

**MINUTES OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
APRIL 16, 2019**

THE MEETING OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 5:30PM.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: TOM EHRHARDT, WARNER BAXTER, TIFFANY TOLBERT, RITA McBRIDE, THEODORE ECKELS

STAFF: ROSS PIETRZAK (ZONING ADMINISTRATOR), BRAD MILLER (IL)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL – GEORGE RAINEY, ABSENT

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MARCH 19, 2019

MR. ECKELS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR MARCH 19, 2019; MS. McBRIDE SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

ACCEPTANCE, ADDITIONS, OR AMENDMENTS TO AGENDA

MR. EHRHARDT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA; MR. BAXTER SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

NEW BUSINESS

**HHPC 19-04A PETITIONER: RICH PLUTA
REQUEST: CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
PURPOSE: ROOFING, WINDOWS, DOORS, EXTERIOR CLADDING & RAMP
LOCATION: 222 CENTER STREET**

DAVID McEACHERN, THE PETITIONER'S ARCHITECT, EXPLAINED THE FIRE DAMAGE TO THE BUILDING AND THEN EXPLAINED THE PROPOSAL, INCLUDING MAKING THE REMAINING BUILDING STAND ALONE AND CONSTRUCTING A RAMP ALONG THE SIDE.

MS. TOLBERT ASKED IF THE PETITIONER COULD PROVIDE A SAMPLE OF THE PROPOSED BRICK FOR THE RECORD. MR. McEACHERN SAID THAT HE WOULD PROVIDE A SAMPLE TO SHOW THE NEW WOULD BLEND WITH WHAT EXISTS ALREADY ON THE BUILDING. MS. TOLBERT CALLED FOR THE STAFF REPORT.

MR. MILLER PRESENTED THE STAFF REPORT. THE PROPERTY, 222 CENTER STREET, IS A NON-CONTRIBUTING ADDITION TO THE GUYER BLOCK WITHIN THE LAKE GEORGE COMMERCIAL HISTORIC DISTRICT.

THE COMMISSION APPROVED THE DEMOLITION OF THE GUYER BLOCK AT THE MARCH 2019 MEETING, WHICH DID NOT INCLUDE THE REAR WALL THAT WAS TIED INTO THE STRUCTURE AT 222 CENTER STREET. THIS PETITION ADDRESSES THIS SHARED REAR WALL AND THE REMAINDER OF THE STRUCTURE AT 222 CENTER STREET THAT RECEIVED MINOR DAMAGE DUE TO THE STRUCTURAL FIRE.

THE PETITION PROPOSES THE RENOVATION OF THE REMAINING STRUCTURE TO MAKE IT A STAND-ALONE BUILDING, INCLUDING: 1) THE INSTALLATION OF AN ADA ACCESSIBLE RAMP ALONG THE SOUTH WALL, 2) RECLADDING THE SOUTH WALL WITH BRICK, 3) INSTALLING LIGHT FIXTURES, 4) CONSTRUCTING A MANSARD ROOF ALONG THE SOUTH WALL, AND 5) INSTALLING TWO WINDOWS AND A DOOR ON THE SOUTH WALL. GIVEN THE NON-CONTRIBUTING STATUS OF THE

MINUTES OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
APRIL 16, 2019

BUILDING AND PROPOSAL TO MAKE IT A STAND-ALONE STRUCTURE, STAFF HAS ADDRESSED THE PROPOSED CHANGES AS "NEW CONSTRUCTION & ADDITIONS" AS STATED IN THE DESIGN GUIDELINES.

THE PROPOSED RAMP WOULD PROJECT APPROXIMATELY 5FT. OUT OF THE NEW SOUTH WALL AND WOULD BE MADE OF Poured CONCRETE WITH A STEEL HANDRAIL. THE RAMP WOULD ENHANCE ACCESSIBILITY TO THE FIRST-FLOOR COMMERCIAL SPACE OF THE BUILDING; HOWEVER, THE PROPOSAL DOES NOT ADDRESS HOW THE REMAINING SPACE OF THE EMPTY LOT (FORMER LOCATION OF THE GUYER BLOCK) WOULD BE IMPROVED TO MINIMIZE THE IMPACT ON THE DISTRICT. THE DESIGN GUIDELINES REQUIRE THAT "THE VISUAL IMPACTS OF NEW PARKING LOTS AND OPEN SPACES" BE REDUCED THROUGH THE USE OF "LANDSCAPED BUFFERS." STAFF RECOMMENDS THE COMMISSION INQUIRE WITH THE PETITIONER ABOUT THE REQUIRED IMPROVEMENTS TO THE EMPTY LOT TO INFORM A COMPLETE DECISION THAT ALSO INCLUDES THE PROPOSED RAMP.

THE PROPOSAL CALLS FOR CLADDING THE SOUTH WALL WITH BRICKS TO MATCH THE EXISTING MULTI-COLORED BRICK PATTERN ALONG THE FIRST FLOOR ON THE EAST AND NORTH SIDE. STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF THE BRICK CLADDING TO MATCH THE EXISTING ON THE BUILDING.

THE PROPOSAL CALLS FOR THE INSTALLATION OF TWO LIGHT FIXTURES ALONG THE SOUTH WALL TO BE LOCATED AT THE NEW ENTRYWAY AND AT THE END OF THE RAMP. THE PETITIONER CONVEYED THAT THEY WOULD PROVIDE A SAMPLE OF THE FIXTURES AT THE MEETING. STAFF RECOMMENDS THE COMMISSION REVIEW DETAILS OF THE PROPOSED FIXTURE AT THE MEETING.

THE PROPOSAL CALLS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION A MANSARD ROOF ON THE SOUTH WALL TO CONTINUE THE SAME ROOF PROFILE AND ASPHALT SHINGLES THAT EXISTS ALONG THE NORTH AND EAST SIDES OF THE BUILDING. STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE MANSARD ROOF TO MATCH EXISTING.

THE PROPOSAL CALLS FOR THE USE OF AN EXISTING DOORWAY ON THE SOUTH WALL WITH A NEW ALUMINUM FRAME DOOR THAT WOULD LEAD TO THE PROPOSED RAMP, AS WELL AS THE INSTALLATION OF TWO NEW ALUMINUM CASEMENT WINDOWS IN EXISTING OPENINGS ON THE SECOND FLOOR OF THE SOUTH ELEVATION. STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED WINDOWS AND DOOR AS THEY ARE COMPATIBLE WITH THE EXISTING ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES ON THE BUILDING.

MR. MILLER SUMMARIZED HIS FINDINGS AND EMPHASIZED ADDRESSING THE COMPLETE FOOTPRINT OF THE GUYER BLOCK WITH THE DESIGN OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY.

MR. EHRHARDT COMMENTED THAT THE ADDITION OF THE RAMP CHANGES THE USE OF THE ENTIRE PROPERTY. MR. McEACHERN PRESENTED A PREVIOUS SURVEY OF THE PROPERTY THAT SHOWS THE LOT WAS DIVIDED IN TWO AND SHOULD BE APPROACHED AS SUCH.

MR. BAXTER COMMENTED ON THE EXISTING ROOFLINE OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY AND THAT IT CURRENTLY IS NOT SYMMETRICAL WITH THE PROPOSED PROFILE. HE ASKED HOW THERE COULD BE BALANCE. MR. McEACHERN SAID THAT IT COULD BE ADDRESSED BY MOVING THE TOP OF THE ROOFLINE BACK AND THEN HANGING THE ROOF OVER THE PROPOSED RAMP.

MS. TOLBERT EXPRESSED HER CONCERN WITH THE MANSARD ROOF TYPE, BECAUSE IT IS NOT HISTORICALLY APPROPRIATE, EVEN THOUGH IT IS EXISTING. SHE SHARED A CONCERN WITH SETTING A PRECEDENT FOR OTHER BUILDINGS. MR. McEACHERN SAID THAT THE SOUTH WALL COULD BE MAINTAINED AS A FLAT WALL SECTION IF THAT

MINUTES OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
APRIL 16, 2019

WAS WHAT WAS DESIRED. MS. TOLBERT COMMENTED THAT THE GUIDELINES DO NOT IDENTIFY THE ROOF TYPE AS APPROPRIATE FOR THE DISTRICT AND THAT THE ADDITION OF NEW ROOFING IN THAT FORM WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE.

MR. EHRHARDT ASKED IF IT MATTERED THAT THE ROOF WAS CONSTRUCTED PRIOR TO THE DISTRICT BEING ESTABLISHED; SO PRECEDENT WOULDN'T BE SET. MS. TOLBERT SAID THE EXISTING ROOFING WOULD NOT HAVE TO BE REMOVED AND THAT THE CURRENT CONVERSATION IS ABOUT NEW CONSTRUCTION. MR. McEACHERN SAID THE EXISTING BRICK WALL COULD BE KEPT AS A FLAT ROOF FINISH.

MS. TOLBERT SAID THAT IT WOULD NOT CHANGE THE PROFILE OF THE REST OF THE BUILDING. MS. McBRIDE COMMENTED THAT THE REST OF THE BUILDINGS ON THAT BLOCK ARE NEWER BECAUSE OF FIRE. MS. TOLBERT AGREED, STATING THAT THEY STILL CONTINUE THE FLAT ROOF LINE. MS. TOLBERT ASKED FOR STAFF OPINION.

MR. MILLER AGREED THAT RETAINING A FLAT WALL WOULD BE HELPFUL TO PREVENTING FUTURE CONSTRUCTION OF MORE MANSARD ROOFS. HE SAID THAT HIS BIGGEST CONCERN WITH THE PROPOSAL WAS THE ADDITIONAL OF THE RAMP ON THE SOUTH SIDE THAT WOULD IMPEDE ON THE FOOTPRINT OF WHAT USED TO BE THE GUYER BLOCK.

MR. PLUTA SAID IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO KEEP IT AS IS BUT HE WAS ATTEMPTING TO MAKE THE BUILDING LOOK BETTER FROM ALL SIDES. MR. EHRHARDT SAID THAT HE HAD NO PROBLEM WITH THE DESIGN ON THE SOUTH SIDE, BUT WANTED TO KNOW ABOUT HOW THE SPACE WOULD LOOK BETWEEN THE SUBJECT PROPERTY AND ANY POTENTIAL NEW BUILDING IN THE FUTURE.

MS. TOLBERT ADDRESSED MR. PLUTA AND SAID THAT NOBODY WAS IMPLYING THE RAMP COULD NOT BE CONSTRUCTED. MR. MILLER ADDED HIS COMMENTS ABOUT THE RAMP WERE INTENDED TO ADDRESS THE REST OF THE EMPTY LOT IN ADDITION TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF A RAMP. MR. PLUTA SAID IT WOULD BE GRASS.

MR. EHRHARDT ASKED IF IT WAS ALL ONE LOT. MR. McEACHERN BROUGHT UP THE SURVEY PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED THAT SHOWS HOW THE LOTS ARE DIVIDED. MR. BAXTER SAID THAT THE DIVISION OF THE LOTS HELPS SOLVE A LOT OF HIS UNANSWERED QUESTIONS ABOUT THE DESIGN.

MS. TOLBERT RESTATED THAT THE CONVERSATION SHOULD BE FOCUSING ON THE DESIGN OF THE SOUTH WALL WHILE KEEPING IN CONSIDERATION THE NON-CONTRIBUTING STATUS OF THE BUILDING. MR. McEACHERN ADDED HOW IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO EITHER DESIGN DISCUSSED. MS. TOLBERT SAID THAT THE COMMISSION COULD VOTE ON A DESIGN AND HAVE A FOLLOW-UP WITH STAFF IF CERTAIN DETAILS COULD NOT BE CARRIED OUT DUE TO COST OR DESIGN ISSUES.

MR. BAXTER ASKED IF THERE WOULD BE A COVERING FOR THE RAMP. MR. PLUTA SAID THAT IF THE ROOF IS CONSTRUCTED THEN IT WOULD COVER PART OF THE RAMP.

MS. TOLBERT ASKED ABOUT THE PROPOSED WINDOWS ABOVE THE RAMP. MR. McEACHERN SAID THEY ARE EXISTING WINDOW OPENINGS THAT WOULD BE FILLED WITH DOUBLE HUNG WINDOWS. MS. TOLBERT ASKED IF THEY WOULD BE WHITE VINYL. MR. McEACHERN SAID THEY WOULD BE DESIGNED TO MATCH THE REST OF THE BUILDING.

MS. TOLBERT ASKED THE PETITIONER TO REMIND THE COMMISSION ABOUT THE PLAN FOR THE EMPTY LOT. MR. McEACHERN SAID IT WOULD BE INFILLED AND SEEDED FOR GRASS. MS. TOLBERT ASKED IF THERE WOULD BE ANY BORDER – HOW WOULD PEOPLE APPROACH THE RAMP. MR. McEACHERN SAID THE RAMP LEADS DIRECTLY TO THE SIDEWALK.

**MINUTES OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
APRIL 16, 2019**

MR. MILLER REMINDED THE COMMISSION TO ASK ABOUT LIGHTING. MR. McEACHERN SAID IF THE ROOF IS EXTENDED, THEN IT WOULD BE CAN LIGHTING IN THE CEILING, OTHERWISE THERE COULD BE LIGHT FIXTURES ON THE BRICK WALL.

MS. McBRIDE ASKED FOR CLARIFICATION IF THE RAMP WOULD EXTEND PAST THE LOT LINE. MR. McEACHERN SAID IT WOULD NOT. MR. EHRHARDT SAID IT IS NOT A COMMON FEATURE IN THE CITY COMPARED TO NEARBY COMMUNITIES.

MR. PIETRZAK ASKED IF THERE WAS ANY INTENTION TO DO ANY TYPE OF SCREENING OR BUFFER AROUND THE EMPTY LOT. MR. McEACHERN ASKED IF IT WAS A MATTER OF KEEPING PEOPLE FROM WALKING ON THE LOT. MR. PIETRZAK SAID A COURTYARD WOULD REQUIRE A BARRIER TO DESIGNATE THE SPACE. MR. MILLER ADDED THAT THIS IS IN REFERENCE TO THE GUIDELINES TO GIVE THE FEEL THAT THERE IS STILL A BUILDING WALL ON THAT LOT. MS. TOLBERT SAID IT COULD BE SIMILAR TO THE FENCING THAT IS UP AROUND THE CITY OWNED PARKING LOTS IN THE DOWNTOWN. MS. TOLBERT ASKED THE PETITIONER TO CONSIDER SOMETHING IN THE FUTURE OTHER THAN JUST GRASS.

MR. PLUTA ASKED WHAT TYPE OF FENCING WOULD BE APPROPRIATE. MR. EHRHARDT SAID IT COULD BE A DISCUSSION FOR LATER. MS. TOLBERT THANKS THE PETITIONER FOR THE COOPERATION THROUGH THE DEMOLITION PROCESS AND TO THINK ABOUT IT IN THE FUTURE.

MS. TOLBERT SUGGESTED THE COMMISSION TAKE THE PETITION AS SUBMITTED, BUT TO HAVE ANY SMALL CHANGES LIKE THE LIGHT FIXTURES AMENDED THROUGH THE STAFF LEVEL IF NEEDED. MR. BAXTER ASKED ABOUT THE TIMELINE OF THE DEMOLITION. MR. PLUTA SAID THAT HE JUST SPOKE WITH THE CONTRACTOR AND THAT IT SHOULD BE HAPPENING THAT WEEKEND.

MS. TOLBERT RESTATED THE DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL AT HAND, INCLUDING: CONSTRUCTION OF THE MANSARD ROOF ON THE SOUTH WALL, INSTALLATION OF BRICK TO MATCH EXISTING ON THE BUILDING, INSTALLATION OF NEW BUILDINGS IN THE EXISTING OPENINGS ON THE SOUTH WALL – DOUBLE HUNG VINYL, CONCRETE RAMP WITH A STEEL RAIL, NEW ALUMINUM AND GLASS DOOR, LIGHT FIXTURES ON THE SOUTH WALL, AND GRASS ACROSS THE LOT WHERE THE GUYER BUILDING ONCE STOOD. MR. BAXTER ASKED IF THERE NEEDED TO BE ANY DISCUSSION OF THE DOOR SIZE. MS. TOLBERT SAID THAT WOULD BE HANDLED BY THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT.

MS. TOLBERT ASKED FOR A MOTION. MR. EHRHARDT MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSAL AS SUBMITTED; SECONDED BY MR. ECKELS. MOTION CARRIED.

**HHPC 19-05 PETITIONER: BRICK HOUSE ENTERTAINMENT GROUP LLC
REQUEST: CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
PURPOSE: FAÇADE RENOVATION, WINDOWS, DOORS, SIGNAGE
LOCATION: 230 MAIN STREET**

MR. BLAKE GILLESPIE AND MR. SHANE EVANS PRESENTED THEIR PROPOSAL TO RENOVATE THE EXISTING FAÇADE ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY. MR. EVANS BROUGHT A SAMPLE OF THE PROPOSED BRICK FOR THE RECORD ("OLD INDIANA BRICK"), WHICH MATCHES THE BRICK PRESENT ON THE REAR OF THE BUILDING.

MS. TOLBERT ASKED ABOUT THE EXISTING FAÇADE AND HOW IT WAS SETUP ON THE INTERIOR THAT COULD POINT TOWARDS WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE UNDERNEATH THE EIFS. MR. EVANS SAID THE STOREFRONT WAS FRAMED FOR A SQUARE WINDOW WHERE THERE IS CURRENTLY A CIRCULAR WINDOW. HE CONTINUED THAT THE NEW WINDOW WOULD BE WIDER TO BE IN KEEPING MORE WITH THE SURROUNDING BUILDINGS. THAT WOULD ALSO INCLUDE A LIMESTONE SILL.

MINUTES OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
APRIL 16, 2019

MR. EVANS ALSO SAID THAT THE STOREFRONT WOULD HAVE A SOLDIERED BRICK PATTERN AROUND THE PROPOSED SIGN LOCATION TO MIRROR THE BUILDING NEXT DOOR. MS. TOLBERT ASKED IF THE PARAPET WALL WOULD BE TOPPED WITH LIMESTONE. THE PETITIONERS SAID IT WOULD BE.

MR. EHRHARDT ASKED IF THE "BAR AND GRILL" PART OF THE SIGN WOULD BE BACKLIT WITH LED LIGHTING. MS. TOLBERT ASKED IF THE PETITIONER COULD DESCRIBE HOW IT WOULD BE LIT. MR. GILLESPIE EXPLAINED AND ASKED TO BRING THE RENDERING THEY PROVIDED UP ON THE TV SCREEN TO VIEW. MR. MILLER READ THE DESCRIPTION OF THE SIGNAGE PROVIDED BY THE SIGN COMPANY. THEY STATED THE SIGN WOULD BE FLUSH MOUNT, REVERSE LIT CHANNEL LETTERS. "BRICK HOUSE" WILL REFLECT ON BRICK AND WILL NOT LIGHT OUT OF THE FRONT. "BAR & GRILL" WILL LIGHT OUT OF THE FRONT AND BACK. MR. MILLER SAID HIS READING OF THE DESCRIPTION WOULD BE THAT PART OF THE SIGN WOULD BE ILLUMINATED INTERNALLY. MS. TOLBERT ASKED IF THE LETTERS WOULD GLOW OUT OF THE FRONT. MR. GILLESPIE SAID IT WOULD BE MORE OF A BOX.

MS. TOLBERT ASKED IF THEY WERE IN THE PROCESS OF REMOVING THE EIFS. MR. EVANS SAID HE WAS NOT SURE BECAUSE THE DEMOLITION HAD NOT BEGUN. HE ANTICIPATED THE BRICK WOULD NOT STAY ANYHOW SO IT DID NOT MATTER.

MR. PIETRZAK PRESENTED AN IMAGE OF THE BUILDING BEFORE THE CURRENT EIFS FAÇADE WAS ADDED. MS. TOLBERT ASKED ABOUT THE HEIGHT OF THE PROPOSED FAÇADE. MR. GILLESPIE SAID IT WOULD BE THE SAME HEIGHT OF THE EDWARD JONES BUILDING NEXT DOOR.

MR. BAXTER REPORTED THAT HE VISITED THE PROPERTY THAT DAY AND ASKED ABOUT THE CURRENT DEPTH OF THE STOREFRONT WINDOW AREA. HE ASKED IF THE WINDOW COULD BE RECESSED. MS. TOLBERT SAID IT SHOULD BE FLUSHED WITH THE FAÇADE. MR. EVANS SAID IT WOULD PROBABLY NOT BE AN ISSUE DURING CONSTRUCTION.

MS. TOLBERT ASKED ABOUT THE BUILDING NEXT DOOR. MR. MILLER SAID IT WAS BARELY RECESSED, ONLY THE WINDOW FRAME THAT IS SET INTO THE BRICK WALL. MS. TOLBERT AGREED THAT THE STOREFRONT IS NOT GOING TO SIT FLUSH WITH THE BRICK ALREADY, SO THERE WOULD BE NO NEED TO MAKE IT MORE.

MS. TOLBERT ASKED ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF AN AWNING. MR. EVANS SAID IT WAS NOT AN INTEREST. MS. TOLBERT ALSO ASKED ABOUT PURSUIT OF A FAÇADE GRANT. MR. EVANS SAID THE PAPERWORK HAD BEEN SUBMITTED TO THE CITY.

MS. TOLBERT ASKED FOR ANY STAFF COMMENTS. MR. MILLER MADE A BRIEF SUMMARY OF HIS STAFF REPORT:

THE SUBJECT PROPERTY WAS PREVIOUSLY RENOVATED TO MATCH THE ARCHITECTURAL STYLE OF THE ART THEATER, ALTHOUGH THIS CONSTRUCTION WAS COMPLETED WITHIN THE PAST 30 YEARS AND DOES NOT POSSESS ANY HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OR INTEGRITY. THE PROPOSED FAÇADE REPLACEMENT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED NEW CONSTRUCTION GIVEN THAT NO HISTORIC FABRIC REMAINS.

ACCORDING TO THE GUIDELINES: "NEW CONSTRUCTION...SHOULD REPRESENT THE TECHNOLOGY AND ARCHITECTURAL TASTES OF THE PRESENT WITH A DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE HISTORIC BUILDING AND THE NEW STRUCTURE AND THE SURROUNDING HISTORIC BUILDINGS." THE NEW BUILDINGS SHOULD "BE COMPATIBLE WITH THE VISUAL CHARACTER, SCALE, MATERIALS, SIZE, AND COLOR OF...THE SURROUNDING HISTORIC BUILDINGS." MOST IMPORTANTLY, NEW BUILDINGS SHOULD BE CONSISTENT IN HEIGHT AND PROPORTION TO ADJACENT PROPERTIES.

MINUTES OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
APRIL 16, 2019

THE PROPOSAL CALLS FOR 1) THE REMOVAL OF THE EXISTING EIFS FAÇADE AND REPLACEMENT WITH A NEW BRICK FAÇADE. THE NEW FAÇADE WILL BE COMPRISED OF OFFSET ALUMINUM FRAME STOREFRONT WINDOW AND DOOR, AS WELL AS 2) ILLUMINATED SIGNAGE MOUNTED ABOVE ON THE PARAPET WALL.

FAÇADE REPLACEMENT

THE PROPOSED FAÇADE REPLACEMENT INCLUDES A BRICK VENEER (SAMPLE PROVIDED AT THE MEETING) THAT EXTENDS TO A PARAPET WALL, TOPPED WITH A LIMESTONE CAP. THE FAÇADE WILL MATCH THE HEIGHT OF THE ADJACENT BUILDING TO THE SOUTH AND WILL BE COMPOSED OF AN OFFSET ALUMINUM FRAME STOREFRONT WINDOW – WITH A LIMESTONE SILL – AND AN ALUMINUM FRAME AND GLASS DOOR (SEE RENDERING ON PETITION). THE TOTAL FAÇADE IS 15' ACROSS, WITH THE WINDOW MEASURING 81" WIDE AND THE DOOR 32" WIDE.

THE FAÇADE REPLACEMENT IS COMPATIBLE WITH THE MATERIALS, MASS, SCALE, HEIGHT, PROPORTION, AND SETBACK OF THE SURROUNDING HISTORIC BUILDINGS. THE PROPOSED FAÇADE IS ALSO COMPATIBLE WITH THE VISUAL CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT. STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL AS SUBMITTED.

ILLUMINATED SIGNAGE

THE GUIDELINES STATE THAT "CONTINUOUS FLAT WALL AREAS ABOVE DISPLAY WINDOWS OR ABOVE UPPER STORY WINDOWS ARE TYPICALLY GOOD CHOICES" FOR SIGNAGE AND THAT THE "BUILDINGS WITH LESS THAN 50 SQ. FT. OF LINEAL FOOTAGE ARE ALLOWED 50 SQ. FT. OF TOTAL SIGNAGE." SIGNAGE SHOULD ALSO NOT BE MORE THAN 2.5 FEET IN HEIGHT. BACKLIT OR INTERNALLY ILLUMINATE SIGNS ARE PROHIBITED. THE GUIDELINES ALSO STATE THAT "HIDDEN, INDIRECT LIGHTING MAY BE INSTALLED AROUND SIGNAGE BORDERS TO GIVE THE APPEARANCE OF ILLUMINATION."

THE PROPOSED SIGNAGE WILL CONSIST OF ¾" ACRYLIC LETTERING WITH AN ALUMINUM FACE; COLORS INCLUDE POWDER COATED BLACK AND GOLDEN YELLOW VINYL. "BRICK HOUSE" WILL BE BACKLIT AND "BAR & GRILL" WILL BE BACKLIT AND INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED. THE TOTAL SIGNAGE IS APPROXIMATELY 33 SQ. FT. WITH A HEIGHT OF 36".

WHILE THE TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE OF SIGNAGE IS WITHIN THE PERMISSIBLE 50 SQ. FT., THE "BAR & GRILL" PORTION OF THE SIGN WOULD BE INTERNALLY LIT, WHICH IS PROHIBITED IN THE GUIDELINES, AND THE HEIGHT OF THE SIGNAGE EXCEEDS THE 2.5 FT. LIMIT FOR TOTAL HEIGHT FOR SIGNAGE. STAFF RECOMMENDS DENIAL OF SIGNAGE AS PROPOSED BECAUSE A PORTION OF THE SIGN WOULD BE INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED – PER STAFF'S READING OF THE SIGN COMPANY'S DESCRIPTION - AND WOULD EXCEED THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT LIMIT. MR. MILLER SAID THE HEIGHT LIMIT WAS NOT CRITICAL BECAUSE THE FONT SIZE IS NOT CONSISTENT ACROSS THE WHOLE SIGN.

MS. TOLBERT ASKED ABOUT THE TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE OF THE SIGNAGE AND THE BUILDING'S TOTAL FRONTAGE. MR. GILLESPIE SAID IT WAS PROBABLY 15 FEET ACROSS, BUT THAT IT DIDN'T SOUND ACCURATE. MR. EVANS SAID IT WAS CLOSER TO 18 FEET. MS. TOLBERT SAID THE SIGN ORDINANCE USES THE FRONTAGE SIZE TO CALCULATE SIGNAGE TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE. MR. PIETRZAK SAID SINCE ITS LESS THAN 50 FEET OF FRONTAGE THEN THEY GET 50 SQUARE FEET OF SIGNAGE.

MR. MILLER REITERATED THAT HIS CONCERN WAS NOT THE SIZE, BUT RATHER THE ILLUMINATION OF THE SIGNAGE. MS. TOLBERT REPEATED THE LANGUAGE IN THE GUIDELINES BUT SAID WHAT WAS DESCRIBED WAS DIFFERENT FROM JUST AN ILLUMINATED BOX. MR. PIETRZAK CLARIFIED THAT IT WOULD MOST LIKELY BE A BOX SIGN THAT HAS CUTOUTS THAT ALLOW LIGHT TO FLOW OUT, SO IT IS SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT. STAFF AND PETITIONERS DISCUSS THE DETAILS OF THE SIGNAGE CONSTRUCTION THAT CONCLUDE THE SIGNAGE WOULD BE BOTH LIT THROUGH THE LETTERS AND AROUND THE LETTERS.

MINUTES OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
APRIL 16, 2019

MS. TOLBERT SAID SHE WAS OKAY WITH THE DESIGN. SHE ADVISED THAT MR. PIETRZAK OVERSEE THE INSTALLATION TO MAKE SURE THAT THERE IS NOT A BOX LIGHT INSTALLED THAT WOULD NOT BE KEEPING WITH THE GUIDELINES.

MR. BAXTER ASKED ABOUT THE ALUMINUM FRAMING AROUND THE WINDOW AND ITS COLOR. MR. EVANS SAID IT WOULD BE A BRONZE COLOR TO MATCH THE CURRENT DOOR ON THE BUILDING.

MS. TOLBERT CALLED FOR A MOTION ON THE PETITION AS PROPOSED. MR. BAXTER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE PETITION AS SUBMITTED; SECONDED BY MS. MCBRIDE.

HHPC 18-09 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – HISTORIC PRESERVATION CHAPTER

MR. MILLER HAD NO UPDATES ON THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN BUT PRESENTED ON CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT DESIGNATION, USING POWERPOINT.

MR. MILLER EXPLAINED THAT CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT STATUS IS A FEDERAL DESIGNATION, IMPLEMENTED BY STATE PRESERVATION OFFICES, AND IS A DESIGNATION OF A LOCAL GOVERNMENT. IT IS KNOWN AS CLG FOR SHORT. MR. MILLER SAID THE CITY OF HOBART IS ALREADY DOING WHAT A CLG DOES, BUT IS NOT DESIGNATED, BECAUSE IT HAS A FUNCTIONING HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION. MR. MILLER ALSO SAID THAT MOST OF THE REQUIREMENTS AND CONTINUED RESPONSIBILITIES ARE ALREADY MET, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF REVIEWING NATIONAL REGISTER APPLICATIONS.

MR. MILLER SHARED DETAILS ABOUT THE APPLICATION PROCESS, INCLUDING WHAT THE CITY OF HOBART ALREADY HAS ASSEMBLED AND READY TO SUBMIT AND WHAT WOULD NEED TO BE CREATED OR ADOPTED IN ORDER TO MEET THE APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS. HE WENT THROUGH A CHECKLIST FOR THE APPLICATION AND WHAT TYPES OF APPROVALS ARE NEEDED AT THE LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL LEVEL.

MR. MILLER EXPLAINED THAT COMMISSION MEMBERS WOULD NEED TO PURSUE CONTINUING EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS AND THE CITY WOULD NEED TO SUBMIT AN ANNUAL REPORT OF ITS ACTIONS FOR THE YEAR. THE CITY WOULD ALSO NEED TO KEEP AN UPDATED SURVEY OF HISTORIC RESOURCES.

MR. BAXTER ASKED ABOUT THE CURRENT STATUS OF THE SURVEY. MR. MILLER SAID A COUNTY-WIDE SURVEY ALREADY EXISTS, ALTHOUGH ITS DATED. MS. TOLBERT ADDED THAT ANY LOCAL DISTRICT THAT IS DESIGNATED COULD THEN BE UPDATED. MR. BAXTER THEN ASKED ABOUT NATIONAL REGISTER-LISTED PROPERTIES. MR. MILLER LISTED THE RESOURCES CURRENTLY LISTED AND SAID THAT NEW NOMINATIONS WOULD NOT BE VERY FREQUENT. THE COMMISSION COULD HANDLE IT AS THEY COME.

MR. BAXTER ASKED IF LAKE GEORGE COULD BE CONSIDERED A HISTORIC RESOURCE. MR. MILLER SAID PROBABLY NOT.

MR. MILLER LISTED THE BENEFITS OF DESIGNATION. THEY INCLUDED IMPROVED LEGITIMACY, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FROM DHPA, SCHOLARSHIPS TO THE STATEWIDE PRESERVATION CONFERENCE, AND PRIORITY FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND GRANTS. ELIGIBLE GRANTS COULD INCLUDE NOMINATIONS OF HISTORIC DISTRICTS TO THE NATIONAL REGISTER, STRUCTURAL AND ARCHITECTURAL STUDIES, AND BRICK & MORTAR PROJECTS.

MR. BAXTER ASKED IF THE GRANT FUNDS VARY FROM YEAR TO YEAR. MS. TOLBERT SAID STATES USUALLY UNDERSTAND HOW MUCH MONEY THEY ARE GETTING EACH YEAR, BUT CLGS GET A PORTION OF THE FUND BEFORE

**MINUTES OF THE HOBART HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
APRIL 16, 2019**

OTHER GRANT APPLICANTS. MR. MILLER ADDED THAT THE GRANTS ARE A GREAT REASON TO GET DESIGNATED SO THE GRANT FUNDS ARE MORE EASILY OBTAINABLE.

MR. BAXTER ASKED IF THERE ARE TYPES OF PROJECTS THAT GET FUNDED OVER OTHERS. MR. MILLER SAID A LOT OF MONEY GOES TOWARDS BRICK AND MORTAR PROJECTS AND THE BUILDINGS HAVE TO BE LISTED ON THE NATIONAL REGISTER. THE GREATEST PRIORITY IS FOR BUILDINGS IN DANGER OF BEING LOST. MS. TOLBERT TALKED ABOUT THE LAST HPF GRANT SHE WORKED ON IN CROWN POINT AS AN EXAMPLE. MR. BAXTER ASKED IF THE PRIVATE FUNDS COULD BE USED WITH THE GRANTS. MR. MILLER SAID THE FEDERAL GRANT HAS TO BE MATCHED WITH NON-FEDERAL FUNDS.

MR. MILLER SAID HE WOULD BE HAPPY TO WORK WITH OTHER CITY STAFF TO PURSUE WITH THE APPLICATION.

MS. TOLBERT ASKED MR. PIETRZAK IF HE HAD ANYTHING TO ADD. HE DID NOT.

MR. MILLER REMINDED THE COMMISSION THAT MAY IS NATIONAL PRESERVATION MONTH AND ASKED IF THEY WERE INTERESTED IN DOING A DOWNTOWN WALKING TOUR. MR. BAXTER ASKED IF JUNE WOULD BE A BETTER MONTH BECAUSE MAY IS BUSY. MR. MILLER AGREED THAT ANY TYPE OF EVENT WOULD BE GREAT IN THE SUMMER. MS. TOLBERT AGREED AND SAID THAT IT WOULD BE GREAT TO CONNECT IT WITH THE SUMMER MARKET IN JUNE.

MR. BAXTER ASKED ABOUT TREES OUT FRONT OF CITY HALL THAT WERE DISCUSSED AT THE LAST MEETING. MR. PIETRZAK SAID IT WAS A MINOR CHANGE WITHIN THE SAME SPECIES.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MS. MCBRIDE MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN.
MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING: MAY 21, 2019

MINUTES APPROVED ON 7/16/19

CHAIRMAN *Sharon B. Ekeh*

ATTEST *Jan E. Howard*