

Historic Preservation Commission

MEETING DATE: Tuesday, March 9, 2021
MEETING TIME: 6:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Pendleton Town Hall
100 W. State Street
Pendleton, Indiana

ORDER OF BUSINESS

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order by George Harris at 6:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Board members in attendance were Craig Campbell, George Harris, Dan Trauthwein, Kevin Kenyon, Tammy Bowman and Sandi Butler. A quorum was established. Individuals representing the Town were Planning Director Rachel Christenson, Planning and Zoning Administrator Kayla Hassett and Shanna Kelly attending on behalf of the Town Attorney Jeff Graham. Also in attendance were Nathan Davis and Latoya Allen-Davis representing Magication Station.

III. OATH OF OFFICE

Recommendation made by Rachel Christenson to table Oath of Office for newest member, Tammy Bowman, until committee meets in person.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Motion made by Sandi Butler to accept and approve the Meeting Minutes from the February 2021 meeting; seconded by Craig Campbell; roll call taken and all members present voted in favor of motion; motion carried.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Kayla Hassett requested slight change in order of meeting agenda. Specifically, Hassett announced that new business owners of Magication Station, Nathan Davis and Latoya Allen-Davis, are in attendance and seek approval of recently submitted sign permit application. Hassett presented a hard copy of the Sign Permit Application and reported the following:

- Certificate of Appropriateness approved and Sign Permit Application recently submitted to the Planning Department.
- Planning Department seeks eyes and input of HPC Members before final approval.
- Business located in store front previously occupied by Times Post on State Street.

Nathan Davis introduced himself and presented the following:

- He and his wife Latoya Allen-Davis are owners of the new Magication Station store in Pendleton.
- Magication Station is a toy store, featuring education toys, spectrum toys for children with autism and magic kits.
- Actively involved with three Santa groups and will run the store as an elf.

Kayla Hassett stated that the permit application proposes a wall sign under the seal of the three windows above the exterior awning. Hassett asked HPC Members for their thoughts and suggested one line sign above awning as well as sign under awning for sidewalk view.

The following discussion took place:

Dan Trauthwein asked if the building owner is responsible for providing the bracket for sign(s). Kayla Hassett replied that the building owner is not required to provide, but always an option.

Kevin Kenyon asked Petitioner why not considering a bracketed sign versus one bolted flush to the building. Nathan Davis replied that the building owner, Owens, prefer to move away from bracketed signs as concerned with high wind damage.

Kayla Hassett asked Petitioner if contractor has been lined up for the sign project. Nathan Davis replied that a contractor has not yet been lined up, but that he planned to install the sign.

Kevin Kenyon asked if insurance would cover damage to the sign. Dan Trauthwein replied that the insurance carrier of the owner of the building would likely cover.

Rachel Christenson commented that Bob Post, active member in Main Street Pendleton, is very passionate about flat signs on buildings in the downtown district and most likely made this recommendation to Owens.

Nathan Davis stated that he plans to have sign in the window as well as can consider having a sign under the awning as well. Dan Trauthwein recommended a sign to stick out under the awning, visible from both sides for better visual.

Craig Campbell asked if two signs were permitted. Kayla Hassett confirmed that two signs are allowed.

Kevin Kenyon stated that HPC seeks consistency and concerned that sign above will not be visible and will not be able to be seen, losing added value. Craig Campbell stated that having Owens install the sign bracket would be best. Kayla Hassett added that most business owners usually put up their own signs.

Dan Trauthwein suggested using lighter material versus metal to prevent significant damage in the event of tornado/high winds.

Kayla Hassett offered to get contractor information for Steve's Tuxedo store sign.

George Harris recommended having a sign that can be read from both sides going down the road, for both one under the awning and one above the awning, perpendicular to the building versus flat.

Rachel Christenson also suggested to go with one line sign using larger print for the sign above the awning. Nathan Davis replied that this can be done.

Kayla Hassett confirmed that Petitioner can do both signs under the one Sign Permit Application. Hassett also informed that sign can be approved as Planning Staff as projected sign and/or skinnier sign as well as smaller one under the awning. All HPC Members agreed.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. Local Façade Grant – Guidelines and Application Development

- Kayla Hassett pointed out the red areas in the updated Local Façade Grant Application represents topics that still need conversed. Hassett also stated that the other areas are fairly typical of grants, but the red areas need discussion.
- Rachel Christenson reported the following:
 - Proposed Local Façade Grant follows the City of Madison guidelines closely and took into consideration comments provided by the HPC Members over the last month.
 - Need to include map of area grants are allowed as the Downtown District does not completely line up with the Historic Preservation District.
- Rachel Christenson gave an overview of the Local Façade Grant Sections: (Local Façade Grant provided in Google Drive)
 - Program Description: provides purpose and guidelines on projects.
 - Funding Limits: matching grant program which will match up to 50% of the costs up to \$50,000. For example, and applicant could apply for \$30,000 towards a \$60,000 project.
 - Application Eligibility: persons, corporations, or non-profits holding a fee simple title of properties located in the Downtown Business Zoning. One must be current on property tax as well as will want to provide reference map for eligible projects. Further, one will need to wait one year after disbursement of funds before being eligible for another grant.
 - Application Review and Approval:
 1. Complete applications are due by the filing deadlines set by the Historic Preservation Commission to appear on the meeting agenda. The Historic Preservation Commission Staff will determine if the applications are complete. [Still need to discuss filing deadlines]
- Need to determine if want rolling grant application cycle. Have couple of options:
 - Be consistent with HPC petition filing deadline which is 15 days prior to the HPC meetings. This 15-day requirement may be too short and 30 days may be more appropriate for review by Planning Staff and HPC members.
 - Dan Trauthwein suggested that 30 days is standard and if application is incomplete, Staff can authorize extension. Rachel Christenson replied that Planning Staff can require application to be scheduled for the next month if deemed incomplete. Christenson asked if application is complete, would HPC Members then feel 15 days would be enough time to review prior to the meeting. George Harris and Sandi Butler replied that 15 days for review would be sufficient.
 - Kayla Hassett and Rachel Christenson agreed that applications can be reviewed at each HPC meeting upon completed application being submitted.

2. A Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) must be granted by the Pendleton Historic Preservation Commission prior to the grant application process, but within twelve (12) months of the time of application. Applications missing elements will not be considered for funding. The applicant is responsible for ensuring the application is complete.

- Need to determine if wish to have the COA completed before the grant is approved. Rachel Christenson recommended that, although these processes will be kept separate, the COA should be approved prior to grant approval. Such requirement will help assure that all architectural issues are resolved before grant project begins. Christenson suggested to incorporate the following steps:

#1- COA approval with design plan in place. COA will need to be current one, one approved in last year.

#2- If COA approved, place with grant application process.

#3- HPC reviews grant application and follows timeline.

3. The Historic Preservation Commission will review completed applications prior to the Historic Preservation Commission Meeting. At the meeting, the applicant shall present the project and answer any questions the Historic Preservation Commission may have. The Historic Preservation Committee may approve, deny, or table the application.

- HPC will approve, deny or table the Local Façade Grant Application until the following monthly meeting.

- Tammy Bowman asked if HPC can approve for a lesser amount. Rachel Christenson replied yes.

- Craig Campbell asked if HPC denies application for any reason, will applicant have to wait a year before applying again. Campbell suggested giving option to table application versus deny to allow time to correct the concerns. All HPC Members agreed with this approach.

- Eligible/Ineligible Work: application provides list of eligible and ineligible projects. Rachel Christenson added that HPC will not approve projects for signage projects.
- Project Section Criteria: The Pendleton Historic Preservation Commission will be rating and selecting projects based on project value, quality, and overall impact on historic preservation efforts in the Town of Pendleton. Minimum scores are required to receive funding. The scoring matrix provided over 5 different criteria questions along with score, weight and total. The following comments were made:
 - Rachel Christenson stated that uses may not be super important to Pendleton, suggesting that may want to place priority on funding projects that spur development versus residential improvements.
 - Kayla Hassett suggested giving higher point if project involves walk up retail versus non-sales business.
 - Sandi Butler asked what are the scores. Rachel Christenson replied scores will be from 1-5 and can give higher score if appropriate. Christenson stated that having criteria set in application, such will be helpful to be upfront as to what HPC is seeking and reduce incomplete applications. Christenson added that HPC can assign weight to preferences. Dan Trauthwein suggested giving weight for uses relating to sales business. Christenson stated that use of structure for retail can receive score of 5 versus for office 0 or 1, for example, and then multiplied by weight.

- George Harris asked if applicant uses modern materials to mimic the original façade. Sandi Butler replied that this should be okay so long as it looks like the original.
 - Rachel Christenson stated that the COA process will assure that the Secretary of Interior Standards are followed.
 - Kayla Hassett added that HPC can include the reversal of previously incompatible work. All HPC members agreed. Rachel Christenson stated that they can also give extra points for turning office/storage space into retail space.
 - HPC Members also agreed to assign higher points for projects that applicant offers more than the 50% match minimum requirement. Rachel Christenson added that it will be good for Pendleton to share how much total investment is made between applicant (building or business owner) and the Town of Pendleton.
 - Craig Campbell stressed that it is the ultimate goal to get Town Council to support the Local Façade Grant Program through a budget line item such as the City of Madison Town Council provides versus relying on Food & Beverage Funding.
- Award Notification: Applicants selected to receive funding must enter into a formal Funding Agreement with the Town of Pendleton. The Agreement specifies the dollar amount awarded, scope of work, agreed project budget, contract duration, and the terms of funding.
 - Applicant responsible for timely payments to the contractor/vendors.
 - Any unspent awarded funds come back to the Town of Pendleton.
- Time Limits: Application provides time limits on projects.
 - All HPC Members agreed with time line as well as agreed with recommended Escape Clause suggested by Kayla Hassett, giving up to 12 months extension should it be warranted.
 - Rachel Christenson explained that each project will need to start within 90 days and to be completed in 12 months. Should extension of time be needed, applicant can submit request for extension and subject to HPC approval.
- Publicity: Grant recipients must post a sign in either the front yard or front window acknowledging the Historic Preservation Commission Facade Improvement Grant Program. The sign must remain displayed in a prominent location through the duration of the project.
- Disbursement of Funds: Once the Funding Agreement is approved by the Pendleton Historic Preservation Commission, fifty percent (50%) of the funds will be provided to the recipient, and the remaining fifty percent (50%) of the funds will be disbursed to the recipient after the project is completed.
 - Rachel Christenson asked HPC Members of their thoughts on 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 disbursement of funds upon completion of the work. Kevin Kenyon expressed support of the 1/3 approach. Christenson stated that 1/3 can be given upfront, 1/3 at 50% completion and 1/3 at end of project. Tammy Bowman expressed agreement with the 1/3 installment plan as well. Christenson stated that these installments will incorporate inspections alongside with case-by-case flexibility for more/less inspections. Bowman stated that interim inspection and final inspection should suffice. All HPC Members agreed. Christenson stated that they can leave the wording in the application a bit vague to leave room for flexibility.
- Final Report: Final Report Checklist to be provided at the end of the packet, all of which to be provided before final payment.
 - Dan Trauthwein asked if applicant can apply for funds for project that had already started. Rachel Christenson replied that any work completed in the past or currently under construction should not be eligible. Kayla Hassett added that limiting projects in which COA had been approved in last year will help weed out projects already in the

works. Trauthwein commented that façade is very important to HPC and suggested one to finish out current COA and then come back for new COA/grant project. Christenson explained that COA is continuous, but building permits expire in 18 months from issue date and HPC will need to determine how to handle if one wishes to apply for new COA before an already existing COA has been completed. Trauthwein asked if HPC should place time limit on COA. Craig Campbell replied that this year has been unusual with Covid-19, but once back on our feet, should consider a time limit on COA.

- Kevin Kenyon asked who cites/fines incomplete projects. Rachel Christenson replied that HPC can fine the property owner, but also have Building Code Enforcer/Inspector and the Planning Department perspective to address once all details of the grant program are worked out. Kayla Hassett added that the grant does have a time limit for completion; therefore, this alone will serve as motivation to finish.
- Rachel Christenson stated that HPC can take case-by-case look into the applications received to address any projects that may have already started prior to grant application, should new COA be applied/awarded.
- Final report due 45 days after project completion.
- Consent Agreement and Grant Agreement need signed before the project begins.
- Checklist: Planning Staff will review and check off items. If project not complete, will hold off until the next month to present project completion to HPC.
- Rachel Christenson asked if HPC Members felt Certificate of Incorporation was necessary. Tammy Bowman replied that this requirement by the City of Madison may be addressing local issue. Dan Trauthwein recommended seeking legal advice regarding this matter. Christenson stated that she will check with Legal Counsel and any other supporting documents that should be included.
- Rachel Christenson gave overview of the Application – Applicant Information, Property Owner Information, Property Information, Description of Project, Description of Project Budget. The following comments were made:
 - HPC Members confirmed that they wish to see itemization from each contractor.
 - Rachel Christenson stated that HPC will want level of detail to make sure all reasonable costs.
 - George Harris stated that a general idea of materials used and labor costs should be provided.
 - Kevin Kenyon suggested identification of sub-contractors. Rachel Christenson stated that this may depend on the size of the project.
- Consent Agreement:
 - Outlines basics of what they are applying for before grant awarded.
 - Helps with expectations from HPC being upfront.
 - Will bold “Initial”.
 - Applicant and property owner signs agreement so to confirm property owner is on board with the project.
- Agreement for Participation:
 - Jeff Graham’s Office will need to review this agreement.
 - Grant recipient and HPC President will sign.
- Next Steps:
 - Rachel Christenson will work on updates per tonight’s discussion.
 - Kayla Hassett will take lead on this project for finished project.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn meeting made by Sandi Butler; seconded by Dan Trauthwein; all members present voted in favor of motion; motion carried with meeting being adjourned by Craig Campbell at 7:26 p.m.

Next meeting Tuesday, April 13, 2021