

DRAFT

MINNEAPOLIS HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION

ROOM 317, CITY HALL
350 SOUTH FIFTH STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55415-1385

PERMIT REVIEW/PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES
JANUARY 14, 2003
5:00 P.M.

The meeting was called to order at 5:02 p.m. **Present:** Commissioners Stevens, Koski, Neiswander, Lindquist (left at 6:38), Messenger, Housum, Anderson, Grover, Glancy, Dunn and Nordstrom.

Staff Present: Mathis, Lucas, Jensen, Graham.

PERMIT REVIEW/PUBLIC HEARING

- 4. 16 University Avenue NE, St. Anthony Falls Historic District, by Keegan Pubs LLC, for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a second sign. (Staff, Amy Lucas).**

Ms. Lucas presented the staff report recommending that the HPC adopt staff findings and deny the Certificate of Appropriateness for the projecting sign with the condition that the ornamental bracket be removed and the building façade brick must be appropriately repaired.

Questions of staff were then taken. Commissioner Koski asked who wrote the sign guidelines. Ms. Lucas replied that the HPC has their own set of adopted Sign Guidelines and then on top of these the building developer and owner, Hunt Gregory, wrote multi-tenant sign guidelines for this building. Hunt Gregory brought their specific guidelines to the HPC for approval and adoption. Both sets of guidelines note that each tenant shall receive only one sign and Hunt Gregory preferred a flat sign. Commissioner Messenger noted that if a second sign were approved for Keegan's, it would be problematic because of the precedence. Then all the other tenants of this development would also want a second sign.

The public hearing was then opened. Terry Keegan, owner operator of Keegan's Pub, spoke in favor of the sign. Mr. Keegan explained that he and his wife have spent a lot

of time and money to design an authentic Irish Pub. This is a full service Victorian restaurant, designed and built in Waterford, Ireland. This is an expensive endeavor. One of the elements of the authentic Irish Pub is the “shingle” or the projecting sign in question. Mr. Keegan noted that he knew his approval was for one flat sign but still installed the second projecting sign and “wanted to wait to see what happens.” Mr. Keegan noted that he had neighborhood support in favor of the sign but did not provide copies to the HPC. He went on to compare his signage with that of his neighbors. Other neighbors include the Police Station signage that has signs on the two lights and a shield on the door. (Not reviewed by the HPC.) He would like the guidelines to be flexible and allow his sign. He feels this sign is appropriate for the era and is also needed for advertisement because of the competition in the area. He notes McNamara’s restaurant has more signage (not in the historic district) and Kramarczuk’s signage. He notes that these signs probably predate the historic district. He also notes the Nye’s signage which he believes may be “grandfathered in” and he cannot compete. Mr. Keegan presents a “historic” 1947 photo he found with multiple signs. He also notes that one way to “get around the sign rules” may be that this is his family crest and not a sign. He states that the precedent setting nature of the sign should be viewed as stopping progress.

No one else wished to speak for or against the application. The public hearing was then closed and Commissioner comments taken.

Chair Messenger commented that it is difficult to deny this sign, because it is an attractive sign and is appropriate. Commissioner Lindquist would like to have the HPC Sign Guidelines reviewed at another meeting.

MOTION by Commissioner Lindquist to adopt recommendations and findings, and deny the Certificate of Appropriateness for the projecting sign. **SECOND** by Commissioner Grover.

Commissioner Housum had comments about the sign. She agrees with Chair Messenger that the sign is attractive and believes the sign is an amenity to the neighborhood. She notes that the Sign Guidelines for historic properties provide that in a multi-tenant situation signs can be approved on a case by case basis. Commissioner Housum asked staff that without setting a precedence, could this sign could be approved. Ms. Lucas replied that in the future tenants of this block must come to HPC if they wanted a second sign because it went beyond the allowable signage that staff may approve. Ms. Lucas suggested that findings be stated as to why this sign would be appropriate if the Commission was moving to approve the sign.

Chair Messenger called the question. **MOTION APPROVED** with 2 nays.

Chair Messenger explained to the applicant that this decision can be appealed to the City Council and staff is available for questions as to the process for appeal.