MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP: HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING: Thursday, May 16, 2019, 1:30 p.m., Conference Room 214, 2nd Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Melissa Gengler, Jim Johnson, Greg McCown and Jim McKee; Liz Bavitz and Greg Newport absent.

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Ed Zimmer, Stacey Hageman and Teresa McKinstry of the Planning Department; and Jonathan Camp.

STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING: Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Chair McCown called the meeting to order and acknowledged the posting of the Open Meetings Act in the room.

McCown requested a motion approving the minutes for the meeting of April 18, 2019. Motion for approval made by Johnson, seconded by Gengler and carried 4-0: Gengler, Johnson, McCown and McKee voting ‘yes’; Bavitz and Newport absent.

The opportunity was given for persons with limited time or with an item not appearing on the agenda to address the Commission. No one appeared.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR WORK AT THE APOTHECARY BUILDING, 801 P STREET, IN THE HAYMARKET LANDMARK DISTRICT (UDR18072)

PUBLIC HEARING: May 16, 2019

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

Ed Zimmer stated that the west lights were installed and were successful. Because the Commission formally considered and denied a request on the north lights and since the 90 day waiting period has lapsed, the applicant can install the lights as he proposed. Zimmer observed that what the applicant asked for—highlighting features on the north front—will still be tricky with a street light on the corner. The lighting effect won’t be as pronounced as on the west. The north side doesn’t have a big canopy to conceal fixtures. We don’t want to see a lot of arms coming out. The applicant wants to address how this could be lit.

Jonathan Camp is also working on trying to figure out a lighting system for the lettering
“Apothecary” that is both minimal in any visual distraction from the building, but also able to wash up the letters. Zimmer suggested the MacPractice building sign for a backlit lettering example. That looks great. He doesn’t know if they have enough space or what the cost would entail. He wondered if there was some way to create a halo effect by using an LED that backlights somehow. Brendan from Voss Lighting was unable to attend today. They are still investigating the lighting. They don’t have a concrete solution. There is the nice ability to minimize any conduit runs and attach to the building north and west facades by coming off the building to the east and run power up about five feet above the roof and wraparound the ledge. That is what they are trying to do.

McCown inquired if each of the letters could be lit from the inside. Camp believes so, it would be a matter of cost. McCown questioned how the letters are attached now. Camp believes they are attached to the mortar. McCown wanted to know if there is any space behind them. Camp believes there is some space, he doesn’t know how much. Zimmer added that it might be enough to just light the building on one face.

Camp asked what the Commission’s views are regarding the aesthetic of having the plate covering the brick, versus covering the individual letters. Zimmer believes it is fairly inconspicuous. The applicant may want to check on the cost of doing the north and west. The north could be enough.

McCown wanted to know what the chance is of the two uplights on the north being enough to catch the light. Camp acknowledged that is what they were hoping for, but he is unsure if it will work. Zimmer believes there will be less light throw on the north. Camp wondered if canopy lights could be done on the west. He also wondered about goosenecks illuminating from the top. Zimmer responded that it could be well worth asking the sign company about. He believes the applicant should ask their company about downlighting as well.

McCown stated that it feels to him that lighting would almost modernize the sign. Zimmer noted that is what this effect was supposed to look like, an older bronze. If the point is cost threshold, the lighting as it is, works.

Zimmer would solve the pilaster lighting on the other side first, and see what the effect is.

Camp noted they could also work on more illumination of the canopy down below and utilize that as more of an identification.

Gengler agrees with some of the statements that have been said. She thinks the lighting as it is now is good. Perhaps lighting the sign panels down below would be enough. The value of those signs is more from a pedestrian or vehicle level. Lighting of the banding at the top may not be necessary.
The applicant had some questions about the brick and mortar. Gengler would recommend the applicant look into contacting Sara Holder at ProSoCo. They do masonry cleaning. They specialize in different treatments that are specific to historic buildings. She would caution against power washing. It could cause damage to the adjacent brick. Typically, the feds would recommend not more than 400 psi. Most contractors are going to laugh at anything lower than 1000 psi. She believes they will provide test bottles of some cleaners to check out.

There was further discussion regarding the brick.

Camp will take the Commissioners’ suggestions and talk to his lighting person. Perhaps some funds can be spent on other projects and the lighting as it is, is good.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.