

**CRIPPLE CREEK HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MEETING MAY 2, 2013  
MINUTES**

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call.**

Chairperson Petty called the meeting to order at 5:00 P.M. Commissioners Petty, Maberry, Batson, Goll, Veatch and McDonald were present. Alternate Schechter was present and was seated. HP & Planning Coordinator Stockton was present. Commissioner Grainger arrived at 5:10 P.M.

**2. Approval of Minutes from Meeting on March 7, 2013.**

Maberry moved to approve the minutes as written, Batson seconded, and motion carried unanimously.

**3. Review of Sign Permit for an Electronic Sign at 442 E. Bennett Avenue, Double Eagle Resorts, Inc., Applicant.**

Staff stated that the applicant requests approval of a sign permit for an electronic sign up to 100 sq. ft. in the B Zone at 442 E. Bennett Avenue. Staff emphasized that the review of the sign by the HPC is according to the new Development Code and needs to include review of **“for the lettering style, colors, and any other elements that influence the historic compatibility of the sign. A compatible sign design is one which uses historic elements with some consideration for more modern equivalents”**. Staff report stated that currently there is an awning and 3 storefront-type modern windows that were approved when the building was constructed in 1996 to provide compatibility with the historic architecture of Cripple Creek. This area of the façade will be modified by removing the awning and covering a portion of the windows to allow for the attachment of the sign below the lighter trim element.

According to the new Development Code, electronic signs are allowed in Section 2.6 of Article 2 (see attached). While the size of electronic window signs is indicated in the code in Table 4-2 as a maximum of 10 sq. ft., no size is specified for other types of electronic signs. On May 15<sup>th</sup> the applicant will be requesting a Variance from the Planning Commission and the City Council for this sign. At that time staff will present the results of the HPC review.

Bill Stankiewicz, representative for the applicant, was present and stated that the intent of the sign is to provide event information via a clean, modern message board. The sign will be 72 sq. ft. outdoor digital display with a slide show to replace the use of banners and will include 20% City of Cripple Creek ads. There is no intention of ever using a “jumbo-tron” size sign and they are positioning the sign low enough on the building so that it would not be obtrusive to nearby residential areas.

McDonald stated that the sign would be very distracting to the motoring public and that there are already many “near-misses” on that corner with vehicles turning onto Bennett Avenue. Schechter asked if the sign could be put behind a window, but Stankiewicz stated that it could not be seen due to the reflective windows. Grainger stated that the sign is a better alternative than banners and this more modern type of sign is overdue. Maberry agreed with Grainger and stated that the city is behind the times in terms of advertising, although we need to keep these signs within the historic character of the city. There was no public comment. After much discussion, a motion to approve the request with the condition that no exterior LED outline lighting will be used while the sign is up was made by Grainger, seconded by Schechter, and passed 4-3 with Batson, McDonald and Veatch opposed. Petty abstained from voting.

**4. Review of Sign Permit Request for a Historic Church Sign at the Corner of Hwy. 67 and E. Golden Avenue, Carl Poch, Applicant.**

Staff stated that the applicant requested that the HPC look at a proposed directional sign design to represent all the historic churches in town. A drawing was distributed. Applicant was not present and HPC asked for more information including permission from the property owner to erect the sign in the proposed location and letters from the three churches agreeing to the sign. Staff stated that rather than listing the different denominations, the sign should have the names of the churches on it. There was no public comment.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:40 PM.