

**LOWELL HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING  
OCTOBER 2, 2012  
6:00 PM**

Chairman Floyd called the meeting to order at 6:05 PM. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Recording Secretary Gena Knapp took roll call. Members answering the roll call were Susan Riley, Martha Burger, Ken Floyd, and Randy Hall. Connie Schrombeck was not in attendance. Also present were Building Official Tom Trulley, Indiana Historic Society Representative Tiffany Tolbert, and 3 citizens.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Ms. Riley made a motion to approve the June 7, 2011 meeting minutes, seconded by Ms. Burger and carried by voice vote.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Petitioner: #2012-16 James and Kathy Sickinger / Sickinger's Jewelry**  
**Request: Certificate of Appropriateness**  
**Purpose: New sign 18' Wide by 2' High**  
**Location: 314 E. Commercial Ave. Lowell, IN 46356**

James Sickinger, 250 W. Oakley Ave., stated this sign has been approved in Valparaiso inside of their historic district, so he felt it was something that would work for our historic district as well. Mr. Sickinger showed an example of the sign from Landmark Signs. He stated the letters will be a brushed aluminum and the lights are inside of the letters. The lights do not shine out nor does the back shine out. The lighting inside of the letters shine back to the back surface and create a hallow effect. He stated this sign would be a definite improvement in the look since his old sign goes back to the early 80's. It is not neon, and it does not shine out, it just gives it a nice glow. As you see in the picture, the bottom section of our building is windows and doors, and then the glass block, and above that would be the sign itself with the windows above that. Mr. Sickinger stated he thought this would be a good sign that would add to the look of the area, and not distract from the historic look.

Brandon O'Brien, Landmark Signs, stated the reason for the backing on the sign was to lower the amount of penetrations being put in to the building. Normally on the letters, depending on the size and shape, you could have three to six studs per letter. With the backer, the letters are secured to the backing and we minimize it to about four to six studs for the entire sign. The sign will stick out from the building about 5 1/8". Ms. Tolbert asked what the font of the sign was. Mr. O'Brien showed her a picture of the font style. He also passed out other photos to the board of other projects they have done with the same sign style. Ms. Riley asked if the backing would be going all the way across the building. Mr. O'Brien stated it would almost go the entire length of the building. We also have the backing color that almost matches the marble looking structure that is already there. We are also not going the whole height of the brick so that they can still

hang their Christmas lights. Ms. Riley stated she noticed it would be mounted to the brick. Mr. Sickinger stated that was correct, it would not attach to or cover the glass block or the windowsills. Ms. Riley asked if they are calling it side lighting. Ms. Tolbert stated she would go through the design guidelines so everyone would understand. She stated the style of the sign is appropriate, the height is appropriate, the lettering is appropriate, the location looks like it is a little higher than McVey's. Ideally the sign would be attached to the glass block to keep it the same height as next door. There is some discussion in terms of the lighting since the guidelines state to avoid backlit and internally illuminated signs, but you can debate because there is lighting in the letter, but it is not lighting the letters it is pointing backwards. Really the only issue is the location and the lighting. When you make a motion, you need to indicate the specifics as far as the size, location, lighting, and overall design of the sign. Mr. Trulley asked if it would overlap McVey's sign. Mr. Sickinger stated it would be strictly on their building and there will be a margin on each side. Mr. O'Brien stated their building is about 22' – 23' and the sign is only 18'. Mr. Sickinger stated the issue with going too low is all of the glass block. Ms. Tolbert stated the idea for signage in the design guidelines is to not block the details in the brick and the design under the window since they are details of the architecture. She stated she was just pointing out the design guidelines in terms of what is being proposed. Ms. Riley stated the placement should not cover windows, so it can't cover the glass block either. Mr. Tolbert stated it would be up above the glass, but below the piece of stone under the window. If it is going to be above the glass, you should include in the motion for it not to cover that piece of stone across the front of the building. Mr. Floyd asked if we know the height between the glass and stone. Mr. Trulley looked at the brick courses and stated it should be fine. Mr. O'Brien stated it would be below the stone details below the windows. As far as the bottom of the sign, you will still have two rows of bricks showing.

Ms. Riley stated she moved to adopt the findings and facts based on the fact that the sign should not cover the stone felt course, the sign will be 2' by 18', will be brushed metal, the lettering will be map brushed aluminum, the illumination will be white LED's, and it will be a shoebox backing that is map dark bronze. This will be placed above the glass block and not cover the block. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hall and carried. Ms. Riley also made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness, seconded by Mr. Hall and carried by voice vote.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Hall made a motion to adjourn at 6:23 PM, seconded by Ms. Burger and carried by voice vote.

---

Ken Floyd, Chariman

---

Connie Schrombeck, Secretary