

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING
JUNE 24, 2010**

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Chalifoux, Acting Chairman
Bill Cote, John Hagerman, Nancy Lisby, Karen Lyons

MEMBERS ABSENT: Christel Schmidt

OTHERS PRESENT: Mitchell Austin, Urban Design Planner
Joe Baun

CALL TO ORDER/ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. Roll Call
- B. Next Scheduled Meeting - July 22, 2010

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Meeting of May 27, 2010
 - Mr. Cody MOVED, Ms. Lyons SECONDED approval of the May 27, 2010 minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

NEW BUSINESS

- A. Certificates of Appropriateness
 - 1. HPAB Review
 - a. CA-16-10 - 408 Tamiami Trail, "Lenamon Law" - Vinyl Door and Window Lettering & Exterior Hanging Sign
 - Mr. Mitchell Austin, Urban Design Planner, displayed an overhead of the proposed signage, as delineated in the agenda material, stating this was the site of the historic Ice House. He noted the Ice House building was constructed circa 1904 and individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1990. He mentioned the building was located in the City Center (CC) zoning district and currently contained three other businesses, Ice House Pub, Kat Eye Photography and Manatee's Pizza. He explained the proposed signage consisted of a projecting sign and window lettering/graphics facing Tamiami Trail, both of which met City Code requirements. He pointed out illustrations provided by the applicant were consistent with existing signage as well as the overall architectural character of the building. He concluded with a recommendation for approval, offering to answer any questions of the Board.
 - Ms. Lisby commented the proposed sign was consistent with other, recently approved signage.
 - Ms. Lisby MOVED, Mr. Cody SECONDED approval of CA-16-10. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- b. CA-17-10 - 209 West Olympia Avenue - "Table 209" Window Lettering
- Mr. Austin displayed an overhead of the proposed signage, as delineated in the agenda material, stating this building was constructed circa 1895 and was listed as a contributing structure in the National Register Historic District. He mentioned the building was located in the City Center (CC) zoning district. He explained the proposed signage consisted of window lettering/graphics facing West Olympia Avenue and met City Code requirements. He pointed out illustrations provided by the applicant were consistent with the overall architectural character of the building. He concluded with a recommendation for approval, offering to answer any questions of the Board.
 - Ms. Lisby mentioned the subject building had been used as a funeral parlor in the past.
 - Mr. Austin commented this building pre-dated the existence of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), stating FDOT had been very surprised to learn the porch was located in their right-of-way (ROW).
 - Mr. Hagerman asked if another business operated in this building.
 - Mr. Chalifoux replied that business had closed.
 - Mr. Hagerman clarified the building was located across the street from the Wotitzky Law Firm.
 - Mr. Cody MOVED, Ms. Lyons SECONDED approval of CA-17-10. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- c. CA-19-10 - 312 West Marion Avenue - "Vacuum Cleaner Center" Window Lettering/Graphic and Façade Sign
- Mr. Austin displayed an overhead of the proposed signage, as delineated in the agenda material, stating this building was constructed circa 1920 and was listed on the Florida Master Site File; however, it was not a contributing structure in the National Register Historic District as its architecture did not exhibit the typical "Main-Street-Type of Commercial Style." He mentioned the building was located in the City Center (CC) zoning district. He explained the proposed signage consisted of window lettering/graphics and a façade sign which would face West Marion Avenue and met City Code requirements. He noted the existing signage would be modified only slightly from "Clinic" to "Center" due to a change in ownership. He concluded with a recommendation for approval, offering to answer any questions of the Board.
 - Ms. Lisby stated she had seen a canvas sign located on the side of the building which read "now under original ownership."
 - Mr. Austin explained same was temporary.

- Ms. Lisby MOVED, Mr. Hagerman SECONDED approval of CA-19-10. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- d. CA-20-10 - 258 West Marion Avenue - "Tapas One" - Façade Sign with Mural on Side of Building and Mounted Sign on the Metal Awning Roof
- Mr. Austin displayed an overhead of the proposed signage, as delineated in the agenda material, stating this building was constructed circa 1909 and was listed on the Florida Master Site File. He mentioned the building was located in the City Center (CC) zoning district. He explained the proposed signage consisted of a façade sign and mural which would face the associated parking area as well as a sign mounted to the metal awning roof. He pointed out the property owner had requested this signage be reviewed under the provisions of City Code Section 26-11.11 as the proposed signage did not conform to other requirements of Section 26-11, Sign Standards. He advised the signage represented a fairly creative use given the building's unique location near the corner of two, one-way streets and site configuration of side yard parking. He continued the mural contained a commercial message, specifically a "café" scene for a restaurant use, and did not conform to maximum size requirements for a façade sign under Section 26-11.4(a). He clarified the proposed sign mounted to the metal awning roof was not permitted in conjunction with a façade sign under the requirements of Section 26-11.4(c), Awning Sign. He stated the proposed signage did not adversely impact the architectural or historic character of this structure and met the intent of Section 26-11.11, Creative Signs, reading a portion of same into the record. He concluded with a recommendation for approval, offering to answer any questions of the Board.
- Ms. Lyons confirmed the front roof was slanted, asking how the signage was intended to be put in place.
- Mr. Austin replied it would be applied to the surface.
- Ms. Lyons then observed it appeared a portion of the mural signage was proposed to extend upward.
- Mr. Austin explained same incorporated the building's angled roof line.
- Mr. Joe Baun, applicant's representative, added the lettering would be painted directly on the building. He noted the mural would be hand painted by Mr. Charles Peck, local artist.
- Mr. Hagerman disclosed he had driven by the subject location, stating all of the murals throughout the City had some relevance to the history of Punta Gorda; however, he expressed concern the proposed mural did not and could perhaps set a bad precedent.

He questioned the reasoning behind placing the sign facing against the flow of traffic on a one-way street. He further asked who was responsible for the City's murals.

- Mr. Austin replied the Punta Gorda Mural Society (PGMS), providing a detailed review of the mural approval process. He mentioned murals were not considered signage but rather were viewed as art. He concluded the owner of the building would be responsible for the mural in the event the subject business failed.
- Ms. Lisby pointed out murals were costly to paint, adding property owners were not required to preserve same.
- Mr. Chalifoux stated he had no objection to the mural; however, he suggested the front sign be designed similar to that described in CA-16-10. He noted the sign would only be clearly visible when facing the business whereas a projecting sign would have much more exposure.
- Mr. Baun agreed, stating he had discussed that possibility with the applicant. He mentioned the applicant had first suggested utilizing individual letters drilled directly into the metal awning roof; however, he pointed out same would entail over 30 drill holes.
- Ms. Lyons suggested letters be painted directly on the window.
- Discussion ensued with regard to the particulars of the City's sign requirements and limitations.
- Ms. Lisby asked if the Board could consider the application in sections.
- Mr. Austin replied affirmatively, noting same could entail an additional 30 day approval process.
- Mr. Chalifoux interjected he did not wish to impose such a hardship on someone attempting to open and operate a business; therefore, he suggested any recommendation for change provide staff the ability to follow through directly with the applicant. He asked if members had any objection to the mural portion of the request.
- Mr. Hagerman replied he wished to proceed with caution, stating he personally could not approve the mural. He questioned how the mural could not be considered a form of advertising. He noted he would look more favorably on window lettering than on the proposed awning signage.
- Ms. Lisby questioned the advertising value of the proposed signage which would not be readily visible by vehicular traffic.
- Mr. Chalifoux confirmed Mr. Baun had the authority to act on the business owner's behalf, asking if he had suggested any of the alternatives discussed this date.
- Mr. Baun replied he and the owner had discussed many possibilities before arriving at the subject proposal. He stated he was personally in favor of window lettering. He

acknowledged Mr. Hagerman's concerns regarding the mural, stating same was representative of a classic painting which would be lovely on any business.

- Mr. Hagerman commented window lettering would be more in line with downtown signage.
- Mr. Chalifoux suggested giving the applicant the option to utilize window lettering or the type of signage typically approved for use downtown.
- Mr. Baun confirmed same would not entail an additional 30 day approval process.
- Mr. Cody MOVED, Mr. Hagerman SECONDED approval of the mural, including the lettering above same, to grant the owner the option to use window lettering or projecting signage and to give staff the authority to work with the owner. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. Information Only

a. CA-15-10 - 717 West Marion Avenue - Re-roof Detached Garage

b. CA-18-10 - 409 West Virginia Avenue - Air Conditioning Unit

- Mr. Austin announced CA-15-10 and CA-18-10 had been approved administratively by staff, providing a brief description of each.
- Ms. Lisby asked why the applicant in CA-15-10 had not made repairs to damage incurred by Hurricane Charley in August 2004.
- Mr. Austin replied he believed the house was under new ownership, stating it appeared the current owner planned on performing the necessary repairs.
- Ms. Lisby asked if a permit had been pulled for the shed on that property.
- Mr. Austin replied he did not recall same.
- Ms. Lisby expressed concern with owners being unfamiliar with historic homes and the associated permitting.

B. Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) for the City of Punta Gorda Comprehensive Plan 2025

- Mr. Austin made a PowerPoint presentation, as delineated in the agenda material, stating adoption of an EAR was required by the State once every seven years, basically providing an assessment of the Comprehensive Plan. He explained an EAR was the principle process for updating local comprehensive plans, adding it reflected changes in local conditions. He continued an EAR would include State policies on planning and growth management and evaluate how the community had addressed major planning issues through implementation of its Comprehensive Plan. He noted the EAR also suggested how the Comprehensive Plan should be revised to address community objectives, reflecting changing conditions and trends and account for changes in State requirements. He advised a Comprehensive Plan must be "fluid" in order to be of

benefit. He announced the community's role was critical to the entire process in order to identify major issues, citing "no safe pedestrian crossing on U.S. 41" as an example. He provided a detailed review of the following elements of the Comprehensive Plan: Future Land Use; Transportation; Recreation & Open Space; Conservation & Coastal Management; Capital Improvements. He mentioned the Conservation & Coastal Management Element may be separated, adding staff would also address climate adaptation. He announced a Public Workshop was scheduled for July 15, 2010, in Council Chambers, concluding staff wished to encourage as much public input as possible.

- Ms. Lisby asked if funding was available to ensure the workshop was well advertised.
- Mr. Austin replied advertising would meet legal requirements.
- Mr. Chalifoux suggested issuing press releases. He confirmed the workshop would be publicized via the City's web site.
- Ms. Lisby recalled Ms. Janeen Weiler, former member of the now sunsetted Revitalization Committee, had pursued the above mentioned issue of pedestrian crossings, up to and including personally meeting with FDOT at their regional office in Bartow. She questioned whether staff planned to follow through in that the Revitalization Committee was no longer in existence.
- Mr. Austin expressed hope Ms. Weiler would continue to pursue the matter as a citizen. He stated he understood FDOT had approved in principle some suggestions for increasing pedestrian safety along U.S. 41.
- Ms. Lisby explained the Revitalization Committee's main concern had been pedestrians crossing U.S. 41 North between the City Marketplace property and the Wyvern Hotel and the dangers associated with same.
- Mr. Hagerman recalled a suggestion to install flashing lights similar to a street in Naples, questioning the status of same.
- Ms. Lisby replied such a proposal would require FDOT approval.
- Mr. Cody pointed out a crosswalk in the subject area had been removed by FDOT.
- Mr. Austin opined FDOT was completely unfamiliar with Punta Gorda's downtown but rather was primarily concerned with traffic flow. He advised FDOT was more receptive to issues pushed forth by the community as opposed to City staff.
- Ms. Lisby mentioned community based organizations were encouraging foot traffic to promote businesses, expressing agreement with the basic idea behind same; however, this encouraged pedestrian traffic in places with no crosswalk.
- Mr. Cody stated he understood a percentage of the County's gas tax would be shared with the City.

- Mr. Austin responded the gas tax was collected at the County level, adding the City received a portion per State law.
 - Mr. Chalifoux clarified the State allowed cities and counties to work out the percentage.
- C. Discussion regarding Fund Raising for Historic Projects
- Mr. Chalifoux stated many times the Board created projects which typically died from lack of funding; however, the Board's bylaws allowed for fund raising. He cited one example of a potential project was the Board's assumption of responsibility for the award program previously handled by the Revitalization Committee.
 - Mr. Hagerman mentioned he had been nominated for an award through Team Punta Gorda (TPG). He questioned the guidelines relative to the Board's ability to conduct fund raising.
 - Mr. Austin replied he did not believe guidelines were spelled out in the bylaws, offering to research same with Charlotte County.
 - Mr. Chalifoux questioned whether the City Attorney's opinion should be sought.
 - Mr. Austin suggested routing the Board's questions through the City Manager.
 - Mr. Chalifoux confirmed Mr. Austin would handle same.
 - Ms. Lisby asked if the awards program formerly handled by the Revitalization Committee was no longer active.
 - Mr. Chalifoux replied TPG was running an architectural type award program; however, there was currently no City award program.
 - Mr. Hagerman asked if the lack of a City program was due to cost.
 - Ms. Lisby opined the Revitalization Committee's award program entailed little if no cost.
 - Mr. Austin agreed the costs were fairly minimal; however, the program essentially had no standards.
 - Mr. Chalifoux stated both this Board and their Charlotte County counterparts had discussed several options, including passing on the cost of plaques to interested property or business owners who would receive an award.
 - Mr. Hagerman stated as the owner of a historic building, he would have no objection to same. He opined a tasteful, historic marker lent more prestige to historic structures.
 - Mr. Chalifoux noted establishment of some type of award program would be discussed at the next joint meeting between this Board and the Charlotte County Historical Advisory Committee (HAC), including frequency of awards, i.e., monthly, quarterly or annually.

- Mr. Hagerman commented less frequent awards would be most cost effective and may imply more prestige.
- Mr. Chalifoux added an annual program was more sustainable.
- Ms. Lyons disagreed, noting she was a former member of the Revitalization Committee and a recipient of one of their awards. She opined once per year would not do enough to encourage property owners to rehabilitate their homes and/or businesses.
- Mr. Hagerman countered awarding properties too readily devalued the award.
- Ms. Lyons reiterated her disagreement, pointing out rehabilitating a home entailed significant cost. She asserted receiving an award inspired pride in ownership.
- Ms. Lisby offered to contact Mr. John Magnin, former Revitalization Committee Chairman, to learn as much as possible about their program, including the most recently awarded properties so as to possibly retrieve the signs.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Punta Gorda Historical Society, Inc.
 - Ms. Lisby commented favorably on an article in the June 23, 2010 Punta Gorda Herald on the Punta Gorda Historical Society's (PGHS) collaboration with Home Depot to spruce up the Train Depot property. She mentioned the Train Depot was closed for the summer due to a lack of air conditioning. She noted a church group had volunteered to paint the interior of the Women's Club and to assume the costs associated with same. She advised gutters had been placed on the cigar cottage at the History Park. She announced fund raising would be conducted to re-roof the Trabue House.
- B. Proposed Joint City/County Meeting Dates
 - Mr. Austin drew members' attention to a list of proposed dates, as delineated in the agenda material, noting Charlotte County recommended July 28, 2010, and October 27, 2010, for the last two meetings of 2010.
 - Consensus of the Board was approval of the recommended dates.

STAFF COMMENTS

- A. Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) Project Status Report
 - Mr. Austin advised he had nothing specific to report, confirming members had no questions.

MEMBER COMMENTS

- Ms. Lisby commented on the above mentioned revitalization award program, asking if formal approval should be sought from the City.
- Mr. Austin opined such a program was an educational, community outreach program, adding same was denoted in the Board's bylaws which were approved by City Council.
- Mr. Chalifoux countered he believed the City Manager should be notified as a courtesy.

- Ms. Lisby requested members be provided with a copy of the Board's bylaws.
- Mr. Cody then commented on the Papillion building, stating a banner had been hung on the railings advertising a bartending school. He asked Mr. Austin to determine whether same was permitted.
- Mr. Hagerman asked if the Waterproof Charts building was historic.
- Ms. Lisby replied affirmatively.
- Mr. Hagerman stated the building had been sold fairly recently, adding the upstairs had been rented. He explained an extremely large banner had been hung and been in place for the past several weeks, asking if same was allowed.
- Mr. Austin replied he was unsure but would research same with Ms. Lisa Hannon, Zoning Coordinator.
- Mr. Hagerman expressed hope the Board would do everything possible to ensure the heritage of Punta Gorda was protected.
- Mr. Chalifoux asked if a grant application had been submitted for updating the Florida Master Site File.
- Mr. Austin replied it had not; however, he anticipated same would be done the following year.
- Mr. Chalifoux welcomed Mr. Hagerman, newly appointed to the Board.

ADJOURNMENT

- Meeting Adjourned: 10:31 a.m.

John Chalifoux, Acting Chairman

Mary Kelly, Recording Secretary