

**LAWRENCE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION  
AGENDA MEETING DECEMBER 18, 2014 6:30 PM  
ACTION SUMMARY**

---

Commissioners present: Arp, Bailey, Hernly, Quillin, Wachs, Williams  
Commissioners excused: Foster  
Staff present: Cargill, Zollner

---

**ITEM NO. 1: COMMUNICATIONS**

A. Receive communications from other commissions, State Historic Preservation Officer, and the general public.

Ms. Lynne Zollner said she did not have any communications. She introduced Katherine Simmons to the Commission.

B. Disclosure of ex-parte communications.

C. Declaration of abstentions for specific agenda items by commissioners.

Commissioner Hernly declared his abstention from Administrative Review DR-14-00461.

**ITEM NO. 2: CONSENT AGENDA**

A. September 18, 2014, October 16, 2014, and November 20, 2014 action summaries.

B. Administrative Approvals

**DR-14-00461** 720 E 9<sup>th</sup> Street; Exterior Alterations; State Law Review and Design Guidelines 8<sup>th</sup> and Penn Redevelopment Zone Review. The property is listed as non-contributing to the East Lawrence Industrial Historic District, National Register of Historic Places and is located in the 8<sup>th</sup> and Pennsylvania Conservation Overlay District. Submitted by Tom Larkin for 720 LLC, the property owner of record.

**DR-14-00463** 737 Connecticut Street; Plumbing Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness Review. The property is located in the environs of the Octavius McAllaster Residence (724 Rhode Island), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by H&H Air Conditioning and Heating for Timothy and Kristin Morland, the property owners of record.

**DR-14-00468** 1509 Stratford Road; Plumbing Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness Review. The property is located in the environs of the Fernand Strong House (1515 University Drive), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Learned Plumbing for Richard and Alma Lahm, the property owners of record.

**DR-14-00473** 512 E 9<sup>th</sup> Street; Building Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness Review. The property is located in the environs of the Green and Sidney Lewis House (820 New Jersey), Lawrence Register of

Historic Places. Submitted by Yueh Li Jean Kao for Hill Family Investments LLC, the property owner of record.

**DR-14-00475** 1109 Ohio Street; Electrical Permit; State Law Review and Certificate of Appropriateness Review. The property is listed as a contributing structure to the Oread Historic District, National Register of Historic Places and is located in the environs of the Oread Historic District, Lawrence Register of Historic Places and the E.H.S. Bailey Residence (1101 Ohio), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Sandra Hardie for John and Elaine Brewer, the property owners of record.

**DR-14-00476** 928 Rhode Island Street; Plumbing Permit; State Law Review and Certificate of Appropriateness Review. The property is listed as a contributing structure to the North Rhode Island Street Historic Residential District, National Register of Historic Places and is located in the environs of the McFarland House (940 Rhode Island), the Hendry House (941 Rhode Island) and the Shalor Eldridge Residence (945 Rhode Island), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Learned Plumbing for John Bodle, the property owner of record.

**DR-14-00477** 619 Massachusetts Street; Sign Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness Review and Downtown Design Guidelines Review. The property is located in the environs of the J.B. Shane Thompson Studio Building (615 Massachusetts), Lawrence Register of Historic Places and is located in the Downtown Urban Conservation Overlay District. Submitted by Lawrence Sign Up for Prime Blu on behalf of Bridgewater Company, the property owner of record.

**DR-14-00478** 904 Vermont Street; Sign Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness Review and Downtown Design Guidelines Review. The property is located in the environs of Plymouth Congregational Church (925 Vermont), Lawrence Register of Historic Places and the Downtown Urban Conservation Overlay District. Submitted by Lawrence Sign Up for Wheatfields Bakery on behalf of Mary O'Bryon Watson, Carol Rogichand Linda Droneburg, the property owners of record.

**DR-14-00480** 2812 Stone Barn Terrace; Plumbing Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness Review. The property is located in the environs of Grover Barn (2819 Stone Barn Terrace), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by All Star Plumbing for Freda McCord, the property owner of record.

**DR-14-00490** 729 Massachusetts Street; Sign Permit; State Law Review, Certificate of Appropriateness Review, and Downtown Design Guidelines Review. The property is listed as a contributing structure to Lawrence's Downtown Historic District, National Register of Historic Places, and is listed in the Lawrence Register of Historic Places. The property is also located in the environs of Miller's Hall (723-725 Massachusetts) and is located in the Downtown Urban Conservation

Overlay District. Submitted by Luminous Neon, Inc., for Ruff House Art on behalf of Kanwaka LLC, the property owner of record.

**DR-14-00491** 809 Vermont; Sign Permit; State Law Review and Downtown Design Guidelines Review. The property is listed in the National Register of Historic Places and is located in the Downtown Urban Conservation Overlay District. Submitted by Star Signs for BZAR on behalf of James Grimes, the property owner of record.

**DR-14-00492** 730 New Hampshire Street (4C); Electrical Permit; Certificate of Appropriateness Review. The property is located in the environs of the Octavius McAllaster Residence (724 Rhode Island), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Schrock Electrical for Allan and Louise Hanson, the property owners of record.

### **ACTION TAKEN**

Motioned by Commissioner Hernly, seconded by Commissioner Arp, to approve consent agenda items with the exception of Administrative Review DR-14-00461, pulled for separate vote.

Unanimously approved 5-0.

Motioned by Commissioner Arp, seconded by Commissioner Wachs, to confirm Administrative Review DR-14-00461.

Motion carried 4-0-1.

**ITEM NO.3:** DR-14-00479 706 Illinois Street; Demolition of Accessory Structure; Certificate of Appropriateness Review. The property is located in the environs of the John Robert Greenlees House, Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Haris Mehmedovic, the property owner of record.

**ITEM NO. 4:** DR-14-00495 1016 New York Street; Addition; Certificate of Appropriateness Review. The property is located in the environs of the German Methodist Episcopal Church (1000 New York), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Kent and Diane Fry for the Lance W. Burr Trust, the property owner of record.

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Ms. Zollner presented the item.

### **APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Mr. Kent Fry said the plan is to convert the four-bedroom rental property to a personal residence. He said their original plans included an attached garage and addition on the south elevation. He explained that staff felt it was more appropriate to have a detached garage, but they will maintain the carport for weather protection. He said there has been some significant settlement around the front door, which has caused some deflection in the lumber that's used in the transom and sidelight. He said he's not sure how old the existing transom and sidelight are, but when Lance Burr bought the property he replaced all the windows and doors. He said right now there's currently a one and a half inch opening under the door so they need to get

some energy efficiency and security. He agrees with staff about the porch elevation, and said they plan to close on the house in the morning pending Commission approval.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Dennis Brown, Lawrence Preservation Alliance (LPA), said the house was previously saved by Lance Burr and was in awful shape when he purchased it. He said Mr. Burr reached out to Park Hetzel to address some structural issues and was pleased with the work he performed. He said Mr. Burr was going to list locally- and it would have been approved this past Tuesday- but his trust officer pulled that approval, so they hope the structure can still be listed on the local register even after the proposed project. He thinks this house is very historic and critical to Lawrence history, particularly with the masonry (sandstone). He said the addition is ok, but he has concerns with the attached breezeway, porch, and porch roof. He asked what materials are proposed for the porch. He said he's glad the garage is detached, but doesn't know that breezeways show up in the environs as much. He said the garage would be the biggest accessory structure on the block, and although it wouldn't harm the listed property, it could set a precedent. He suggested the wraparound porch roof should go to the Architectural Review Committee, and feels a shallow porch or simple shed roof would be appropriate. He said if you walk south to north on the street you can see this façade. He added that he's glad to see this will be a single family home and someone will be caring for it. He hopes this will be a project that Mr. Burr would have approved of. He said he'd like to know if the house could be listed after the completed project.

Ms. KT Walsh said she is happy to hear that the Frys are preservationists. She said a former owner, before Lance Burr, allowed the kitchen ceiling to fall in, so she's glad it's in good hands now. She said breezeways are very uncommon in East Lawrence, but she understands the need for weather protection. She mentioned the tax credit incentives for listing on the State Register. She feels the garage is too big for the neighborhood, but is otherwise very pleased with the design.

### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Wachs asked if the applicant will list the property in the future.

Mr. Fry said they aren't familiar enough with the process and are unsure at this time.

Commissioner Bailey asked if it would be eligible for local listing after this project.

Ms. Zollner believes it would be eligible for local listing. She said Dennis Domer mentioned the evolution of structures and how they change over time, so using that context as a background for the addition, porch, and garage, she believes it would not preclude the property from being listed locally.

Commissioner Wachs asked if that included the breezeway.

Ms. Zollner said yes. She said breezeways are difficult because they are not common in this neighborhood but the alley is very eclectic and includes attached and detached garages, as well as several carports and a commercial property at the end.

Commissioner Quillin asked if that is for the local register.

Ms. Zollner said yes. She said even in its current state it would probably not be eligible for the National Register but possibly for the State Register with more history research. She mentioned that if Dennis Domer didn't find any more history there probably isn't any more out there.

Commissioner Arp said he understands why the porch wraps around because it covers an entrance. He asked if that will be the main entrance or just an additional entrance.

Mr. Fry said it is an additional entrance.

Commissioner Arp why the concrete porch floor is at grade, noting that it is uncommon.

Mr. Fry said they didn't intend it to be at grade in the plans- it will be at the height of the existing entry of the home.

Commissioner Arp asked if the existing steps will be incorporated.

Mr. Fry said the existing concrete steps may have to be removed but there will be steps up to the porch just below the elevation of the front door.

Commissioner Hernly said he thinks it's a great project and appreciates that they're converting a rental into a single-family residence. He doesn't think the proposed significantly affects the listed property, although there are some small design issues. He said the front porch at a four foot dimension is pretty narrow for this location. He said the Sanborn maps indicate the previous porch may have been a little bigger than four feet. He suggested if it was six feet they might be able to fit a chair out there. He said the breezeway connection in this particular case is connecting the new garage to the existing 1940's addition, not the historic stone portion of the house, so that makes a difference. He thinks the garage is a little big but the 24 ft width facing the alley is common and the bigger size is coming back into the lot, so it's not too bad. He mentioned also that second story eaves line is pulled down so massing-wise it won't compete with the stone portion of the house. He added that the configuration of the wraparound roof feels more contemporary.

Commissioner Quillin asked if the porch is something the ARC could explore.

Commissioner Hernly said yes.

Commissioner Bailey asked for staff's opinion regarding the breezeway.

Ms. Zollner said she initially felt strongly about Staff Recommendation 3 regarding the breezeway because they are not typical for the neighborhood, but after spending more time looking at the site she doesn't think it will be visible from the listed property and there are other very atypical structures in neighborhood. Due to the size of the garage and placement of the breezeway, she doesn't feel it will be visible from the public right-of-way.

Commissioner Arp said there could be a more historic approach to that element but he doesn't want to hold up approval on the project over it.

The commissioners agreed it wasn't a deal breaker.

Ms. Zollner said in the past, the Commission has approved items with small issues to go to the ARC, provided the ARC has clear and specific direction.

Commissioner Arp asked Mr. Fry how strongly he feels about the design element.

Mr. Fry said they would welcome input from the ARC.

Commissioner Hernly said the ARC would review the drawings in a little more detail to figure out options for the porch roof, which would be at a meeting in two weeks.

Commissioner Arp added that they didn't want to hold up their closing process.

Mr. Brown said it would be great for the applicant to meet and find something that will fit the historic structure and the applicant's needs.

Commissioner Arp asked if they are striking Staff Recommendations 2 & 3.

Ms. Zollner said it was her understanding that they were striking Staff Recommendation 3 and that the porch height would continue to be a recommendation.

Commissioner Arp suggested the applicant could make a good faith effort to meet with the ARC.

### **ACTION TAKEN**

Motioned by Commissioner Arp, seconded by Commissioner Wachs, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with the following amendments:

1. Final building permits should be reviewed by the Historic Resources Administrator for compliance with the HRC approved project.
2. The final building permit will not be released until the plans are modified to show the concrete porch is elevated to the bottom of the door.

Unanimously approved 5-0.

**ITEM NO. 5:** DR-14-00501 810 W 6<sup>th</sup> Street; Addition; Certificate of Appropriateness Review. The property is located in the environs of the Witter S. McCurdy House (909 W 6<sup>th</sup>), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Gould Evans for USD 497, the property owner of record.

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Ms. Zollner presented the item.

Commissioner Wachs asked if staff is satisfied with the brick used for the addition.

Ms. Zollner said based on discussions with the architect, she feels the brick they've chosen will be compatible.

Commissioner Wachs asked if staff was concerned about the west-facing windows that do not have the line of brick that goes with the original building.

Ms. Zollner said staff feels that the set of windows clearly distinguishes the addition from the historic structure.

### **APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Ms. Marianne Melling, Gould Evans, said they considered the exteriors and the massing of the buildings in their design approach, and said they used the Secretary of Interior Standards as a guide. She explained their goals are to define the structure as something separate and new, to respect the existing building, and to reinvest by returning the main entry to the south and activate the courtyard, which will no longer be fenced. She said the openings on the west façade are just one element that references the original blocking of the windows.

### **No public comment**

### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Hernly said there's a balance between not replicating historic details and something that looks 100% modern. He said it's easy to tell when a building is from a particular time period, so a stark difference between historic detail and modern minimal detailing seems extreme. He said he would like to see a little more brick detailing on the addition, perhaps a brick pattern that wraps the west facing windows, not as detailed as the original but something that still gives it a frame. He said he would even like to see a little more contrast on the top edge, and suggested a change to the top cap. He asked if there is a reason why the two windows on the bottom right don't stack.

Ms. Melling said the interior façade was difficult because they are limited by the amount of glazing, so instead of introducing a lot of brick detail to break up the brick wall, all four windows are a little different.

Commissioner Wachs said he is more concerned about the brick between the windows on the west side.

Commissioner Hernly said that actually doesn't bother him.

They further discussed the placement of the windows.

Commissioner Bailey said he thinks it looks pretty cool to the untrained eye.

Commissioner Wachs said it definitely is not a deal breaker.

### **ACTION TAKEN**

Motioned by Commissioner Bailey, seconded by Commissioner Arp, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness as per the staff report.

Unanimously approved 5-0.

**ITEM NO. 6:** DR-14-00506 900 New Hampshire Street; Sign; Certificate of Appropriateness Review and Downtown Design Guidelines Review. The property is located in the environs of the Social Service League Building (905 Rhode Island), the Hendry House (941 Rhode Island), and the Turnhalle (900 Rhode Island), Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Submitted by Odegard Sign & Light for 900 New Hampshire LLC, the property owner of record.

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Ms. Zollner presented the item. She explained that staff is recommending approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness, but would like further direction from the Commission regarding the Downtown Design Guidelines. She said the sign meets several of the guidelines, but does not meet requirements for overall height, placement, size and scale in proportion to the street level façade, and pedestrian orientation.

Commissioner Wachs mentioned staff's original suggestion of placing the word "Marriott" over the main entrance, and asked what staff feels is the ideal location for the larger sign currently proposed.

Ms. Zollner said staff recommended the "Marriott" type sign on the canopy instead of the sign currently proposed.

Commissioner Hernly asked if there is a canopy over the entrance.

Ms. Zollner pointed to the location of the canopy on the overhead photo. She said it is higher than a typical transom area but, due to the modern design of the building and placement of the canopy, staff felt it would be an appropriate compromise.

Commissioner Arp asked if staff had knowledge of Marriott's sign requirements.

Ms. Zollner said most corporations do have requirements for branding purposes, but when working with a historic or overlay district there are additional guidelines. She said staff has worked with other corporations in the past, such as Gap and Starbucks, to address signage in an effort to make it more compatible with Lawrence's Downtown Historic District. She feels it is appropriate to focus on the historic character of Downtown.

### **APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Mr. Joe Morrison, Capital Management Inc., said Marriott is very brand-oriented and their signage is a big piece of that. He said unfortunately, the original sign depicts a separate Marriott brand which would not be acceptable, and it would be difficult to fit "TownePlace Suites" on the canopy. He noted a separate proposed sign location would block the view from two guest room windows. He said Marriott originally proposed a much larger sign that was not pedestrian-friendly, so the current blade sign is the compromise that will still accommodate guests who are driving to find the hotel. He said most people driving to their location will be traveling north to south, and their intent is to guide people to the front of the building. He said they would prefer to locate the sign on the corner but the glass prohibits that on one end and it would not be visible from the other. He said the proposed sign can be seen from both sides and also guides guests to the front door. He further discussed other sign options that were not feasible and the reasons behind the proposed sign and location. He added that they plan to install pedestrian-friendly plaques on either side of the front entrance using materials similar to the building.

Commissioner Wachs asked if the sign rendition is true to the actual view of the sign.

Mr. Morrison said yes, that is how it will look from both sides.



Commissioner Arp said the Historic Resources Commission (HRC) and the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) both spent a great deal of time reviewing the building design. He asked what the original plan for Marriott signage was, or if it was even considered during the design of the building. He said it's interesting that the HRC is still considering exceptions to the plan at this point in the process.

Mr. Morrison said they may not have understood the Marriott piece of the project as well as they should have.

Commissioner Arp said they certainly understood all of the requirements for the building, such as the hotel pool, because those were incorporated. He said it is frustrating that the HRC is again being asked to make an exception because they chose to use glass on the corner, which was optional, that eliminates a space for the sign. He asked if there was an original concept for the hotel signs.

Mr. Morrison thought the original concept included a blade sign at the northwest corner and "Marriott" above the door as a placeholder.

Commissioner Arp asked why they would propose a blade sign in that location if they planned to have other tenants in that area.

Mr. Morrison assumed they were looking at it from a building design perspective, without regard for the hotel's operational needs.

Commissioner Wachs asked if there is any smaller, alternative logo that could be used for TownePlace Suites.

Mr. Morrison said he wishes there was. He said the ownership group wanted a vertical-written sign that would have been significantly bigger. He said the proposed sign is closer to other typical downtown signs written as a bookend.

Commissioner Wachs asked if the hotel brand requires any sign at all, and if they could get away with having just the placards on either side of the front door.

Mr. Morrison said unfortunately, no.

Mr. Morrison said the hotel's opening day is January 14<sup>th</sup>, and the sign typically takes 6 weeks to manufacture. He said because he called on the 18<sup>th</sup> of last month it pushed him to this meeting date.

Commissioner Bailey asked if they looked into the possibility of installing the sign on the northwest corner.

Commissioner Wachs asked if that would obscure the view from those hotel rooms.

Mr. Morrison said it would. He said moving the sign around the corner also decreases its proximity to the front door. He explained the faster they can get someone to the front door and out of their car, the less they're driving around which is more prohibitive to pedestrian traffic or safety. He said he shares all of the commissioners' concerns and would prefer a corner-located sign, but it serves the retail tenant better than the hotel.

Commissioner Arp asked if this is the only design Marriott will consider.

Mr. Morrison said yes.

Commissioner Arp asked what the future is for the hotel if the sign is not approved.

Mr. Morrison said he was not sure but hopes that is not the case.

Commissioner Arp asked if Marriott has authorized modifications to the sign in an effort to meet the Downtown Design Guidelines.

Mr. Morrison said the sign is typically much different- it has a teal blue background with red and white letters. He said the entire sign was changed to match the building design, with the exception of the "Marriott" logo. He said the cost of the proposed sign is more than four times the cost of a typical sign. He apologized for his frustration as he had not attended previous meetings regarding the overall project, but he feels they have tried to adapt the sign appropriately.

Commissioner Hernly asked if the 4 x 15 ft. size is typical for this particular version of the sign.

Mr. Morrison said if it was any smaller it would not be readable. He said a typical sign for the hotel for placement over the front door would be about three feet tall.

Commissioner Bailey asked if they are a franchisee.

Mr. Morrison said yes.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ms. KT Walsh said she shared the commissioner's frustrations. She said she couldn't remember when they knew it would be a Marriott, but everyone knew the Downtown Design Guidelines. She said early on, neighbors researched Marriott worldwide and found they have a stellar record for historic preservation. She said although cheesy, it might be worth the trouble to place a plastic banner on the building until the signage is modified to fit the Downtown Historic District. She is sure she's seen countless examples of Marriott restoring buildings in historic districts so there must be a precedent for signage. She noted that many people are finding restaurants and hotels these days via GPS and not relying solely on signage. Ms. Walsh also reminded the commission of Noodles & Co.'s original request to put a giant frying pan on top of their building, but they flexed their requirements due to the guidelines for the Downtown Historic District.

Mr. Morrison emphasized that his group is big on preservation, and these particular sign modifications were approved by Marriott for a historic building in San Jose, CA. He said his group has also attempted to invest in the community and be a good neighbor through their significant contribution to the Social Services League building.

### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Bailey said he wasn't present for the initial project, but is unsympathetic to the change, although he acknowledged that was no fault of the applicant present. He said he is troubled by the very specific guidelines that the sign does not meet, and the guidelines that are met are only on the periphery of their intent. He said he would not be comfortable making an

exception, and feels this is an all-or-nothing project that would prove difficult for the ARC to find a middle ground.

Commissioner Arp feels this is not an issue for the ARC.

Ms. Zollner asked if the Commission could provide some direction. She said, for example, the Greenhouse Culture was willing to work with the ARC and come up with a design solution. She mentioned an option worth considering is a smaller sized sign placed closer to the door.

Commissioner Hernly said the three main issues are related to the sign type and the vertical dimension of it. He asked if a wall sign with the same dimensions placed on the face of the building would meet compliance.

Ms. Zollner said it depends on the placement.

Commissioner Hernly asked if there is an allowable square footage.

Ms. Zollner said the rule of thumb is to allow 20 square inches of sign area for every one foot of linear façade width. She said staff and the HRC have been fairly liberal with that guideline, adding that most storefronts downtown are 25-50 feet.

Commissioner Wachs said he agrees the proposed sign would deviate from the Downtown Design Guidelines and added that they're in place for a reason. He said he also agrees that people use GPS and it's pretty clear that this is a hotel, so some type of signage near the entrance door that identifies it as such should be sufficient. Having previously worked in the hotel industry, Commissioner Wachs said he understands the issue with branding. He suggested signage above the door for "TownePlace Suites" with "Marriott" in smaller font.

Mr. Morrison said the "Marriott" font size is in specific proportion to the size of the brand name. He said they looked at probably 40 different sign variations to find something acceptable. He said they also explored non-illuminated pin letters right above the front door, but the space is only eight inches high so the letters would be too small. He feels the guidelines not met relate mostly to the location and not the size of the sign. He further discussed alternatives he researched to make the sign work for the hotel and meet the design guidelines. He said he would be glad to answer any other questions.

Commissioner Hernly asked if they looked at placing the blade in the center of the curved glass and how tall that section is.

Mr. Morrison said it is about 10 feet.

Commissioner Arp asked if the Marriott designers were given the Downtown Design Guidelines

Mr. Morrison said yes, they tried to accommodate everything from their brand guidelines as well as the City's.

Commissioner Bailey said Marriott can change their requirements just as easily as the HRC can change theirs. He said it sounds like an issue between his group and Marriott.

Mr. Morrison said they have changed their requirements, referencing the aforementioned changes to the sign colors.

Commissioner Arp said they always knew this was going to be a TownePlace Marriott, and the ownership group has asked for a lot of changes already in order to make the project work, so it sounds like the two ends are not matching up. He said he didn't appreciate that it is now the HRC's responsibility to make things work for the hotel despite their previous knowledge of the guidelines.

Commissioner Bailey said he feels Marriott will bend depending on their decision.

Mr. Morrison asked what they would like to see.

Ms. KT Walsh said Treanor Architects is very used to working within the Downtown Design Guidelines and asked if they had been consulted.

Mr. Morrison said Treanor is the firm they are working with.

Ms. Zollner said they initially placed signage on the building that did not meet the guidelines, so the release of the building permit has a stamp indicating the signage is not approved and must be approved by the HRC.

Commissioner Arp said it might be a waste of time to refer the sign to the ARC if all alternatives will not meet Marriott's standards. He feels they need to come back with a sign that meets the Downtown Design Guidelines. He said he doesn't feel it is the ARC's job to design a Marriott sign or spend an hour making recommendations that they will not accept.

Commissioner Wachs said it was his opinion that the best place for the sign is at the northwest corner, in a placement similar to the Eldridge. He refuted the applicant's claim that the sign will confuse hotel patrons and cause them to enter the restaurant instead of the hotel.

Commissioner Arp said the Eldridge even has a restaurant and bar below their sign, which is not the entrance to the hotel, but does not seem to cause confusion.

Mr. Morrison said the restaurant is owned by the hotel group and the entrances are the same.

Commissioner Wachs said it wasn't always owned by the hotel group. He said the shops were previously sublet.

Mr. Morrison said every concern relates to the size of the sign. He asked if the sign would be compliant if it was five feet tall.

Ms. Zollner said it would depend on placement. She said they would probably want to put it on the brick portion as opposed to being so far north.

Mr. Morrison said a five foot sign in that location, tucked behind a wall, would be nonexistent.

Ms. Zollner asked how deep that recess is.

Mr. Morrison said it's about 18 inches, give or take.

Commissioner Wachs asked if they had considered a horizontal sign on the gray portion of the building between the first and second floor of windows.

Mr. Morrison said it isn't the front door, but would be close to windows resembling a front door.

Commissioner Arp argued that their proposed sign is also not at the front door.

Mr. Morrison said it is not, but it does lead people to the front door and it can be seen from anywhere.

Commissioner Wachs said he didn't believe someone would try to walk through a window just because the sign is above it. He suggested they could also place signage above the front doors that say "Hotel Lobby" or "Hotel Entrance" in a font or material that is more germane to the historic relevance of the area. He added that they would have more leeway with that type of signage as opposed to their brand signage.

Commissioner Arp asked what would be the most expeditious way to find a compromise.

Commissioner Hernly said they won't have time to make a sign if a decision isn't made tonight.

Commissioner Arp asked what the next steps for them will be if disapproved.

Commissioner Hernly said if they don't approve their proposal there could be a temporary sign.

Commissioner Arp said they can either not approve the sign and ask them to come back with a different proposal, or they could be referred to consult with the ARC, which might be the faster route.

Ms. Zollner said the ARC route may be a more timely option if the applicant is willing to work with the ARC.

Commissioner Arp asked the applicant if that is a possibility.

Mr. Morrison said if this sign is not approved, there will be no sign for the hotel opening. He said he cannot and will not hang a temporary banner on the building.

Commissioner Arp asked, given Mr. Morrison's explanation, if they should specify the ARC's involvement in any future application with modifications to the sign.

Ms. Zollner said no. She said if the HRC denies their request, the applicant has the ability to appeal the decision to the City Commission. She mentioned City Commissioners are not meeting on December 23<sup>rd</sup> and are only meeting on December 30<sup>th</sup>, 2014 for consent items but may have a full agenda on January 6<sup>th</sup>, 2015, depending on how the Mayor sets the agenda. The soonest possible meeting may be the second week in January. She added that the timeframe for referral to the ARC would be similar.

### **ACTION TAKEN**

Motioned by Commissioner Bailey, seconded by Commissioner Quillin, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness as per staff recommendation.

Unanimously approved 5-0.

Motioned by Commissioner Bailey, seconded by Commissioner Arp, to deny the project for failure to meet the following Downtown Design Guidelines:

- 18.15 A projecting sign shall be no more than fifteen square feet in size with a maximum sign height of five feet.
- 18.16 A larger projecting sign should be mounted higher, and centered on the facade or positioned at the corner of a building.
- 18.8 Signs should be subordinate to the building's facade. The size and scale of the sign shall be in proportion to the size and scale of the street level façade.

Unanimously denied 5-0.

Ms. Zollner asked if the applicant decided to try to find a solution for the project, if there are any design parameters the ARC should work with, or if the ARC should work with the applicant as opposed to just staff.

Commissioner Arp suggested staff and ARC work together with the applicant. He said it isn't unreasonable to ask the applicant to design a sign that meets the Downtown Design Guidelines.

#### **ITEM NO. 7: MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS**

- A. There were no Board of Zoning Appeals applications received since November 20, 2014.
- B. There were no demolition permits received since the November 20, 2014 meeting.
- C. There were no Architectural Review Committee approvals since November November 20, 2014.
- C. There was no general public comment.
- D. There were no miscellaneous matters from City staff and Commission members.

ADJOURN 8:30 pm.