

#### **New Albany Architectural Review Board**

Monday, June 12, 2023 meeting minutes

#### I. Call to order

The New Albany Architectural Review Board met in regular session on June 12, 2023 in the New Albany Village Hall. Vice Chair Iten called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

#### II. Roll call

## Those answering roll call

| Mr. Hinson           | absent  |
|----------------------|---------|
| Mr. Iten             | present |
| Mr. Brown            | absent  |
| Mr. Davie            | present |
| Mr. Maletz           | absent  |
| Ms. Moore            | present |
| Mr. Strahler         | present |
| Council Member Durik | present |
|                      |         |

Note – Council Member Durik was present on behalf of Council Member Wiltrout.

Having 4 members present, the board had a quorum to transact business.

**Staff members present:** Planner II Chris Christian, Intern Melanie Bade, Deputy Clerk Christina Madriguera.

#### **III.** Action on minutes: May 8, 2023

Vice Chair Iten asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes from the May 8, 2023 meeting. Hearing no response, he asked for a motion on the minutes.

Board Member Strahler moved to approve the May 8, 2023 meeting minutes as submitted. Board Member Moore seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Strahler, yes; Ms. Moore, yes; Mr. Davie, yes; Mr. Iten, yes.

Having 4 votes in favor, the May 8, 2023 meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

### IV. Additions or corrections to agenda

Vice Chair Iten asked if there were any additions or corrections to the agenda.

Planner Christian answered there were none from staff.

Vice Chair Iten administered the oath to all present who would address the board.

#### V. Case:

#### ARB-57-2023 Certificate of Appropriateness

Certificate of Appropriateness to allow two new wall signs to be installed for Sakasci Diamonds located at 153 Granville Street (PID: 222-000121-00).

Applicant: ProSign Studio c/o Sean Alley

Planner II Christian delivered the staff report.

Vice Chair Iten noted that normally the board did not see temporary signs and asked whether there was any particular reason they needed to see it here.

Planner II Christian agreed that temporary signs were not typically reviewed by the board, that they were handled administratively. He explained that review of this temporary sign was because it was included with the application materials.

Board Member Strahler stated, regarding the temporary sign, that he knew there had been issues in the past with them going way beyond and asked whether that was a concern here.

Planner II Christian answered that typically the temporary sign would be removed when the occupancy permit is issued and that staff follows up to ensure the temporary sign is removed.

Vice Chair Iten asked whether the applicant would like to supplement the staff report and also to offer comments in support of a white sign as opposed to a black sign.

Jason Sakasci, 153 Granville Street, applicant, thanked the board. He stated that this was a big project and he felt very good about it. He noted that he had been New Albany's personal jeweler for 8 years already, and he was a 5-minute walk away. He further noted that he is an appointment-only jeweler and offered personal service. He preferred the white sign because it was more visible than the black. The white with the red was personal and very important to him. He noted that for 8 years he had used that type of logo and desired continuity.

Vice Chair Iten asked Mr. Sakasci about his intent with the colors of the building.

Mr. Sakasci answered that he wanted to do all white with a black roof and black window trim. He further stated that he had spoken to his contractor earlier that day about the project. He clarified that he was not interested in going against the grain and would like the building to look like the other structures in New Albany.

Vice Chair Iten thanked Mr. Sakasci for answering his question.

Board Member Moore clarified whether white was the color of Mr. Sakasci's typical logo.

Mr. Sakasci indicated that it was.

Board Member Moore continued that she had no issue with it [the white]. She further noted that she thought the black might stand out more than the white but she understood his desire for continuity with his logo. She further suggested that he might consider doing a study and comparing examples but she was fine with the white.

Vice Chair Iten stated that if the sign was going to be white perhaps Mr. Sakasci would consider putting a black border around it.

Board Members Strahler and Moore agreed that a border would be helpful.

Mr. Sakasci answered that if the sign was going to be white, that a black border would be fine with him.

Vice Chair Iten stated that he was indifferent on black or white, but recommended a black border if white was used and asked for guidance from staff regarding the width of the border.

Planner II Christian stated that staff would look into it and work with Mr. Sakasci.

Vice Chair Iten indicated that it would be subject to staff approval.

Board Member Davie commented that regarding the positioning of the sign on the north elevation, he would like to see more breathing room around the sign, between the sign and the window.

Mr. Sakasci responded that he understood, and that that actually might end up being the location of the door.

Vice Chair Iten commented that placement of a border there would create a visual distinction around the top and the bottom.

Board Member Davie yes it was similar to when a mirror is hung, it is helpful to have an area at the top and the bottom.

Vice Chair Iten asked whether the board should specify that there should be at least an inch on the bottom and on the top.

Board Member Davie responded that it was likely that it wasn't measured perfectly based on the rendering. If the boards are 4-5 inches there is potentially 15 inches and if the sign measures 12 inches then the space exists already.

Vice Chair Iten stated that it [the condition] can simply say that as mounted it will be an inch on the bottom and on the top. He further remarked that if it already has that, then that would be fine.

Mr. Sakasci said that would be fine and asked whether the board had an issue with the location of the sign.

Vice Chair Iten confirmed that the board had no issue with the location.

Board Member Strahler asked staff to comment on the reasoning for the recommended usage of black for the sign color.

Planner II Christian responded that it was not necessarily black per se, but usage of a darker background such as New Albany blue because the white was stark compared with the tan siding of the building.

Vice Chair Iten asked whether the board would like to make a motion.

Board Member Strahler moved for approval of the certificate of appropriateness for application ARB-57-2023 with the following conditions:

- 1. The proposed wall sign must have a black border, subject to staff approval.
- 2. The eastern elevation sign should be positioned as presented this evening (June 12, 2023) in the updated renderings.
- 3. The requirements of 1169.10(c) must be met for the proposed temporary commercial construction sign.
- 4. The northern elevation must be mounted at least one inch above the window line and one inch below the roof line.

Board Member Moore stated there should be some relief, visually.

Vice Chair Iten seconded the motion.

Council Member Durik stated that the conditions did not mention the sign color.

Vice Chair Iten stated that his view was that the board was approving a white sign.

Board Member Strahler stated that condition 1 could be amended to reflect that the proposed white wall sign must have a black border, subject to staff approval. As amended, the pending motion was for approval of the certificate of appropriateness for application ARB-57-2023 with the following conditions:

- 1. The proposed white wall sign must have a black border, subject to staff approval.
- 2. The eastern elevation sign should be positioned as presented this evening (June 12, 2023) in the updated renderings.
- 3. The requirements of 1169.10(c) must be met for the proposed temporary commercial construction sign.
- 4. The northern elevation must be mounted at least one inch above the window line and one inch below the roof line.

Vice Chair Iten asked to hear the roll.

Upon roll call: Mr. Strahler, yes; Mr. Iten, yes; Ms. Moore, yes; Mr. Davie, yes. Having 4 yes votes, the certificate of appropriateness was approved subject to conditions.

The board thanked Mr. Sakascki and wished him good luck.

#### VI. Other business

Vice Chair Iten asked whether there was any other business.

Planner II Christian answered there was none from staff.

Greg Mantor indicated he would like to address the board. Mr. Mantor resides at 6450 Kitsmiller Road. He explained that he owns just shy of 5 acres and he would like to put 2 other houses on the property. Has been here since 1980. Mr. Mantor stated that he has spoken to other folks and has been told that because he wants to do that, it would be a subdivision and would be subject to all subdivision requirements. He continued that he only wanted to build 2 homes, not a subdivision.

Mr. Mantor stated that he was asking 2 things. First that this project, which was intended to improve the community, be granted an exception. He stated that his proposal was within the intent of the law and that it would be a benefit to the community because it would increase taxes by at least 4-fold. He asked for consideration for what he wanted to do without calling a subdivision. Second, he wanted to direction regarding what kind of paperwork and formal information he needed to submit.

Vice Chair Iten answered that it was the Planning Commission, rather than the Architectural Review Board that would consider a project like this. He recommended that Mr. Mantor work with staff. He stated that presentation to the Architectural Review Board was good practice, but these issues fall outside of jurisdiction of this board. He further explained that the Architectural Review Board may become involved in what the development would look like if a variance was sought. He reiterated that Mr. Mantor's appearance before this board was good practice and encouraged Mr. Mantor to work with staff in order to prepare for an appearance before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Mantor thanked him and said that he had been in touch with staff and asked when the Planning Commission met.

Board members answered that the Planning Commission met on the third Monday, which would be next week.

Council Member Durik asked, as a point of reference for the Planning Commission, whether Mr. Mantor could be on the agenda or whether he would be a walk-in item.

Planner II Christian confirmed that the Planning Commission was scheduled to meet on June 19<sup>th</sup> and that although it was too late to be scheduled for the June 19<sup>th</sup> agenda, Mr. Mantor could speak informally to the commission on other business. Formal applications for Planning Commission consideration must be submitted within the appropriate time table.

Vice Chair Iten thanked Mr. Mantor and wished him luck.

Planner II Christian encouraged Mr. Mantor to feel free to keep in touch regarding this project and any other questions he might have.

Vice Chair Iten asked whether there was any other business. Hearing no response, he polled the members for comment.

### VII. Poll members for comment

Vice Chair Iten noted that he missed the guiding hand of Chair Hinson.

Board Member Moore commented that Vice Chair Iten did a great job, the rest of the members agreed.

Vice-Chair Iten noted that it was nice to see Council Member Durik, even for a brief time.

Vice Chair Iten noted there was no further business before the board and asked for a motion for adjournment.

## VIII. Adjourn

Board Member Davie moved to adjourn. Board Member Moore seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Davie, yes; Ms. Moore, yes; Mr. Strahler, yes; Mr. Iten, yes. Having 4 yes votes the June 12, 2023 meeting of the New Albany Architectural Review Board was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Submitted by Deputy Clerk Christina Madriguera, Esq.

## **Appendix:**

**ARB-57-2023 Certificate of Appropriateness** 

- Staff report
- Record of action



# Architectural Review Board Staff Report June 12, 2023

### SAKASCI DIAMONDS WALL SIGNS CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

LOCATION: 153 East Granville Street

APPLICANT: ProSign Studio c/o Sean Alley
REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness

ZONING: Urban Center, Historic Center Sub-District

STRATEGIC PLAN: Village Center APPLICATION: ARB-57-2023

Review based on: Application materials received on May 11th and 30th, 2023.

Staff report prepared by Chris Christian, Planner II.

#### I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant requests a certificate of appropriateness to allow two wall signs to be installed at 153 East Granville Street, for Sakasci Diamonds. The wall signs are proposed to be installed near entrances to the building, one along the Granville Street building elevation and the other on the eastern elevation of the building.

#### II. SITE DESCRIPTION & USE

The property is zoned Urban Center located within the Historic Center sub-district. Therefore, the city's sign code regulations apply to the site. The existing structure was built in 1940. The Cottage Salon and Day Spa previously occupied the building.

#### III. EVALUATION

#### **Certificate of Appropriateness:**

Per Section 1157.07(b) any major environmental change to a property located within the Village Center requires a certificate of appropriatenesss to be issued by the Architectural Review Board. 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 and 1169 City Sign Regulations, 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.
  - 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 two wall signs with the following dimensions.

### Wall Sign Board #1

• City sign code Chapter 1169.16(d) permits a maximum area of 30 square feet based on the building's frontage, allows one wall sign per business entrance and requires a minimum sign relief of one inch. The building has 30+/- feet of

frontage on Granville Street and 2 business entrances. External illumination is allowed.

- a. Area: 20 square feet [meets code].
- b. Location: the sign is proposed to be installed above the first story window on the eastern elevation of the building [meets code].
- c. Lighting: none proposed [meets code].
- d. Relief: 1.25 inch [meets code].
- e. Colors: white, black and burgundy (total of 3) [meets code].
- f. Lettering Height: 7" maximum [meets code]
- The sign will read "Sakasci Diamonds | Your Personal Jeweler" and feature a diamond logo
- The sign panel is made out of MDO which is a permitted sign material.
- The applicant proposes to use either a white or black sign board panel. City code section 1169.12(a) provides the context and compatibility requirements for signs in the city. C.O. 1169.12(a)(1) states that signs are to be consistent with the design/style of the building on which they are located. Further, signs shall integrate with the building/site on which they are located and adjacent development in scale, design and intensity.
- The ARB should evaluate the appropriateness of the proposed panel colors. In order to meet these requirements, the color of a sign board panel is typically chosen so that a sign may "blend" into the architecture, consistent with the building on which they are located. Based on these requirements, it appears that using the black color for sign panel may be more appropriate than using white.
- The ARB should evaluate the appropriateness of the proposed location of this sign. Positioning the sign so that it fits within the outside frames of the first and second story windows and centered between them may be more appropriate in this case.
- The applicant proposes to install a 6 sq. ft., temporary sign underneath the permanent wall sign. The temporary sign will read "Summer 2024". C.O. 1169.10(c)(1) states that a temporary commercial construction sign may be placed no sooner than 60 days prior to the start of construction, must be removed 14 days after construction is complete and may be no larger than 30 sq. ft. in size. These requirements shall apply to the proposed temporary sign.

#### Wall Sign Board #2

- City sign code Chapter 1169.16(d) permits a maximum area of 30 square feet based on the building's frontage, allows one wall sign per business entrance and requires a minimum sign relief of one inch. The building has 30+/- feet of frontage on Granville Street. External illumination is allowed.
  - a. Area: 6 square feet [meets code].
  - *b.* Location: the sign is proposed to be installed above the first story window on the Granville Street elevation of the building [meets code].
  - c. Lighting: none proposed [meets code].
  - d. Relief: 1 inch [meets code].
  - e. Colors: white, black and burgundy (total of 3) [meets code].
  - f. Lettering Height: Less than 24 inches [meets code]
- The sign will read "Sakasci Diamonds | Your Personal Jeweler" and feature a diamond logo
- The sign panel is made out of MDO which is a permitted sign material.
- The applicant proposes to use either a white or black sign board panel. City code section 1169.12(a) provides the context and compatibility requirements for signs in the city. C.O. 1169.12(a)(1) states that signs are to be consistent with the design/style of the building on which they are located. Further, signs shall integrate with the

- building/site on which they are located and adjacent development in scale, design and intensity.
- The ARB should evaluate the appropriateness of the proposed panel colors. In order to meet these requirements, the color of a sign board panel is typically chosen so that a sign may "blend" into the architecture, consistent with the building on which they are located. Based on these requirements, it appears that using the black color for sign panel may be more appropriate than the white.
- 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 proposed signs are an 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.
  - If modified as described above, the signs appear to be positioned in suitable locations and do not 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 signs are designed and scaled appropriately for this tenant space.
- 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.
  - It does not appear that the sign affects the original structure, if removed or altered in the future.

## IV. SUMMARY

The proposed wall signs, with the modifications described in the report, appear to be consistent with the architectural character of the building, the overall Village Center and are appropriate for this space.

#### V. ACTION

Should the Architectural Review Board find sufficient basis for approval, the following motion would be appropriate.

#### **Suggested Motion for ARB-57-2023:**

Move to approve Certificate of Appropriateness for application ARB-57-2023 with the following conditions:

- 1) The proposed wall sign panels must be black;
- 2) The eastern elevation sign must be positioned so that it fits within the outside frames of the first and second story windows, centered between them; and
- 3) The requirements of 1169.10(c) must be met for the proposed temporary commercial construction sign.

**Approximate Site Location:** 



Source: ArcGIS Online



# **Community Development Department**

RE: City of New Albany Board and Commission Record of Action

Dear Prosign Studio c/o Sean Alley,

Attached is the Record of Action for your recent application that was heard by one of the City of New Albany Boards and Commissions. Please retain this document for your records.

This Record of Action does not constitute a permit or license to construct, demolish, occupy or make alterations to any land area or building. A building and/or zoning permit is required before any work can be performed. For more information on the permitting process, please contact the Community Development Department.

Additionally, if the Record of Action lists conditions of approval these conditions must be met prior to issuance of any zoning or building permits.

Please contact our office at (614) 939-2254 with any questions.

Thank you.



# **Community Development Department**

# **Decision and Record of Action**

Tuesday, June 13, 2023

The New Albany Architectural Review Board took the following action on 06/12/2023.

## **Certificate of Appropriateness**

**Location:** 153 W GRANVILLE RD

Applicant: Prosign Studio,

**Application:** PLARB20230057

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness to allow two new wall signs to be installed for Sakasci

Diamonds located at 153 Granville Street (PID: 222-000121-00).

**Motion:** Move to approve with conditions

**Commission Vote:** Motion Approved with Conditions, 4-0

**Result:** Certificate of Appropriateness, PLARB20230057 was Approved with Conditions, by a vote

of 4-0.

Recorded in the Official Journal this June 12, 2023

#### Condition(s) of Approval:

- 1. The proposed wall sign panels may be white but must have a black border around the sign, subject to staff approval.
- 2. The eastern elevation sign must be positioned so that it fits within the outside frames of the first and second story windows, centered between them; and
- 3. The requirements of 1169.10(c) must be met for the proposed temporary commercial construction sign.
- 4. The wall sign on the northern building elevation must be mounted at least one inch above the window and one inch below the roof line in order to provide visual relief.

**Staff Certification:** 

Chris Christian

Chris Christian Planner II