavers do fall under our purview and were something we approved before so if it is changing we should review it.*
- *Tom – I will say that there has been some miscellaneous paver removal per the submitted site plan and it is up to you guys to look at the site plan to make sure you are ok with it.*
- *Jen White – There were a lot of things like that, that we weren't sure were approved and what was changing. So we are just trying to make an accurate and detailed description of what is different.*
- *Susan confirms that the width of the sidewalk is 6 feet at the street.*
- *Howard – I would like to make a comment about the monument. Ms. Ricketts has worked with this commission for years and I think we owe her a hearing. Now it does not have to be a hearing today, how long is your presentation?*
- *Melanie Ricketts – It is not long at all. I can try to keep it down to 10 minutes.*

- *Howard – I was wondering if we could ask her to come to our next meeting and make that presentation about the monument and we could invite the movers and deal with all of the monument business at our next meeting.*
- *Ryan – Tom what is your timeline?*
- *Tom – Really this was just the last approval other than waiting on review for some drainage.*
- *Howard – Well could we not approve without reference to the monument?*
- *Jen White – Well there’s nothing in this application about the monument.*
- *Tom – The new monument location has already been approved. This is confirmed by the commission what is outstanding is the method of movement.*
- *Tom – We have not advertised this or gone to bid. We just want to check off all of the boxes and ya’ll were the last ones we needed to go to.*
- *Howard – Well could we do a special session for that?*
- *Ryan agrees that a special session could be called as there are a lot of concerns surrounding the movement of the monument.*
- *Melanie Ricketts – I feel that the decision made on the monument was made without all of the information. And I am opposed to moving the monument and I am also concerned about the space as part of the historical landscape. I have more concerns than just the monument being moved. This has never been in my opinion the best space for the pavilion.*
- *Ryan – I understand that but we have moved beyond that argument at this point.*
- *Melanie Ricketts – But my feedback is that those decisions were made without having all of the information. And in the city ordinance that is the regulation for the Historic District Commission is that it shall have the purpose and promotion of the educational, cultural, economic, and general welfare of the public through the preservation and protection of all buildings, sites, monuments, and structures of historic interest and importance through the protection and maintenance and development of historic landmarks. And I just think the decision that you made prior was made without having all the information about that and I think it should be considered. I would be glad to come back, I will always talk about this but I think that the information that you were given before was not complete.*
- *Ryan – I am going to move that we amend the application to include the completion of the paver area around the monument and the alley as noted on the revised site plan.*
- *Tom – At this point we want to actually get it in budget so that it will happen and then we can take the next steps.*
- *Motion to amend application as presented, by Ryan Faulk. Second by Jessica Shirey.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Shauna Seals (A), Howard Nichols (Y), Susan Owens (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), Ryan Faulk (Y), and Jen White (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved to Amend: 6-1*
 - *Ralph Ross – It is no secret that I have not been a fan of this project. Originally my greatest objection was the site and I still think there are some unanswered questions about whether or not this can be done without violating the terms of*

the dedication or donation of this property to the city. But that is not really a consideration of yours and this still has to go before City Council to be approved. My first concern is that I have mentioned before is that it is going to overwhelm the site now that is just my trying to picture it in my mind. We are only seeing pictures of it from one perspective. The application as linked that had other pictures of the site. I would love to see other perspectives of the rendering showing the site. I think you are going to be driving into town and where you have an open space now and will have a huge building that will block the sun. We have only seen one rendering. The first rendering was to actually see it from that perspective. Tom states that the perspective has not been changed. Ralph continues to state that it is too big for the site. Another thing that I have mentioned is the zoning for this particular site is MX-CBD states that it has to have a front facing entrance. My comment has been blown off because you can say that you can enter from anywhere. But if you show this to anybody they will say the entrance is on the end and not facing the street. It is also in the zoning that requires a 5 foot setback from any alley now these things can go before planning and zoning and I don't think any of these have been addressed.

- *Tom – states that these things have been addressed. It is not an alley it is a city service street. Since it is open on three sides it is a pavilion, you can call all three sides an entrance facing the street.*
- *Ralph Ross - The other thing is that it is a community pavilion but it is primarily being sold as a farmer's market.*
- *Tom – No it is not it is a community pavilion.*
- *Ralph Ross- If you Google for a farmer's market 90% of them are tents. It is not a new project but you are going out to bid as a new project and how many times in the business world you try to push something forward and you got to change this or that the text books and experience say you step back and look at in total as a new project. The changes here and there and it is up to you all and decide – the last time you all looked at it, there were four people absent so it was approved by three votes and if I remember correctly it was like pulling teeth to get Shauna to approve it and it was hard to get Howard to participate. I am not trying to put words in your mouths but I don't think this project is supported by many people. And I think you are being bullied and moving forward with this little change and that little change and with that I will end my comments.*
- *Ryan – And as we said before at the special session meeting was a monument discussion and they provided the mover to explain to the commission the process.*
- *Jen White – I was not at that meeting it was added to the special session meeting rather quickly. It was something I was comfortable about and something I expressed with the commission I wanted to be there for. So there has been some discussion on our end on what qualifies as a special session especially on big projects like this where there are people with lots of concerns.*
- *Tom – I want to go on record to sincerely state that the term “bully,” Ryan you know as architects we are hired as the spokes people so I get the opportunity to come up and explain the design. I know we have been through this project for*

three or four years. I don't think we are bullying anyone into anything. I just want to go on record that this is a little unfair.

- *Ryan – There was a motion on the floor. The motion was to approve the application as amended. The amendment was to identify the pavers from the area of the site from the alley and around the monument as noted on the site plan and rendering.*
 - *Motion to approve as amended, by Ryan Faulk. Second by Jessica Shirey.*
 - *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Shauna Seals (A), Howard Nichols (A), Susan Owens (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), Ryan Faulk (Y), and Jen White (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved Amended Application: 5-2*
-
- *Ryan – We will invite the DDD to our next scheduled meeting and hopefully include the mover and we will also make time for Melanie's presentation to us.*
 - *Jessica Shirey – I think it is important that we include everyone in the process.*
 - *Melanie Ricketts confirms that this is the next meeting on March 20th. This is confirmed by the commission.*
-
- **Updates From Director:**
 - **Compliance Update**
 - **Banners**
 - **Main Street Dance – 119 S. Cypress; received a violation letter on November 29, 2017 and have yet to address temporary sign painted on window**
 - *Will send letter letting them know they have a temporary sign and these are the HD's rules and let's try to get some more permanent signage.*
 - **Anytime Fitness – new banner on front of building**
 - **Moving Lights**
 - **Sweet Rolls – blinking/moving lights underneath overhang**
 - **Rustic Treasures – moving lights in windows**
 - *Is it moving lights or moving signage? What is the difference between moving lights and moving signs? This was also talked about the TV in the windows. Need to check the UDC. Will be talked about at retreat day.*
 - **200 N. Cate – Seal and Ross; Work without COA**
 - *Can approve if it in kind repairs – COA given.*
 - **123 S. Cate – old Iron Horse; COA was given and approved in office due to rain in the building. New TPO roof is being installed and no added parapets or structures the profile will stay the same. And we have allowed TPO roofs in the district and the material is different from what they have but we have approved this type of roof.**
 - **Should we add how long a COA is good for back to an application?**
 - **This will be added; it used to be on the guidelines and has been omitted in the new revision.**
 - **Added Funding Opportunities to Website**
 - **Federal Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit**
 - **State Commercial Tax Credit**
 - **Façade Grant – DDD**
 - **Revolving Loan – DDD**
 - **Historic District & Tangipahoa 150th Celebration**

- Instagram Campaign and Partnership with HRAC
- Budget
 - Good standing – \$3K left in budget
- *Ralph Ross – Apologizes for calling someone a bully during his public input.*
- **Adjournment:**
 - Motion to Adjourn by Howard Nicholls and seconded by Susan Owens.
 - Vote: Ryan Faulk (Y), Jessica Shirey (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), Susan Owens (Y), Shauna Seals (Y), and Jen White (Y)
 - Motion Approved: 7-0