



Architectural Review Board

Meeting Minutes

March 13, 2017

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
Mr. Jack Schmidt	Absent
Mr. Jonathan Iten	Present
Mr. Lewis Smoot	Absent
Mr. Jim Brown	Present
Mr. E.J. Thomas	Absent
Ms. Kim Comisar	Present
Mr. Matt Shull	Present

Staff members present: Stephen Mayer, Planner and Pam Hickok, Clerk.

Mr. Iten moved, seconded by Mr. Brown to approve the meeting minutes of December 12, 2016. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Iten, yea; Ms. Comisar, yea; Mr. Brown, yea. Yea, 4; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0; Motion carried by a 4-0 vote.

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

Mr. Mayer stated that the applicant for the case is not present. We would like to start with the village center project updates listed under other business. Under other business we have two updates that include Market and Main Street multi-unit project and Safety Town.

Mr. Hinson swore to truth those wishing to speak before the board.

Ms. Lisa Carson, Safety Town, provided staff with PowerPoint presentation and additional information to the board and continued stating that it has been 3 years since the last update. We hold five sessions with 400-500 kids each year. We are looking for a way to secure site due to vandalism.

Ms. Comisar asked what the fence height at the schools is.

Ms. Carson stated that one is 6' and one is 8'. The cemetery fence is 4' with gates that are 6' tall.

Mr. Iten stated that he liked the preferred fence. What type of detailing is at the gate?

Ms. Carson stated that the fence will attach to the existing brick columns then pop out towards the parking lot and connect. We want to prevent the ability to use the columns to jump over the fence.

Mr. Brown asked where the light poles are located on the site.

Ms. Carson showed on the map the location of the light poles.

Mr. Brown asked the height of the light poles.

Chief Greg Jones stated that they are scaled down to prevent people from climbing.

Ms. Carson stated the buildings are 12' and the poles are slightly taller.

Mr. Brown stated that a motion detector with a flood light may deter people.

Ms. Carson stated that we reviewed motion sensors but was cost prohibitive. The current fence does not lock.

Mr. Shull asked if the trees at the parking lot prevent the cameras view and asked if the camera could be moved.

Ms. Carson stated that moving the camera is expensive for the images that are provided.

Mr. Mayer stated we provide this as an update for Village Center to allow the board to provide comments and feedback.

Mr. Hinson stated that fence is in the right direction. No issues with the style of the fence, it's appropriate, several styles of fence in that area.

Ms. Comisar stated that the first fence is preferred.

Mr. Iten swore to truth those wishing to speak before the Board.

Moved by Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Iten to accept the staff reports and related documents into the record. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Iten, yea; Ms. Comisar, yea; Mr. Brown, yea. Yea, 4; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0; Motion carried by a 4-0 vote.

**ARB-02-2017 Certificate of Appropriateness & Waivers
Certificate of Appropriateness and waivers for new wall and post top sign for Virtual
Velo Cycle Training at 11 Second Street (PID: 222-000002).
Applicant: Geoffrey Clark**

Mr. Clark stated that we will not be installing the post top sign because it would be redundant and it would not be visible from the Main Street.

Mr. Mayer presented the staff report.

Mr. Iten stated that he has no issues with the sign or the staff conditions. A procedural note for the Council representative. In looking at the grounds for waivers we have the four items that have to be met. The third item, be necessary for reasons of fairness due to unusual site specific constraints, does not seem to apply to signs. I have no issue with approving this sign meeting the 3 items.

Mr. Mayer stated that criteria was created for all types of waivers and now that we have had a few applications we could review that issue.

Moved by Mr. Iten, seconded by Ms. Comisar to approve certificate of appropriateness and waiver application ARB-2-2017 for only the wall sign subject to the condition that the sign board is a minimum of one inch thick. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Iten, yea; Ms. Comisar, yea; Mr. Brown, yea. Yea, 4; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0; Motion carried by a 4-0 vote.

Mr. Mayer stated that we will continue the village center update with the multi-tenant building. Mr. Tom Rubey is present to explain the changes since it was approved at this board.

Mr. Tom Rubey, New Albany Company, stated that the it is 132 units on both sides of the road. We have the fencing in place and will soon be installing the scrim to shield the construction from traffic. It is about a twelve month construction timeframe. (PowerPoint presentation) Showed changes that include modifications to the garages to reduce the overall scale of the project by lowering the height and courtyard layout; and clarifications to some details and landscaping.

Mr. Iten asked if the leisure trail path from Ackerly will be connected.

Mr. Rubey stated that it will connect to the sidewalk.

Mr. Hinson stated that he likes the changes. The entrance and columns are an improvement.

Mr. Rubey stated that it will be similar to the entrances near Mellow Mushroom.

Mr. Iten asked for leasing or pricing information.

Mr. Rubey stated that we are not ready to market the apartments until they are further along. Nothing to announce about the Market & Main II tenants. The plan is two restaurants at either end, we need the right fit. We are continuing to meet with the residents of Ackerly. We talked about eliminating the white horse fence and we were going to match the Keswick fence. The residents don't want any existing vegetation removed and they want an 8' fence that matches the Maplewood cemetery screening fence stained dark green.

Mr. Hinson stated no issue with that change.

Mr. Brown asked about parking concerns.

Mr. Rubey stated at this time the complaints are with the fencing, screening, walkability to school and the construction hours of work.

Mr. Iten moved to nominate Mr. Hinson as chairperson of the ARB, seconded by Mr. Brown. Upon roll call vote: Upon roll call vote: Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Iten, yea; Ms. Comisar, yea; Mr. Brown, yea. Yea, 4; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0; Motion carried by a 0 vote.

Mr. Hinson moved to nominate Mr. Iten as vice-chairman of the ARB, seconded by Mr. Brown. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Iten, yea; Ms. Comisar, yea; Mr. Brown, yea. Yea, 4; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0; Motion carried by a 4-0 vote.

Mr. Brown moved to nominate Mr. Smoot as secretary of the ARB, seconded by Mr. Hinson. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Iten, yea; Ms. Comisar, yea; Mr. Brown, yea. Yea, 4; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0; Motion carried by a 4-0 vote.

Mr. Hinson moved to keep the Architectural Review Board meetings scheduled on the 2nd Monday of each month at 7:00pm at Village Hall, seconded by Mr. Brown. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Iten, yea; Ms. Comisar, yea; Mr. Brown, yea. Yea, 4; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0; Motion carried by a 4-0 vote.

Mr. Iten moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Comisar. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Iten, yea; Ms. Comisar, yea; Mr. Brown, yea. Yea, 4; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0; Motion carried by a 4-0 vote.

The meeting adjourned at 7:49 p.m.

Submitted by Pam Hickok

APPENDIX



Architectural Review Board Staff Report March 13, 2017 Meeting

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS & WAIVER 11 SECOND STREET

LOCATION: 11 Second Street (PID: 222-000002)
APPLICANT: Geoffrey Clark
REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness & Waiver
ZONING: UCD: Historic Center
STRATEGIC PLAN Village Center
APPLICATION: ARB-02-2017

Review based on: Application materials received January 20, 2017.

Staff report prepared by Stephen Mayer, Community Development Planner.

I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant requests a certificate of appropriateness for a new wall sign and post-top sign. The new signs are for Virtual Velo Cycle Training. There is no other existing signage at the site.

The applicant also requests the following waiver:

- A. Waiver to Codified Ordinance 1169.12(f) to allow the sign to have six (6) colors where the code allows a maximum of four (4) colors per sign.

Per Section 1157.07(b) any major environmental change to a property located within the Village Center requires a certificate of appropriateness issued by the Architectural Review Board. In considering this request for new signage in the Village Center, the Architectural Review Board is directed to evaluate the application based on criteria in Chapter 1157 and Chapter 1169.

II. SITE DESCRIPTION & USE

The lot is located on the west side of Second Street and contains a primary structure fronting Second Street and a detached garage that accesses the alley. According to the Franklin County Auditor the lot is approximately 0.11 acres.

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 City 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 proposes to install one new wall sign on the front porch's gable roof (facing Second Street) and one new post-top ground sign along Second Street.
- Per the city's sign code section 1169.14(a) each building or structure in the Historic Core sub-district shall be allowed three (3) sign types. The building has no other existing signage.
- The sign will provide signage for Virtual Velo Cycle Training. The signs are evaluated below:

Wall Sign

- City sign code chapter 1169.16(d) permits a maximum area of one s.f. per linear s.f. of building frontage, not to exceed 30 s.f. and allows one wall sign per business entrance. External, neon and internal illumination is allowed. The applicant proposes a wall sign with the following dimensions:
 - a. Size: 22" x 73" [meets code].
 - b. Area: 11.15 square feet [meets code].
 - c. Location: on the front porch gable, centered over the business entrance.
 - d. Lighting: none [meets code].
 - e. Relief: 0.5 inch [does not meet code. Staff recommends the sign is revised to have a minimum of one inch thickness to meet code requirements and be consistent with other Village Center signage].
 - f. Colors: blue, red, black, yellow, white, and green [Does not meet code. See Waiver section below].
 - g. Material: PVC [meets code]
- The sign is mounted flat against the building face, above the door.

Post-top Ground Sign

- City sign code chapter 1169.17(d) permits a maximum area of six square feet per side and allows one per building. The maximum pole height (not including the sign itself) is seven feet. External and internal illumination is allowed. The applicant proposes a post-top sign with the following dimensions:
 - a. Size: 18" x 48" [meets code].
 - b. Sign Area: 6.0 square feet [meets code].
 - c. Number of signs: one [meets code].
 - d. Location: Front yard along Second Street.

- e. Lighting: Not indicated. Staff recommends the Architectural Review Board verify with the applicant if lighting is proposed.
 - f. Material: aluminum [meets code].
 - g. Colors: blue, red, black, yellow, white, and green [Does not meet code. See Waiver section below].
 - The applicant has submitted a rendering showing the sign located in the front yard but has not provided a site plan so staff cannot fully evaluate the proposal. Per C.O. 1169.05 signs are prohibited from being located in any public easement, right-of-way, or no build zone. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring a scaled site plan is submitted showing the sign's exact location on the site and the sign is located outside of any public easement, right-of-way, or no build zone.
 - The sign is horizontally oriented on the top of the post. Per. C.O. 1169.12(a) signs integrate with the building/site on which they are located and adjacent development in scale, design, and intensity. Staff recommends modifying the sign so it is square or vertically oriented in order to make it consistent with existing signage in the area and be subject to staff approval.
 - The post is seven feet tall and painted white but the material is not indicated. Staff recommends the Architectural Review Board verify with the applicant the post material.
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.*
 - The wall and post-top signs are an appropriate sign-type for this site.
 3. *The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, site and/or its environment shall not be destroyed.*
 - The wall sign is positioned in an appropriate and suitable location and do not block any architectural features.
 - A site plan must be submitted for staff to fully evaluate the proposed ground's location.
 4. *All buildings, structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time.*
 - The building is a product of its own time and as such should utilize signs appropriate to its scale and style, while considering its surroundings. The proposed signs appear to match the general style of the building.
 - The Architectural Review Board should evaluate the orientation of the post-top sign. Staff recommends modifying the sign so it is square or vertically oriented in order to make it consistent with existing signage in the area and be subject to staff approval.
 5. *Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site shall be created with sensitivity.*
 - a. Not Applicable.
 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.

Waiver Request

The ARB's review is pursuant to C.O. Section **1113.11 Action by the Architectural Review Board for Waivers**, within thirty (30) days after the public meeting, the ARB shall either approve, approve with supplementary conditions, or disapprove the request for a waiver. The ARB shall only approve a waiver or approve a waiver with supplementary conditions if the ARB finds that the waiver, if granted, would:

1. *Provide an appropriate design or pattern of development considering the context in which the development is proposed and the purpose of the particular standard. In evaluating the context as it is used in the criteria, the ARB may consider the relationship of the proposed development with adjacent structures, the immediate neighborhood setting, or a broader vicinity to determine if the waiver is warranted;*
2. *Substantially meet the intent of the standard that the applicant is attempting to seek a waiver from, and fit within the goals of the Village Center Strategic Plan, Land Use Strategic Plan and the Design Guidelines and Requirements;*
3. *Be necessary for reasons of fairness due to unusual site specific constraints; and*
4. *Not detrimentally affect the public health, safety or general welfare.*

The applicant is requesting waivers to the following code requirements:

A. Waiver to Codified Ordinance 1169.12(f) to allow the sign to have six (6) colors where the code allows a maximum of four (4) colors per sign.

The following should be considered in the board's decision:

1. The sign is proposed to have blue, red, black, yellow, white, and green.
2. The business logo contains the majority of the colors. The logo consists of 6 different colors. The remainder of the sign is just two colors: black and white.
3. The sign's color will substantially meet the intent of the standard that the applicant is attempting to seek a waiver from and fit within the City Goals. Although there are more colors than allowed, none of the proposed colors are jarring or overly bright and are a minimal component in the overall sign. The sign's colors have been successfully utilized at the business's other location within the Village Center.
4. By increasing the number of background colors permitted while coordinating other elements such as sign size, fonts, letter coverage, sign borders, etc., more visual interest may be added to the site while still meeting the intent of the code.
5. It does not appear that the proposed sign color waiver will detrimentally affect the public health, safety or general welfare.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the certificate of appropriateness application, provided that the ARB finds the proposal meets sufficient basis for approval. The sign graphics are very similar to the existing Veloscience location at Market Square. The wall sign appears to be appropriately designed for its location on the building, but staff recommends the Architectural Review Board evaluate the orientation of the post-top sign to ensure its compatibility with other post top signs in the Village Center.

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 Certificate of Appropriateness and Waiver application ARB-02-2017 subject to the following condition(s) of approval (conditions may be added):

1. The sign board is a minimum of 1 inch thick.
2. A scaled site plan is submitted showing the sign's exact location on the site and the sign is located outside of any public easement, right-of-way, or no build zone.
3. Modifying the sign so it is square or vertically oriented in order to make it consistent with existing signage in the area, subject to staff approval.

APPROXIMATE SITE LOCATION:



Source: Franklin County Auditor