



Architectural Review Board
December 9, 2019 Minutes

New Albany Architectural Review Board met in regular session in the Council Chambers at Village Hall, 99 W Main Street and was called to order by Architectural Review Board Chair Mr. Alan Hinson at 7:02 p.m.

Those answering roll call:

Mr. Alan Hinson, Chair	Present
Mr. Francis Strahler	Present
Mr. Jonathan Iten	Present
Mr. Jim Brown	Present
Mr. E.J. Thomas	Present
Mr. Andrew Maletz	Present
Ms. Sarah Briggs	Present
Mr. Matt Shull	Absent

Staff members present: Steven Mayer, Development Services Manager and Josie Taylor, Clerk

Mr. Iten provided corrections for the November 13, 2019 minutes.

Mr. Hinson called for an action on the minutes of November 13, 2019.

Moved by Mr. Iten, seconded by Mr. Thomas to approve the November 13, 2019 meeting minutes, as corrected. Upon roll call: Mr. Iten, yea; Mr. Thomas, yea; Mr. Brown, yea; Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Strahler, yea; Mr. Maletz, yea; Ms. Briggs, yea. Yea, 7; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 7-0 vote.

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

Mr. Mayer stated none from staff.

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

Mr. Hinson asked if there were any visitors for items not on tonight's agenda. (No response).

Moved by Mr. Thomas, seconded by Mr. Strahler to accept the staff reports and related documents into the record. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Thomas, yea; Mr. Strahler, yea; Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Iten, yea; Mr. Brown, yea; Mr. Maletz, yea; Ms. Briggs, yea. Yea, 7; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion carried by a 7-0 vote.

ARB-100-2019 Certificate of Appropriateness and Waiver
Exterior building modifications, signage and waiver at 15 South High Street
(PID: 222-000071)
Applicant: Bill Murphy

Mr. Mayer presented the staff report.

Mr. Iten asked if the new sign was in lieu of the addition of an arm and post.

Mr. Mayer stated yes.

Mr. Thomas asked if this would keep it from encroaching on the sidewalk.

Mr. Mayer stated condition (1) in the staff report was no longer needed.

Mr. Brown asked if the Board had previously reviewed and approved the carriage house expansion.

Mr. Mayer stated yes.

Mr. Brown asked if, as far as the carriage house, for the purpose of this meeting, all was in existence.

Mr. Mayer stated the shutters were existing and to his knowledge the only new things were the windows on the east elevation.

Mr. Lance White, with the applicant, described the changes that would be made to the building.

Mr. Brown noted some of them were not being shown.

Mr. Mayer stated that changes to doors and windows, per codified ordinances, could be approved by staff.

Mr. Brown stated the south elevation's two (2) windows that were to the left side, were not at the same elevation and asked if there was an intent to alter the windows.

Mr. White stated there would not be a change in these, they were in existence.

Mr. Iten noted Mr. Brown was saying that what was drawn on the application was not what was built.

Mr. Brown stated his point was that the existing condition was not being shown on the application as the windows were not all at the same elevation.

Mr. Hinson stated to Mr. White that Mr. Brown was noting that one (1) window sat much higher than the other and were not on the same level.

Mr. White stated that would not be changed.

Mr. Iten directed the applicant to the new, east elevation. Mr. Iten noted that the light arrangement on the new French doors, when looking down below, was in a two-by-six

(2x6) arrangement yet on the top it looked to be two-by-five (2x5) arrangement. Mr. Iten asked why they would not match.

Mr. White stated they did not want to disturb a lintel.

Mr. Iten asked why it could still not be done using a two-by-six (2x6).

Mr. Michael Tolen, with the applicant, stated the upstairs lights were identical to the downstairs lights and were, in fact, a two-by-six (2x6).

Mr. Iten noted that resolved his concern.

Mr. Hinson stated there was a vertical orientation to the panels.

Mr. Iten stated he assumed that would also be true for the French doors on the south elevation.

Mr. Tolen stated yes.

Mr. Brown asked about the request to change the siding on one elevation of the carriage house to board and batten versus the claps currently surrounding it, saying he wondered what the thought behind that was.

Mr. White stated it provided a cool effect.

Mr. Strahler asked staff for further information regarding the lights on the east and west sides.

Mr. Mayer stated there had been discussions regarding the impact and purposes for their placement.

Mr. Strahler stated the neighbor's property was so close that the architecture would not be visible.

Mr. Mayer stated the side profile would be visible rather than the front.

Mr. Iten stated he was okay with the condition.

Mr. Hinson stated he would perhaps need to see it before he could make a recommendation so it might be better to leave it to staff.

Mr. White stated he would be fine with either location.

Mr. Hinson stated that would be fine as long as it was one or the other.

Mr. White stated yes.

Moved by Mr. Iten to approve ARB-100-2019 and the waiver with the conditions that

1. The side porch's canopy and column dimensions and detailing match the front porch along High Street, subject to staff approval; and
 2. The gas lights be moved to the east and west sides of the porch so they face the street and rear parking lot or they face north, at the applicant's discretion;
- seconded by Mr. Hinson. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Iten, yea; Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Strahler, yea; Mr. Maletz, abstain; Ms. Briggs, yea; Mr. Thomas, yea; Mr. Brown, yea. Yea, 6; Nay, 0; Abstain, 1. Motion carried by a 6-0-1 vote.

Mr. Hinson polled members for comment.

Mr. Iten asked Mr. Mayer if the school district had indicated what would be happening with the orange barriers near the high school.

Mr. Mayer stated, depending on the 2020 capital improvement budget, the school hoped to find a more permanent solution.

Moved by Mr. Thomas, seconded by Mr. Maletz, to adjourn the meeting. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Thomas, yea; Mr. Maletz, yea; Mr. Brown, yea; Mr. Iten, yea; Mr. Strahler, yea; Ms. Briggs, yea; Mr. Hinson, yea. Yea, 7; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion carried by a 7-0 vote.

Meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.

Submitted by Josie Taylor.

APPENDIX



Architectural Review Board Staff Report December 9, 2019 Meeting

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS & WAIVER EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS AND SIGNAGE 15 SOUTH HIGH STREET

LOCATION: 15 South High Street (PID: 222-000071)
APPLICANT: Bill Murphy
REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness & Waiver
ZONING: UCD: Historic Center
STRATEGIC PLAN Village Center
APPLICATION: ARB-100-2019

Review based on: Application materials including elevations received October 30, November 15 and December 3, 2019

Staff report prepared by Chris Christian, Planner

I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant is proposing several exterior modifications to the existing buildings at 15 South High Street. The applicant proposes the following exterior modifications:

- New signage
- New second story door with a walk out space and new railing
- New covered porch in the side yard
- New windows and lighting on the carriage house

The applicant also requests a waiver to allow a new covered porch to be setback 2 feet from the side property line where the Urban Center Code requires a 3 foot side yard setback.

II. SITE DESCRIPTION & USE

The lot is located on the west side of South High Street and contains a primary structure fronting High Street and a detached carriage house along the alley. According to the Franklin County Auditor the lot is approximately 0.175 acres. The Franklin County Auditor's historical assessment of the property provides evidence a primary brick structure was existing as early as 1924. Additionally, the Franklin County Auditor states the garage was originally built in 1910.

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*

Signage

- 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 including, but not limited to, projecting, awning and wall signs. The applicant is proposing to install one single post sign and one architectural canopy sign.

Single Post Sign

- City sign code Chapter 1169.16(d) permits a maximum area of 6 square feet per sign and allows one per street front. External illumination is allowed. The sign can be a maximum total height of 7 feet. The sign board cannot exceed three feet wide. The sign's board height cannot be more than two times the width.
- The applicant has submitted two ground sign options with the same dimensions but different post designs. Staff recommends the ARB evaluate the appropriateness of both signs.
- The applicant proposes single post sign with the following dimensions:
 - a. Size: 16" x 24" [meets code].
 - b. Area: 2.67 square feet per side [meets code].
 - c. Height: 43.75 inches [meets code].
 - d. Location: the sign is proposed to be installed along High Street [meets code].
 - e. Lighting: The plan indicates that indirect up-lighting is recommended. External illumination is permitted. Staff recommends the ARB verify with the applicant is the sign will be illuminated and the appropriateness of the uplighting.
 - f. Relief: one inch [meets code].
 - g. Material: HDU material [meets code].
 - h. Colors: black and white (total of 2) [meets code].
 - i. Lettering Height: 2.25" [meets code]
- The sign will read "Morgan Stanley" in black front with a white background.
- The applicant has indicated to staff they intend on utilizing an existing wood post. The existing post is approximately 23 inches from the outside edge of the public sidewalk. Both ground signs show the sign and arm extend 26 inches from the post. This will result in the sign hanging over the sidewalk approximately three inches. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring the sign post be relocated or sign and arm be modified so they do not hang over the public sidewalk.

Architectural Canopy Sign

- City sign code Chapter 1169.16(c) permits one sign per canopy face and can occupy a maximum of 75% of the canopy face. A minimum of 8 feet of

clearance is required from the surface grade and lettering cannot exceed 18 inches in height. External, internal, and halo illumination is allowed.

- The applicant is proposing a wall sign with the following dimensions:
 - j.* Size: 6' 6" in length [meets code].
 - k.* Area: 45% of the canopy face [meets code].
 - l.* Location: Canopy fronting High Street [meets code].
 - m.* Lighting: None proposed [meets code].
 - n.* Relief: 1/2 inch [meets code].
 - o.* Colors: black (total of 1) [meets code].
 - a.* Lettering Height: 8.0 inches [meets code]
 - b.* Clearance: 8+feet (existing canopy) [meets code]

- The canopy sign is centered left to right, and top to bottom on the canopy fascia. The outside edges of the sign appear to match the width of the inside columns.
- The letters will be individually cut out of 0.5" thick satin aluminum.
- The letters will be installed flush to the canopy fascia and painted black.
- The signs appear to be appropriately located and scaled for the building.

Exterior Modifications

- Section 2 of the Design Guidelines and Requirements (DGRs) provides the requirements for residential development inside the Village Center. Overall, this building should follow the precedents of traditional American architectural design and be located in an appropriate setting.
 - The DGRs require the architectural style of the building to be appropriate to the context, location and function of the building.
 - The applicant proposes the following exterior modifications:
 - New second story window with a walk out space and new railing
 - New covered porch in the side yard
 - New windows and lighting on the carriage house
 - The applicant proposes to add to two exterior windows and new gooseneck light fixtures to the east elevation of the carriage house. The new windows are consistent with the other windows on the building.
 - The applicant is proposing to install a covered porch in order to provide an ADA accessible entrance to the building. The porch is 6 feet, 8 inches in width and has been designed to mimic the building's front covered porch along High Street. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring the side porch's canopy and column dimensions and detailing match the front porch along High Street.
 - The applicant proposes to include two gas lights on the side porch. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring the gas lights be moved to the east and west sides of the porch so they face the street and rear parking lot.
 - The applicant also proposes to add wood railing above the existing one story entry to the building and replace the existing windows with a French door walk. The handrail and door appear to be appropriately designed to match the building's and other existing doors' architectural style.
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. There are no landscape changes as part of this application.
 - Lighting
 - a. The applicant is proposing to add new lighting to the columns on the new porch which match those on the existing porch.
3. *The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, site and/or its environment shall not be destroyed.*
 - The distinguishing original qualities of the building and environment will not be destroyed. The addition of the covered porch provides an ADA accessible entrance to this historic building. With staff's condition of approval requiring the design match the front porch, it will be consistent with the existing architecture of the building. The city architect comments that it is important to ensure that the scale, proportions and materials of the new porch are identical to the existing front porch in order to ensure that the original character of the building is not altered.
 4. *All buildings, structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time.*
 - The city architect states that the proposed additions and modifications to this existing structure should be done with careful consideration of how these changes will integrate into this existing, historical building.
 5. *Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site shall be created with sensitivity.*
 - The proposed first story balcony handrail and side yard porch have been created with sensitivity to the historic character of the building and the surrounding area. The applicant is using a door on the second story that matches the window and door grid patterns of the existing building in order to be consistent with the building's window and door features.
 6. *The surface cleaning of masonry structures shall be undertaken with methods designed to minimize damage to historic building materials.*
 - a. 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.

Urban Center Code Compliance

1. Lot and Building Standards

Classic Commercial (UCC Section 2.78)

Standard	Minimum	Maximum	Proposed
Minimum Side	3 feet	15 feet	2 feet [DOES NOT MEET CODE]
Minimum rear	0 feet	no max	0 feet [Existing, non-conforming]

B. Waiver Request

Per C.O. Chapter 1113.11 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:

- a) *Provide an appropriate design or pattern of development considering the context in which the development is proposed and the purposed 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;*
- b) *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;*
- c) *Be necessary for reasons of fairness due to unusual site specific constraints; and*
- d) *Not detrimentally affect the public health, safety or general welfare.*

The applicant is requesting a waiver to allow a building to be setback 2 feet from the side property line where the Urban Center Code requires a minimum 3 foot side yard setback.

- The applicant is proposing to add a covered porch on the northern, side elevation of the building to serve as an ADA accessible entrance. In order to ensure that there is enough clear space for full ADA turning movements the applicant states that this waiver is necessary in order to allow for a wider porch.
- The porch is designed to mimic the building's front covered porch along High Street. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring the side porch's canopy and column dimensions and detailing match the front porch along High Street. Providing consistent architectural details will ensure an appropriate design is achieved and meet the intent of the Village Center Strategic Plan, Land Use Strategic Plan and DGRs.
- The waiver request appears to be necessary for fairness. Currently, this building does not have an ADA accessible entrance and in order to accommodate all users, staff believes that this is an appropriate justification for setback waivers in the Village Center.
- The owner of 15 South High Street is also the property owner of the lot to the north, along the side lot line where the waiver is requested. Therefore the property owner is requesting a setback reduction to their owner property.
- It does not appear granting the waiver will detrimentally affect the public health, safety, or general welfare.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

The ARB should evaluate the overall proposal based on the requirements in the Urban Center Code, and Design Guidelines and Requirements. The New Albany Design Guidelines and Recommendations state that all building elevations shall be designed in a manner that is consistent with the architectural style of a building and particular attention shall be paid to building proportions, walls, roof and surface slopes, window and door openings and window sash and glass panes. It appears that the proposed exterior modifications are appropriate given the context of the building and the surrounding area. The city architect states that the details, proportions and materials of the new porch should match those of the existing front porch in order to ensure that the porch does not appear out of place. Matching the front

porch's detailing and proportions will ensure a consistent architectural vocabulary throughout the building.

V. ACTION

Should ARB find that the application has sufficient basis for approval, the following motion would be appropriate:

Move to approve application ARB-100-2019 with the following conditions:

1. The sign post be relocated or sign and arm be modified so they do not hang over the public sidewalk.
2. The side porch's canopy and column dimensions and detailing match the front porch along High Street, subject to staff approval.
3. The gas lights be moved to the east and west sides of the porch so they face the street and rear parking lot.

APPROXIMATE SITE LOCATION:



Source: Franklin County Auditor