

## COA / Demolition Review Committee Meeting 10/23/23

### Approved as Presented

Attendees: Toni Kile, Mardita Murphy, Emma Lane, Shannon McDowell

*The meeting convened at 2:03 p.m.*

#### COA Review 29 N Main Street

Ms. Lane discussed the two COAs that have been submitted for 29 N Main Street. One is related to modifications on the back of the building, which has been approved administratively. The second COA focuses on the front of the building and includes staining the wood, painting the aluminum trim grey/black, and adding a tenant sign to the wall.

#### Background on the Building:

The building has several projecting signs now but has 11 tenants and would like to provide signage for each tenant. The owner is proposing removing the projecting signs and adding a wall sign that will have a space for each tenant's name. Due to the high number of tenants and width of the building, staff had encouraged the owner to move toward a tenant sign during preliminary discussions. Per the City's sign code, projecting signs are limited to 6 square feet in size which would be difficult to accommodate signage for all of the tenants.

#### Process for COA Review:

Ms. Lane has already conducted an administrative review of the COA and found the modifications do not meet the threshold for administrative approval. She has referred the COA to the COA/Demolition Review Committee for consideration. The COA/Demolition Review Committee members each conduct a review of the COA against the COA criteria. Consideration should also be given to the Downtown Design Guidelines. Each committee member must prepare written comments, which are then compiled by Ms. Lane. All comments are due on 10/31. If there is not concurrence among the committee members, the committee could meet again to discuss options on moving forward.

Ms. Murphy indicated her initial thoughts were to approve the stain and paint requests. She suggested adding a blade (projecting) sign to identify the building.

Ms. Lane agreed with Ms. Murphy's thoughts on the stain and paint requests and indicated the review should focus on the signage request.

Ms. Murphy asked if this decision could impact any other signs or buildings in the historic district.

Ms. Lane indicated this is one of the only buildings in the historic district with many tenants, so it is a bit of a unique case.

Ms. Kile indicated she was concerned that the addition of the wall sign would significantly change the color of the wall or could obscure architectural features, which the design guidelines discourage.

Ms. Lane indicated she also had concerns about how the sign would be attached to the building and has already addressed this with the owner.

Ms. Murphy asked whether we could request a mockup of the actual sign and request that the materials used be compatible with signage materials used otherwise in the district. Seeing the actual sign design would be helpful in determining whether the design is compatible with the character in the district.

Ms. Lane indicated we can ask for the actual design of the sign and indicated she would reach out to the applicant.

Ms. McDowell asked whether we should ask for the color of the trim and signage to match the Benjamin Moore historic color palette as mentioned in the design guidelines.

Ms. Lane indicated we could request the color to match.

*The meeting was adjourned at 2:38 p.m.*