

other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character-defining features of the historic building" is not recommended. Options A & B appear appropriately scaled and are placed on the very narrow sign board which appears to be the appropriate placement. Option C is similar to another sign placed on the Burford Building and would also be acceptable. In the past, signs have been on awnings or projecting but there is no historical evidence of where signs were placed prior to 1998. Any of the options would meet the Standards and could be approved per KSA 75-2724.

Project Type & Review Standards			
	YES	NO	N/A
Historic use/reuse and minimal change to distinctive materials, features, etc.			X
Historic character retained; removal or alteration distinctive materials avoided	X		
No changes that create a false sense of historical development	X		
Changes that have acquired historical significance in their own right will be retained	X		
Distinctive materials, features, examples of craftsmanship, etc. will be preserved	X		
Repair deteriorated historic features; new features will match old in design			X
Chemical and physical treatments will be as gentle as possible			X
Protect and preserve archeological resources in place			X
New construction will not destroy historic features that characterize property and will be differentiated from the old; new work is compatible with size, scale, massing, etc	X		X
New construction can be removed without destroying essential form & integrity	X		



Undated photo provided by the Burford. It would have been taken shortly before the renovations began. The "sign board" existed at this time but it is likely that the windows were behind it as can be seen in the green panels to the south.



Photo dated 8/4/1998 provided by the Burford shows the window area at that time was covered by an awning. The photo also shows a box sign above one of the store fronts in a similar location as the proposed sign.



