Chair McCown called the meeting to order and announced the Open Meetings Act posted at the back of the room.

McCown requested a motion approving the minutes for the meeting of February 21, 2019. Motion for approval made by Johnson, seconded by Newport and carried, 5-0: Hewitt, Johnson, McKee, Newport and McCown voting ‘yes’; Bavitz and Gengler absent.

The opportunity was given for persons with limited time or with an item not appearing on the agenda to address the Commission.

**REQUEST FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR SIGNS AT THE BURGESS HOUSE, A DESIGNATED LANDMARK AT 6501 SW 40TH STREET.**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**  
**March 21, 2019**

Members present: Hewitt, Johnson, McCown, McKee and Newport; Bavitz and Gengler absent.

McCown wondered how long the Burgess House has been operating. McKee said it has been a few years now.

McKee commented that most business for bed and breakfasts does not come from people driving by. The main reason to have a sign is to help customers who are in the general area to locate the home.

Hageman said the operators are proposing to add this sign just north of their driveway along SW 40th Street. Their special permit allows them to place it closer to the street than typically allowed by the sign ordinance.

McKee asked if whether the sign is oriented east/west; that could be a waste unless one is already in the driveway. He also wondered if the sign is single or double faced. Hageman said the sign is
two-sided. The applicants made it sound like it is oriented towards people coming from the south. It is also tucked into some existing evergreens. McKee commented that he is not familiar with traffic patterns along this road. McCown said Denton Road is to the south.

**ACTION:**

McKee moved for approval, seconded by Johnson and carried, 5-0: Hewitt, Johnson, McKee, Newport and McCown voting ‘yes’; Bavitz and Gengler absent.

**REQUEST FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR WORK AT THE PEPPERBERG BUILDING, 812 O STREET, IN THE HAYMARKET LANDMARK DISTRICT.**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

March 21, 2019

Members present: Hewitt, Johnson, McCown, McKee and Newport; Bavitz and Gengler absent.

McCown commented that he read the minutes from the previous month. He could not figure out how HPC felt about this project, other than that there was a preference to delay action until the property owner was present. Newport said the main concern was the disregard for process on the part of the owners before the door was installed. A second concern was that HPC could not comment on the appearance of the door in historic context since the process was ignored. Johnson agreed that was the general tone of the comments.

McKee asked the applicant why the process was ignored.

Jessica Lindersmith, Vice President of Operations at US Property, stated there are no excuses. They hired a contractor they have worked with previously under the assumption they would pull the proper permits and go through the process. She was “hands off” on this project due to the fact that it was a relatively minor change compared with others they work on. She has learned her lesson. There was no intentional decision to ignore process or to avoid seeking approval from this body. She takes full responsibility since they are ultimately in charge when it comes to choosing contractors to do work.

McCown said that the main difference he sees in the installed door is that it appears a brick skirt was removed to accommodate the overhead door. Lindersmith said the walkthrough door existed. She provided photos of other examples of similar doors located in the Haymarket. There is not much pedestrian traffic at this location, which is under the overpass. In their opinion, the door they selected was the most similar to the windows with aluminum. That decision was made prior to the lessee, Tomahawk’s, leasing the space. They have found someone to operate the kitchen in the space. McCown asked for clarification that the kitchen was necessary to use the café tables outdoors. Lindersmith said that is correct.

Hewitt asked if any contact was made with the contractor about why he failed to get the necessary permits and approvals. Lindersmith said she has made efforts and is not getting much
feedback. She was told they had submitted images for the last HPC meeting which obviously turned out not to be the case. Unfortunately, they did not give a reason. Hewitt asked if there will be any punitive action taken. Lindersmith said she is taking things one step at a time now and wants to get through this portion of approvals first. Then she will work with the contractor about several things.

McCown asked for a description of the timeline for how all of this occurred. He specifically wondered if it was installed for Tomahawk’s or if was for the prior user. Lindersmith said they contacted the contractor to install the door many months ago. That contractor had taken out a month to month occupancy of this location to function as a temporary overflow area. US Property thought this door would be a good addition to market the space; they have struggled to acquire and keep tenants in the location. This seemed like a good direction to try to get new life to the front of the building and to appeal to a different group. Tomahawk was looking for a space around this time, but the new door had already been ordered. McCown said he had wondered who was behind the idea to change the storefront. It is clear now that the management company requested the change and then turned it over to the contractor to do the work. Lindersmith agreed that was the case.

Newport asked why they chose the overhead door. Lindersmith said that since they are tucked under the viaduct, they hope it will bring more visibility to the location. A space with indoor/outdoor space is more desirable to prospective commercial tenants. Newport asked if this was a way to get around the smoking ordinance. Lindersmith said no, all of their properties are non-smoking.

Hewitt said he is not looking for an apology, but he wonders why this was trusted to the contractor if it was such an important project. Lindersmith agreed she should have paid more attention. She had other projects that drew her attention, but knows that is not an excuse.

McCown asked how long the lease of Tomahawk’s is. Lindersmith said it is a 3-year lease, though they are not off to a smooth start. Hewitt asked if they have provided insurance coverage. Lindersmith said yes.

Newport said there is no need to overreact to this situation since there is a precedent for using this type of overhead door in the area, but he also wants to be careful not to underreact due to the precedent aspect of this. The design should have been evaluated as to how it relates to the area. He generally has a negative reaction to it, though he sees the commercial value in making sure the space is utilized successfully. McCown agreed that they want to create relevance to make sure they can attract tenants, but it is also important to view the historical context of the location.

McCown asked if the new tenant is requesting any changes, noting that the lighting in the area is not great. There are some parts of the storefront that could become an eyesore. Lindersmith said there is some neon lighting that is deteriorating. She does not know when that was installed or
if it was approved, but it can certainly be removed.

Hewitt asked if there is a lease with the contractor. Lindersmith said they have a month to month arrangement, and they gave discounted rent in exchange for work. The storefront is obviously dirty right now. The lighting is something she has noticed.

McKee asked if there is another door on the right side of the overhead door. Lindersmith said it is an egress door.

Newport asked if the current step is to seek the approval of HPC. Lindersmith said yes. McCown said HPC will have to choose whether to approve the change retroactively to allow for things to be done properly from here on out. He also sees this as an opportunity to comment on the appearance as a whole in order to get the entire storefront looking better.

Newport asked about signage. Lindersmith said there will be no additional signage. McCown asked if the tenant had contacted HPC about the sign. Hageman said it was just a face-change to an existing, previously approved sign cabinet. She and Ed Zimmer reviewed it and felt if was consistent with the Commission’s previous approval.

McCown asked if the railing panels surrounding the patio will be repaired. McKee wondered if the panels were intended for signage. Lindersmith said it is possible there were no panels when the railing was installed.

McKee commented that the new door is not as out of character as he thought it might be. It is black and fits into the industrial character of the area. Hewitt commented that he would like to see a clearer picture of what the finished exterior will look like. On the other hand, he does not wish to penalize the owners who have at least made the effort to be present today. He wondered what the impact of further delay would be. McCown thought they could still operate. Newport asked if the tenants have an occupancy permit. Lindersmith said she does not know. Newport commented that there are a lot of loose ends the tenant needs to resolve.

McKee asked whether there are other changes planned on the façade. Lindersmith said there is nothing else planned. She asked what HPC members are looking for. McCown reiterated this could be a chance to examine the rest of the look of the façade and fine tune it so it is more attractive. McKee asked if changes are ultimately up to the tenants or the owners. Lindersmith said the owners.

McKee suggested waiting to see what is in mind for the upper window and other aspects of the façade. Lindersmith said she is confused as to what the Commission is requesting. She can remove the board with the neon to see what is underneath, but that would result in coming back again to report on it, and asking again what else should be done. She does not feel that she has been given adequate direction. McKee said they would like to see the finished concept as the owners see it.
Newport wondered if the lighting issue is being addressed. Lindersmith said there is no plan to change the lighting. That would be adding an element that was not there previously. McCown said they are looking for something to make the overall space look better and less like a patchwork of all of the old uses that have occupied the space. Even with the new door, it could get back to a more historic look.

McKee asked whether the owners see this façade as completed, as it stands now. Lindersmith said yes. If they did anything, it would be to remove the old neon tube. They wanted to avoid removing the horizontal piece at the top because they do not know what is underneath it. McCown would like to have that investigated. It could be covering more brick. Lindersmith thought it could be glass. Lindersmith wondered if removal of the horizontal piece and the neon would need to come through HPC as a separate item, apart from the door today. McCown asked that it just be investigated.

Hageman asked if the building permit includes anything beyond the façade. Lindersmith said the permit is just for the door. Hageman said it is important to be sure other things are not being held up as the result of a delay. Lindersmith said the tenants are doing work to the interior, but today the permit is only for the door. Newport commented that if the dock is used for seating to serve food, it is likely more lighting will be needed, so it might be a good time to look into that. It is not necessarily a safety issue, it is just not as inviting.

Lindersmith said she cannot say what a plan will be until they find out what is under the horizontal feature. It concerns her that she does not know how to address issues without seeing what is behind it. McCown said it might be as simple as just having a contractor on a ladder to see what is behind it. Hageman said staff can be contacted if there are any concerns along the way.

The Commission took no further action.

RESOLUTION ON FY19 GRANT APPLICATION (GRANT PERIOD 06/01/2019 TO 05/31/2020) TO HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND OF U.S. DEPT. OF THE INTERIOR THROUGH NEBRASKA HISTORY.
PUBLIC HEARING: April 21, 2019

Members present: Hewitt, Johnson, Newport; McCown and McKee; Bavitz and Gengler absent.

Hageman said this is very similar to the request of previous years. Work will continue on the Story Map and other aspects of the program’s online presence, including Story Maps for tours. HPC’s endorsement is a requirement for submission of the application to History Nebraska.

McCown commented that he would like to see a link from the HPC page to a historic districts map.
ACTION:

Motion to recommend endorsement of the application and the submission of the application to the State made by McKee, seconded by Newport and carried, 5-0: Hewitt, Johnson, McKee, Newport and McCown voting ‘yes’; Bavitz and Gengler absent.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:18 p.m.