



New Albany Architectural Review Board  
September 13, 2021 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 7:00 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	Absent
Mr. Andrew Maletz	Present
Ms. Sarah Briggs	Absent
Mr. Michael Durik	Present

Staff members present: Steven Mayer, Development Services Coordinator; Ms. Anna Van Der Zwaag, Zoning Officer; and Josie Taylor, Clerk.

Moved by Mr. Maletz to approve the July 12, 2021 meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Brown. Upon roll call: Mr. Maletz, yea; Mr. Brown, yea; Mr. Iten, yea; Mr. Strahler, yea; Mr. Hinson, yea. Yea, 5; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

Mr. Hinson asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Agenda.

Mr. Mayer stated none from staff.

Mr. Hinson swore in those wishing to speak before the Architectural Review Board (hereafter, "ARB") this evening to tell the truth and nothing but the truth.

Mr. Hinson asked if there was anyone who wanted to discuss any items not on tonight's Agenda. (No response).

**ARB-92-2021 Certificate of Appropriateness**  
**Certificate of Appropriateness for a new wall sign for McHenry Advisers at 134 E. Main Street (PID: 222-004293).**  
**Applicant: FastSigns, c/o Mark Rubcich**

Ms. Van Der Zwaag presented the staff report.

Mr. Iten asked the applicant if the condition requiring a white, 1.5 inch border size was okay.

Mr. Rubcich stated it was.

Moved by Mr. Iten to approve the certificate of appropriateness for ARB-92-2021 with the condition that the sign have a white 1.5 inch border around the sign face, seconded by Mr. Hinson. Upon roll call vote: Mr. Iten, yea; Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Brown, yea; Mr. Strahler, yea; Mr. Maletz, yea. Yea, 5; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion carried by a 5-0 vote.

Mr. Iten stated he had a few items to discuss at this time. Mr. Iten asked about the new sign that was currently on the building that at one time had a sign saying "First and Main." Mr. Iten

stated the new sign appeared to be permanent and indicated he had asked staff about this issue previously and asked if an update was available.

Mr. Maletz indicated he too had asked about this sign.

Mr. Mayer stated they had reviewed this issue and the new owner appeared to have added a temporary sign over the existing sign space. Mr. Mayer stated the owner had also submitted a sign permit. Mr. Mayer stated it would not return to the ARB because it was considered a face change.

Mr. Iten stated they had taken the letters down and changed colors and asked why the ARB would not see that.

Mr. Mayer stated that as long as the sign was the same size and used the same structural means to adhere to the building then an administrative review was sufficient per the sign Code.

Mr. Strahler stated the new sign was not the same size.

Mr. Mayer stated he believed that was the temporary sign and would go away.

Mr. Hinson stated that at least four (4) of the five (5) members of the ARB found the current sign unacceptable.

Mr. Iten stated the temporary sign was not what staff could or did approve.

Mr. Mayer stated no.

Mr. Durik asked if there was a timeline for when the change would occur.

Mr. Mayer stated he would follow up with the owner and update the ARB.

Mr. Durik stated that if staff had reviewed the sign then they should be removing the temporary one within a timely manner.

Mr. Mayer stated absolutely.

Mr. Strahler asked what the rules were on temporary signs.

Mr. Mayer stated staff could approve temporary signage and he believed the owner had submitted a temporary sign permit.

Mr. Iten stated the owner had attempted to dot i's and cross t's.

Mr. Mayer stated that was correct.

Mr. Iten stated the second item was the BrewDog door and asked if the signs there had been approved.

Mr. Mayer stated there were two (2) window signs on the front doors which were not part of the sign package previously provided for ARB reviewed. Mr. Mayer stated staff had contacted BrewDog and made them aware of this matter and they were now working with BrewDog to submit additional applications for signs.

Mr. Hinson stated that with current signage it seemed all should know where BrewDog was located.

Mr. Iten stated that, to clarify, they had put some type of decals on the two (2) front doors.

Mr. Maletz stated he recalled there had been additional requests for signs when they last came to the ARB.

Mr. Iten stated staff should be sure they did not resubmit anything they had previously turned down.

Mr. Mayer stated yes.

Mr. Brown stated the ARB had denied a movable copy sign.

Mr. Iten stated his third inquiry regarded the NoNA Steiner development. Mr. Iten stated the Strategic Plan was for the ARB to approve such hamlets but the NoNA application was made prior to that being done. Mr. Iten stated City Council had tabled NoNA. Mr. Iten asked if NoNA returned could any approval by City Council be made contingent on a certificate of appropriateness by the ARB.

Mr. Mayer stated the application had been tabled so staff could conduct research regarding standards and requirements for hamlet subdivisions and they could include a recommendation that hamlets go to the ARB for review.

Mr. Iten asked if those standards would then apply to NoNA.

Mr. Mayer stated the City Attorney and City Council would need to review that.

Mr. Iten stated okay.

Mr. Hinson stated he believed the ARB should review the hamlets.

Mr. Maletz stated there were substantial architectural elements in the proposals and he agreed.

Mr. Hinson stated there were a substantial number.

Mr. Durik asked if it was not normal for the ARB not to review these.

Mr. Mayer stated no, the ARB reviews only those within the Village Center.

Mr. Iten stated this application had been approved before they could amend the Code to include hamlets for ARB review.

Mr. Durik asked if typically the ARB would review a project in the hamlet locations.

Mr. Mayer stated the ARB would review new developments, but new developments outside of the Village Center would be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Iten stated that was prior to the amendment to cover hamlets. Mr. Iten stated the intention from the Strategic Plan was that hamlets would be under the ARB's jurisdiction but that had not occurred prior to the NoNA application being made.

Mr. Mayer stated that was correct.

Mr. Durik asked if hamlets were supposed to be reviewed by the ARB.

Mr. Iten stated the Strategic Plan's recommendation was that hamlets fall under the jurisdiction of the ARB but the recommendation had not yet been implemented prior to the time the NoNA application was made.

Mr. Durik asked if that was correct.

Mr. Mayer stated that was correct and said that currently the Planning Commission reviewed a PUD using a final development plan (FDP) outside the Village Center in a similar way the ARB would normally review new developments in the Village Center. Mr. Mayer stated the Strategic Plan recommended the ARB review hamlets but the Codes had not yet been updated for this.

Mr. Iten stated that until the Code was updated, and as this project continued, he wanted City Council to condition this so the ARB could review.

Mr. Durik stated he thought this should be brought to City Council for approval.

Mr. Mayer stated absolutely and noted they planned to bring an update to Chapter 1187 to City Council in October. Mr. Mayer asked if the ARB would want to time their reviews at the time of the FDP presentation.

Mr. Iten stated he would trust staff's expertise as to when it would be most appropriate for the ARB to review.

Mr. Durik stated the project moved quickly from the Strategic Plan to the application and had many different types of construction involved in this project.

Mr. Hinson stated he believed there was value added for the ARB to do this review.

Mr. Durik stated absolutely.

Moved by Mr. Strahler to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Brown. Upon roll call: Mr. Strahler, yea; Mr. Brown, yea; Mr. Iten, yea; Mr. Hinson, yea; Mr. Maletz, yea. Yea, 5; Nay, 0; Abstain, 0. Motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

Meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Submitted by Josie Taylor.

# APPENDIX



## Architectural Review Board Staff Report September 13, 2021 Meeting

---

### CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS MCHENRY ADVISERS – SIGNAGE

---

LOCATION: 134 E. Main Street – New Albany Exchange  
APPLICANT: FastSigns, c/o Mark Rubcich  
REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness for New Signage  
ZONING: I-PUD (Infill Planned Unit Development) New Albany Exchange within the Village Center  
STRATEGIC PLAN: Village Center  
APPLICATION: ARB-92-2021

Review based on: Application materials received August 27, 2021.

*Staff report prepared by Anna van der Zwaag, Acting Zoning Officer*

---

#### **I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND**

The applicant requests review and approval of one new wall sign at the New Albany Exchange for McHenry Advisers.

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 property is zoned I-PUD (Infill Planned Unit Development) under the New Albany Exchange Zoning Text. The site contains the mixed-use New Albany Exchange Development which is located within the Village Center district on the west side of E. Main Street. Other tenants within The New Albany Exchange include Berkshire Hathaway Home Services, Preferred Planning Services, and Surround Design. Overall, the development contains 14 two story units.

#### **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 **1157.09, Criteria for Evaluation of Application for Certification of 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 and Codified Ordinances.*

- NA Exchange’s zoning text Section 4c.06 allows one primary wall mounted sign per tenant. C.O. Section 1169.16(d) of the sign code requires a minimum sign relief of one inch. External illumination is allowed. The applicant proposes one wall sign for McHenry Advisers with the following dimensions:
      - a. Size: 120” x 20” [meets code]
      - b. Area: 16.66 ft<sup>2</sup> [meets code]
      - c. Location: fastened flush to the storefront face [meets code].
      - d. The proposed signage will be illuminated by preexisting overhead external lighting [meets code].
      - e. Relief: 1.5” sign board thickness [meets code]
      - f. Colors: Black background with white lettering and border [meets code]
    - The wall sign is a horizontally-oriented rectangular wall sign is made of a 1.5-inch thick high-density urethane (HDU) which is a permitted material.
    - This sign is 16.66 square feet in area (120” x 20”). Its lettering says “MCHENRY ADVISERS”.
    - The proposed height of the sign is 20”, which compares with similar signs in the zoning district. Heights of similar signs in the New Albany Exchange include 19” (Berkshire Hathaway HomeServices) and 19.5” (Ohio Family Chiropractic).
    - The zoning text Section 4c.06(1)(a) limits the size of the sign to one square foot of sign face per each lineal foot of office frontage. This tenant space is 20 feet wide. As such, the sign is under the required size requirement by 3.33 square feet and meets code.
    - The New Albany Exchange Zoning Text Section 4c.06(3)(a) states that all wall mounted signage shall have a common background color. Taupe, black, cream and cabernet have been approved as a background colors for existing signs in the Exchange. The application requests a black background, which is an approved background color.
    - The New Albany Exchange Signage Recommendation Plan suggests a standardized 1.5” black frame with sign applied to the face of the frame, sign heights and ratios maintained across all store fronts in addition to what the zoning text and sign code requires. In 2011, the ARB approved a white sign frame to be installed instead of black for Preferred Planning Services which was a black sign. The applicant proposes a white border around the sign face with a black routed edge; however, the applicant has not provided the white border dimension. Staff recommends a condition of approval that the white border around the sign face equal 1.5- inches thick in order to keep the frame design consistent with the majority of the signs in this zoning district.
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 sign is the most appropriate sign-type for this tenant space.
  3. *The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, site and/or its environment shall not be destroyed.*
    - This wall sign is positioned in a suitable location above the storefront and matches the width of window framing. The sign does not appear to block any architectural features.
  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 wall sign appears to be appropriately scaled for the proposed building and appears to match the style of the building.

5. *Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site shall be created with sensitivity.*
  - 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.

#### **IV. RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the wall sign certificate of appropriateness application, provided that the ARB finds the proposal meets sufficient basis for approval. The wall sign is in an appropriate location above the storefront windows, consistent with other tenants in the New Albany Exchange. The sign size, background color, and sign relief are appropriate and meet code. With these factors in mind, the spirit and intent of the zoning text requirement are met which is to ensure that signage for the overall development is coordinated.

#### **V. ACTION**

Should the Architectural Review Board find sufficient basis for approval the following motions would be appropriate. Conditions of approval may be added.

#### **Suggested Motion for ARB-92-2021:**

Move to approve Certificate of Appropriateness for application ARB-92-2021 (conditions of approval may be added).

#### **Approximate Site Location:**

