

## MEETING RECORD

**NAME OF GROUP:** HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

**DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:** Thursday, September 19, 2019, 1:30 p.m., Conference Room 214, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Lincoln, Nebraska.

**MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE** Melissa Gengler, Jim Johnson, Greg McCown, Liz Bavitz, Jim McKee and Nancy Hove-Graul; (Greg Newport absent).

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE** Ed Zimmer, Stacey Hageman, Rhonda Haas of the Planning Department; the media and other interested citizens.

**STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING:** Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Chair McCown called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and acknowledged the posting of the Open Meetings Act in the room.

Nancy Hove-Graul, newly appointed Historic Preservation Commission member, introduced herself. She stated that she was born and raised in Nebraska. She shared that she went to the University of Nebraska where she received her Bachelor's Degree in Architecture, and then went to Virginia where she received her Master's. In 2000 she moved back to Nebraska with her husband and twins, and has been involved in community activities since her return.

McCown requested a motion approving the minutes for the meeting of August 15, 2019. Motion for approval made by McKee, seconded by Bavitz and carried 6-0: Gengler, Johnson, McCown, Hove-Graul, Bavitz and McKee voting 'yes'; 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 803 Q STREET, THE HUBER BUILDING, IN THE HAYMARKET LANDMARK DISTRICT**

#### **PUBLIC HEARING:**

**September 19, 2019**

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

Matt Will, Studio 951 Architects, 800 P Street, came forward and gave the group graphic material (see Exhibit #1) that reference a number of changes that have been made to the

original plans. He shared that there were five items that he would be discussing in regards to this project. First, the awnings have been removed from the building as seen in the new plan. Second, at the last meeting there was discussion on the rooftop structures. He explained in order to support the roof deck in the way that they are wanting, it will required 2 means of egress, and he stated that it is appropriate to have the elevator access that level as well. He further explained that for those structures they will try to match the building's brick, but do know it will not be a perfect match. He stated that there was discussion about the pergola at the last meeting, and changes to that structure account for his items 3, 4 and 5. He stated that the pergola has been lowered and its structure has been pushed back to allow for more open area above the roof decks. He shared that instead of beams and joist not in the same plane, they were brought into the same plane, which gives it a sleeker and cleaner appearance. And lastly, the divider walls between the private deck space I will be lower and not seen from the ground.

Johnson stated that the design revision result in a plan better than the original one and it addresses his concerns.

**ACTION:**

Bavitz moved approval, seconded by Johnson.

Gengler abstained due to a conflict of interest.

Zimmer stated Haymarket, past and present, is full of things on top of buildings. He recommended this design appears to stay within the range and spirit of Haymarket's industrial buildings.

McKee stated that it he likes that this has been setback and is less visible from the street. And he further stated he likes that it is more industrial and less modern.

McCown stated that it has an elegance to it that the first version did not have, and he shared this is more streamlined and a little more subtle.

Motion carried 5-0: Members present: Hove-Graul, Johnson, McCown, Bavitz and McKee voting 'yes'; Gengler abstained; Newport absent.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR 800 Q STREET, THE "TOOL HOUSE" BUILDING, IN THE HAYMARKET LANDMARK DISTRICT**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**September 19, 2019**

Zimmer stated with this project is new sign faces for the frame on the corner, and that this would be the third face on this frame, which is rather different from the others.

McKee inquired if the gooseneck lighting was new.

Wally Steil, CBS Signs, 3415 N. 44<sup>th</sup> Street, stated this was not new, and the gooseneck lighting will aim down at the lower panel. All of the work will be done onsite and non-invasive, and they will not need to remove the sign frame.

Zimmer stated that the sign consists of an inscription and a logo, which is consistent with other approved signs in the district, hence he recommends this for approval.

Steil stated that they would be using ½ inch thick acrylic with 1 inch stand-offs and the only illumination will be the gooseneck lighting.

**ACTION:**

McKee moved approval, seconded by Johnson.

Motion carried 6-0: Members present: Hove-Graul, Johnson, McCown, Bavitz, Gengler and McKee voting 'yes'; Newport absent.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR TIFERETH PLACE APARTMENTS, A DESIGNATED LANDMARK AT 344 SOUTH 18<sup>TH</sup> STREET**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**September 19, 2019**

Zimmer stated this is just a clean-up. They are wanting new awnings, which are feature installed in the 1980s adaptive reuse. The new awnings will not alter any historic elements and merely represent an on-going interpretation of a minor added feature to this building.

Mike Rierden, 402 Lakeview Way, stated that they have worked on this project for a long time and looked at a lot of different colors, and further stating that black was the most attractive color.

McKee inquired if the awning frames are the same as what is being used now, or if it will be new frames. Zimmer stated that he understood that the original frames will be used for the awnings.

**ACTION:**

McKee moved approval, seconded by Hove-Graul.

Motion carried 6-0: Members present: Hove-Graul, Johnson, McCown, Bavitz, Gengler and McKee voting 'yes'; Newport absent.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR DELRAY BALLROOM, 817 R STREET, IN THE HAYMARKET LANDMARK DISTRICT**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**September 19, 2019**

Shelly Fritz, 817 R Street, stated that in 2005 the building had a new roof put on and was fully tuckpointed. She stated that now they are wanting to dress up the front of the building. She explained that with the awning they would like to change the color to black from their current color. She shared that the paint on the brick building is fading and now you can slightly see a sign from years prior that was painted on the side of the building, and they are wanting to paint "DelRay Ballroom" on the building over where the paint is barely visible.

McKee inquired about the lettering that is barely visible. Fritz stated that it is very faded and she has not been able to figure out what it once said.

Zimmer stated that seldom would they try to reconstruct a sign, unless it was totally gone and did not interfere with the current business having that identification on it.

Hove-Graul asked about painting dancers on the side of the building. Fritz stated that would be a secondary thought. She stated after driving around she had wondered if the City would be willing to let her have a mural painted on the west side of the building.

McKee inquired about the three hanging lights that are down facing and thought that should be a second item to review. Fritz explained that the white and black painting would be the first request, and then second, would be the lighting, and then the possibility of having a painted mural, third.

Gengler asked if she was switching the color of the awnings from green to black. Fritz said yes.

McKee said that he would want to see the mural prior to deciding. Fritz stated that she first wanted to see if this was something that would be viable. Hove-Graul inquired if they are wanting to paint something on the brick. Fritz said correct.

McCown stated as the brick paint is wearing more of the sign is starting to show through. Fritz said yes, on the front of the building. McCown stated in time more of the sign might become more visible, and wondered if their sign could be brought out and have a structure, so that it does not destroy what could potentially be there as it ages more.

Zimmer offered his opinion that when an old painted sign is legible, even if it is faded, it can have value when you can read enough to get a sense of the passage of time and the earlier uses. Those do have value. When a "ghost sign" is illegible, the value is more questionable.

Gengler asked if the façade has been painted. Fritz stated that it has been painted.

Gengler stated that if it is painted and your intent is to paint a new sign, she asked what they needed to do to the existing paint or to the surface of the brick to prepare for the application of the painted new sign. Fritz stated that she is wanting to get a company that has done this before.

Gengler stated that the idea of the painted sign, with being able to see where the past sign was, and if you have prep work to remove it is important to make sure that who does the work is well versed on how it needs to be prepped so they do not damage the brick. She further stated that you would not want to use something abrasive on the brick or chemicals that could be damaging to the hard fired face of the brick or mortar. Fritz stated that is what she has been working on.

Gengler stated that the design is appropriate and likes the new color of the awnings, with the simple façade without much detail pulls it all together for a historical look.

Hove-Graul stated to attach the 3 lights, she would recommend to attach along the very top of the sign and not the cornice of the building and that everything needs to be below the cornice. Gengler stated that it is appropriate if you stay away from any ornamental and detailed brickwork that is not the regular coursing of the facade.

Zimmer stated that over the windows there are rowlock arches of chipped bricks, which adds a different texture and projection to that detail.

McCown asked if there was a product that can prep the brick without having to remove the old paint. Gengler said that there is a company in Kansas City, that does a lot of these and they do specialize in stone and masonry materials. She further stated that typically the recommendation would be for a chemical removal, rather than an abrasive removal. The area will need to be completely dry before applying the paint, and if done correctly the first time with touch-ups it will hopefully have some longevity.

Gengler inquired if making a motion on this item there would need to be 2 separate motions. The first, with the signage on the front, and second, the potential for a mural or ornamental paint on the side of the building.

Johnson said that he would not want to approve without seeing the design. McKee stated that there should be 2 separate motions.

Zimmer stated you could do the north façade as one, and west façade as a separate issue.

**ACTION:**

Gengler moved to approve the signage on the north side as presented with the comments that

were provided in regards to the lighting and the size of the signs, seconded by Johnson.

Fritz stated that she would like to know what font had been used in the past to use for her sign. Zimmer stated that she could contact Stacey Hageman on the font.

Gengler stated that Ebbeka Design Co. located above The Mill, might be able to help with the historic font.

Modified Motion carried 6-0: Members present: Hove-Graul, Johnson, McCown, Bavitz, Gengler and McKee voting 'yes'; Newport absent.

Gengler moved motion that the concept and area identified for a painted mural, pending the approval of the content by the Historic Preservation Commission, seconded by McKee.

Modified Motion carried 6-0: Members present: Hove-Graul, Johnson, McCown, Bavitz, Gengler and McKee voting 'yes'; Newport absent.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR THE WOODS BROS. COMPANIES BUILDING, A DESIGNATED LANDMARK AT 132 S. 13<sup>TH</sup> STREET**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**September 19, 2019**

Zimmer stated this applicant uses this area as their office space and they would like to put up a sign with their company name on it: Moose Roofing.

Hove-Graul inquired of the arches were removed or if they were just underneath. Zimmer stated that he thought that they were gone. McKee stated that with the shadow that is present he would be curious to see what is behind it.

Zimmer stated that they need Commission approval of a certificate of appropriateness to proceed with a sign.

Gengler commented about the logo on the website, and asked if the applicant could come back with more options that would give them more choices to discuss. She stated that the logo on the webpage is more effective. She suggested the applicant should come back with a sign that works better with the size, scale and design of the building.

Hove-Graul stated that they need to come back with a sign that historically complements, and incorporates their logo with the building, so that does not conflict. She stated that the current sign is too modern and they would like to discuss with the applicant more historic options.

Zimmer stated with the guidelines that are in place for signs, the Commission could find that this sign does not meet those standards. This building does have a historic name, and the

applicant's sign is bigger and bolder than the name that is on the building, and the applicant needs to take this into account. He stated that the Commission can ask that they come back with more options.

**ACTION:**

Gengler moved that the sign does not meet guidelines as proposed and the applicant should come back to HPC with a design more appropriate to the scale and the specifics of the building where they are located, seconded by Johnson.

McCown stated that they should bring back different design options that can be discussed. Gengler stated they should have signs with logo from website included.

Motion carried 6-0: Members present: Hove-Graul, Johnson, McCown, Bavitz, Gengler and McKee voting 'yes'; Newport absent.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR THE RAYMOND BROS. BUILDING, 801 O STREET, IN THE HAYMARKET LANDMARK DISTRICT**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**September 19, 2019**

Ryan Haffey, Nebraska Signs, stated this for a new canopy to be installed to on the west side of the building and the requested sign will require no new attachment to the building. The sign will be painted on the inside, along with the lighting. He stated that the Commission has approved numerous similar signs like this sign.

Zimmer stated this is not red and blue plastic, this is a black sign cabinet, which is internally illuminated with white LEDs. McKee inquired if it was their logo on the sign. Zimmer stated that it is the logo for the company.

**ACTION:**

Johnson moved approval, seconded by Gengler.

McKee stated that it looks like the sign sets at an angle. Haffey said that the sign looks that way because of the rendering.

Motion carried 6-0: Members present: Hove-Graul, Johnson, McCown, Bavitz, Gengler and McKee voting 'yes'; Newport absent.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR THE PEPPERBERG CIGAR BUILDING, 815 O STREET, IN THE HAYMARKET LANDMARK DISTRICT**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**September 19, 2019**

Zimmer stated this business is on the second floor and asked for the sign on the third floor. The sign is black-painted wooden backing, with individual silver-colored metal letters attached, and "HAYMARKET" printed below. He explained that the sign is an approved type and size, although it is recommended that the sign should be on the second floor where the business is located, and they will need to take down the old banner.

**ACTION:**

McKee moved approval of the sign on the second floor, seconded by Bavitz.

Motion carried 6-0: Members present: Hove-Graul, Johnson, McCown, Bavitz, Gengler and McKee voting 'yes'; Newport absent.

**MISCELLANEOUS:**

**STAFF REPORT:**

Zimmer stated that Stacey went to the NAPC (National Alliance of Preservation Commissions) training on Friday, and Zimmer, Jim and Greg attended the training on Saturday. He stated that there were 15 representatives, with more from communities that are not yet Certified Local Governments, than from those that are. He stated that the presenters were 3 individuals from Madison, Georgia; Denver, Colorado; and the last was from several locations. Zimmer complimented our HPC for participating and said the presentations had balance and good information.

McCown stated that the discussion on standards was interesting, and he stated with some of the buildings, the biggest challenge what standard should they be held to. He stated that it will need to be case by case, because it will change with the different sites.

Zimmer stated that he traveled to Washington to see the Standing Bear statue unveiled in the U. S. Capitol. He stated that the statue is very impressive in its design and its height--10 feet tall. He noted it has a very prominent placement in Statuary Hall.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:01 p.m.