



Architectural Review Board

Meeting Minutes

February 8, 2016

7:00 p.m.

New Albany Architectural Review Board met in regular session in the Council Chambers of Village Hall, 99 W Main Street and was called to order by Architectural Review Board Chair Mr. Alan Hinson at 7:03 p.m.

Mr. Alan Hinson, Chair	Present
Ms. Shirli Billings	Present
Mr. Jonathan Iten	Absent
Mr. Lewis Smoot	Present
Mr. Jim Brown	Present
Mr. E.J. Thomas	Present
Mr. Bill Schubert	Present
Mr. Sloan Spalding	Present

Staff members present: Adrienne Joly, Deputy Director, Stephen Mayer, Planner and Pam Hickok, Clerk.

Billings moved, seconded by Thomas to approve the meeting minutes of January 11, 2016. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Brown, yea; Mr. Smoot, yea; Ms. Billings, yea; Mr. Schubert, yea; Mr. Thomas, yea. Yea, 6; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0; Motion carried by a 6-0 vote.

Mr. Hinson asked for any changes or corrections to the agenda.

Mr. Mayer stated none.

In response to Mr. Hinson's invitation to speak on non-agenda related items, there were no questions or comments from the public.

Moved by Thomas, seconded by Billings to accept the staff reports and related documents into the record. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Brown, yea; Mr. Smoot, yea; Ms. Billings, yea; Mr. Schubert, yea; Mr. Thomas, yea. Yea, 6; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0; Motion carried by a 6-0 vote.

**ARB-101-2015 Certificate of Appropriateness for New Building Construction
Certificate of Appropriateness for the west building elevation of a new structure at
the northwest corner of Market and Main Streets. (PID: 222-000067)
Applicant: The New Albany Company**

Mr. Stephen Mayer presented the staff report.

Mr. Tom Rubey stated that as difficult as the process is, it works well. Brian Jones, architect is present tonight for any questions. At the last meeting this building had a mostly flat roof with a few pitches. We were ready to come back

tonight to discuss the benefits of not having a pitched roof. After reading the comments from Mr. Iten, included in the packets, we looked at the building again. We now have a pitched roof and it is better as a result of this board. This perspective is from 300ft from the west elevation, which is about the middle of the parking lot, to provide the size and scale of the screening walls.

Mr. Schubert asked if this is the screening shown.

Mr. Rubey stated yes.

Ms. Billings stated that it was great improvement in the roof line.

Mr. Thomas stated that it looks great. You did a wonderful job listening to the board comments.

Mr. Rubey stated that we are hoping to start moving dirt in May and have occupiable space in a year. The second floor is professional office, first floor restaurants at each end and some additional space for retail.

Mr. Smoot asked if any of the parking lot will be removed during construction.

Mr. Rubey stated that the parking lot will not be removed as part of this building. The city is working on a plan for the Rose Run Park. We were planning on adding to the parking lot behind the library. As a result of the city's planning effort that would negatively impact that project so that is on hold. We will be adding a temporary parking lot behind Fifth Third Bank.

Mr. Spalding asked how many parking spaces will be closed during construction.

Mr. Rubey stated he is not sure but may be around 120 spaces.

Ms. Billings asked how the Heit Center will be affected.

Mr. Rubey stated that parking, screening wall and the green space will not be available.

Ms. Billings stated that the Heit Center rents the outside space and if they can't rent it will they be compensated.

Mr. Rubey stated that they will still be able to use the area but the background will be a construction site. We will keep the lines of communication open with the Heit Center.

Mr. Spalding asked if the previous edition has some board and batten.

Mr. Rubey stated that it did and it is now all brick.

Moved by Hinson, seconded by Thomas to approve ARB-101-2015, west building elevation. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Brown, yea; Mr. Smoot, yea; Ms.

Billings, yea; Mr. Schubert, yea; Mr. Thomas, yea. Yea, 6; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0; Motion carried by a 6-0 vote.

Billings moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Smoot. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Schubert, yea; Mr. Brown, yea; Mr. Smoot, yea; Mr. Thomas, yea; Ms. Billings, yea. Yea, 6; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0; Motion carried by a 6-0 vote.

The meeting adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

APPENDIX



Architectural Review Board Staff Report February 8, 2016 Meeting

MARKET AND MAIN STREET BUILDING “C” AND “D” WEST ELEVATION CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

LOCATION: Northeast corner of Main Street and Market Street (PID: 222-000067)
APPLICANT: The New Albany Company
REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness
ZONING: I-PUD: Market Square Expansion & C-PUD NACO 1998 PUD
Subarea 4A: Northwest Street
STRATEGIC PLAN Village Center
APPLICATION: ARB-101-2015

Review based on: Application materials received November 12, December 1, 2015, and revised west building elevations submitted January 18, 2016.

Staff report prepared by Stephen Mayer, Community Development Planner.

I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness for the west building elevation of a new 47,115+/- square foot building containing a mixture of restaurant, office, and retail uses. The Architectural Review Board evaluated and approved waivers and the north, south, and east sides of the building on December 14, 2015. The ARB requested a bird's eye view of the roof lines and additional information on screening height and how it relates to the back form. The applicant has provided this material. This staff report contains an evaluation of just the west elevation materials.

The Architectural Review Board evaluates the site design, building locations, building form and massing information, and a palette of design elements that includes exterior materials, window and door design, colors and ornamentation. The applicant proposes to design the building under the Urban Center Code's development standards and not the zoning text requirements. The Urban Center Code will take precedence over any conflicting standard located in the Codified Ordinances of New Albany. The Urban Center Code is meant to work in conjunction with the Design Guidelines and Requirements.

Per Codified Ordinance 1158.03(C): Effect [of Urban Center Overlay District] on Planned Unit Development Texts. Planned Unit Development (PUD) districts in existence and all associated zoning texts and development plans adopted prior to the effective date of this Chapter 1158 shall continue in effect and shall be considered to be

legally conforming under this code. Property that has a PUD zoning designation on the effective date of this ordinance may be developed, at the election of the property owner or applicant, in one of the following manners:

- 1) Pursuant to the terms of the approved zoning text and development plan(s) for the relevant PUD, provided that if the approved zoning text and/or development plan(s) are silent on any particular matter, issue, restriction, or requirement that is addressed in the Urban Center Code, then the Urban Center Code shall apply to that matter, issue, restriction, or requirement; or
- 2) In accordance with the requirements of the Urban Center Code, provided that in this circumstance the approved PUD zoning text and/or development plan(s) for the property shall not apply.

II. SITE DESCRIPTION & USE

The building is located on a 0.946 lot between the Market Street retail building and the Phil Heit Center for Healthy New Albany (the Heit Center). The lot is vacant. The proposed building is approximately 47,115 square feet with all of the off-street parking located on a separate parcel behind the building. Access to the parking will be from the existing market square development internal roadways and parking lot from Village Hall Road. The eastern portion of the lot will be utilized as an active outdoor space.

III. EVALUATION

A. Certificate of Appropriateness

The ARB's review is pursuant to C.O. Section 1157.06. No environmental change shall be made to any property within the Village of New Albany until a Certificate of Appropriateness has been properly applied for and issued by staff or the Board. Per Section **1157.07 Design Appropriateness**, the modifications to the building and site should be evaluated on these criteria.

1. *The compliance of the application with the Design Guidelines and Requirements*

- The applicant has submitted the following revised elevations:
 - View from the parking lot level 300 feet from the building.
 - Bird's eye view of the building.
 - Colored rendering.
- The new submittals are renderings and therefore do not show the same level of detailing as previous elevations, but the applicant proposes the same brick banding and patterns, gutters, etc to match the other three sides of the building.
- The applicant's new submittal of the west elevation contains a revision showing a gable/parapet wall above the covered walkway.
- The west elevation contains a combination of a parapet wall and a metal screen wall to block the view of all mechanical equipment.
- The building will have five different "accent" options for the exterior of the building. Five different mixtures of brick styles, window color,

Color Scheme	
Bond Types, Window and Trim Colors	
X1. Brick MFR:	Glen-Gery Brick
Brick Name:	Belgium Toasted HMOS
Window Color:	Stone White
Mortar Color:	Lafarge Argos, "Lite Buff"
Joint Type:	Grapevine Joint
X2. Brick MFR:	Glen-Gery Brick
Brick Name:	Belgium Toasted HMOS
Window Color:	Sierra White
Mortar Color:	Lafarge Argos, "Lite Buff"
Joint Type:	Grapevine Joint
X3. Brick MFR:	Glen-Gery Brick
Brick Name:	Belgium Toasted HMOS
Window Color:	Cashmere
Mortar Color:	Lafarge Argos, "Lite Buff"
Joint Type:	Grapevine Joint
Y1. Brick MFR:	Glen-Gery Brick
Brick Name:	Danish HMOS
Window Color:	Coconut Cream
Mortar Color:	Lafarge Argos, "Lite Buff"
Joint Type:	Grapevine Joint
Y2. Brick MFR:	Glen-Gery Brick
Brick Name:	Danish HMOS
Window Color:	Cadet Gray
Mortar Color:	Lafarge Argos, "Lite Buff"
Joint Type:	Grapevine Joint

mortar color, and joint types are proposed to break up the massing of the building. The Design Guidelines and Requirements require large massed blocks to be visually “broken up” into a series of smaller masses appropriate for the scale of the Village Center District.

- The city architect has reviewed the building elevations and provided the following comments:
 - The proportion, massing, and composition are appropriate for an urban setting.
 - If you look at the west elevation, you will notice that the end pieces (the flanking masses) both have roof shapes that contain the flat, store-front elevations between. This is an extremely successful design decision. Also, the Main Street Elevation has parapet (flat roof) elements mixed in with the shaped roof elements, so the vocabulary exists on both sides. These moves help to create an overall design that is strong and successfully executed.
 - The gable/parapet addition fits nicely with the west elevation. This building will be a nice addition to the city fabric!
 - The proposed buildings at Market and Main are skillfully designed in every aspect: fenestration, proportion, and use of materials (I’m especially enthused by the differing brick bond patterns, which is almost unheard of in commercial development). I also have no issue with the west elevation nor the transition to the Heit Center. This is an extremely well designed project.

2. *The visual and functional components of the building and its site, including but not limited to landscape design and plant materials, lighting, vehicular and pedestrian circulation, and signage.*

- Landscape
 - a. Not applicable.
- Lighting
 - a. Not applicable.
- Parking and Circulation
 - a. Not applicable.
- Signage:
 - a. No signage has been submitted at this time. All new signs will have to receive separate approval by the Architectural Review Board in the future.

3. *The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, site and/or its environment shall not be destroyed.*

- The site is currently vacant and in-between the Heit Center and the Market Street retail building. This proposed structure appears to take into account the distinguishing qualities of the overall Market Square development pattern. Similar exterior materials, massing, and ornamentation are proposed for this building that currently exists on the neighboring site. The west elevation (rear) transitions architecturally between the Heit Center and the Market Street retail building by providing more articulation on the south side of the building than the north side.
 - Overall it appears that the improvements to site will enhance the appearance of this corner within the city by improving the site and providing an appropriately styled building to the corner.

4. *All buildings, structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time.*

- The proposed building is new construction and appears to be a product of its own time.
5. *Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site shall be created with sensitivity.*
 - The building is designed to break up the overall large massing of the structure in with different stylistic features such as the building facades being slightly pushed back or forward. Additionally, several different accent features will break up the massing but keep the building visually appearing by avoiding blank walls. It appears that attention has been paid to the details that will ensure an appropriate appearance for the building. Specifically:
 - a. All windows on the building will be simulated divided lite wood windows and appear to be vertically oriented.
 - b. The massing of the proposed building appears to be appropriate. Additionally, careful attention has been given to the placement and proportion of windows and doors.
 - c. The structure will be brick.
 - d. The building consists of three brick bond types: English, Flemish, and Running.
 6. *The surface cleaning of masonry structures shall be undertaken with methods designed to minimize damage to historic building materials.*
 - Not Applicable.
 7. *Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to structures shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the original structure would be unimpaired.*
 - Not Applicable.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

The ARB should evaluate the overall proposal based on the requirements in the Urban Center Code, and Design Guidelines and Requirements. The application should be evaluated on the design of the building and use of materials. The building elevation appears to match the intent of the standards and goals found within various city planning documents. Overall, it appears that the elevation has been designed to complement the traditional American architectural style of the existing Market Square site and will enhance New Albany's Village Center.

The west elevation's end pieces (the flanking masses) both have roof shapes that contain the flat, store-front elevations between. The city architect has commented that this is an extremely successful design decision. The Main Street Elevation also has parapet (flat roof) elements mixed in with the shaped roof elements, so the vocabulary is exists on both sides. These moves help to create an overall design that is strong and successfully executed.

Staff recommends approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the west elevation provided that the ARB finds the proposal meets sufficient basis for approval.

V. ACTION

Should ARB find that the application has sufficient basis for approval, the following motion would be appropriate (conditions of approval may be added):

Move to approve application ARB-101-2015's west building elevation.

Approximate Site Location:



Source: Google Maps