

New Albany Architectural Review Board
Monday, August 14, 2023 Meeting Minutes - Approved

I. Call to order

The New Albany Architectural Review Board held a regular meeting on Monday, August 14, 2023 in the New Albany Village Hall. Chair Hinson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. Roll call

Those answering roll call:

Mr. Hinson	present
Mr. Iten	present
Mr. Brown	present
Mr. Davie	absent
Mr. Maletz	present
Ms. Moore	present
Mr. Strahler	absent
Council Member Wiltout	present

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

Staff members present: Planner Cratic-Smith; Planning Manager Mayer; Deputy Clerk Madriguera.

III. Action on minutes:

Chair Hinson asked whether there was any action on the minutes from the July 10, 2023 meeting.

Deputy Clerk Madriguera remarked that in the version of the draft minutes that was circulated with the August meeting agenda and quorum call, Mr. Strahler's name was missing from the Roll call section. Mr. Strahler and Mr. Iten had both noticed this and brought it to the clerk's attention. Following that the draft was updated and the version in the meeting packet reflected Mr. Strahler's absence.

Chair Hinson asked if there were any other changes to the minutes. Hearing none, he asked for a motion on the minutes.

Board Member Brown moved for approval of the minutes from the July 10, 2023 meeting. Board Member Moore seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Brown yes; Ms. Moore yes; Mr. Iten yes; Mr. Maletz abstain; Mr. Hinson yes. Having four votes in favor and one abstention, the July 10, 2023 meeting minutes were approved.

IV. Additions or corrections to agenda

Chair Hinson asked whether there were any additions or corrections to the agenda.

Planning Manager Mayer answered there were none from staff.

Chair Hinson administered the oath to all present who would be addressing the board.

V. Hearing of visitors for items not on tonight's agenda

Chair Hinson asked whether there were any visitors present who wished to address the board for an item not on tonight's agenda. Hearing none, Chair Hinson called the first and only case on the agenda.

VI. Case:

ARB-75-2023 Certificate of Appropriateness

Certificate of Appropriateness to allow a building addition and exterior building changes at 153 Granville Street (PID: 222-000121-00).

Applicant: f5 Design c/o Todd Parker

Planner Cratic-Smith delivered the staff report.

Board Member Iten asked whether the proposal sought to change the orientation of the entrance to west-facing or whether the proposal sought to change the orientation of the building to west-facing.

Planning Manager Mayer responded that the proposal sought to change the main entrance to the west side elevation but the building orientation would still face the road.

Board Member Iten thanked staff and confirmed that DGR section 3(II.B.2) states that the orientation of main building facades, those with primary entrances, shall be toward the primary street on which the building is located.

Board Member Moore stated that her concern with relocating the door was that it would be difficult to find and match the stone that would be needed to fill in the gap on the front of the building where the existing door was located.

Todd Parker, applicant and architect, responded that he planned to install additional windows, and the additional windows would require removal of existing stone from the façade. He explained that he would be able to re-use that stone and further that he did not anticipate having difficulty finding additional matching stone, but matching the mortar would be the trick. Mr. Parker further remarked that relocation of the door was an attempt to increase security. As currently designed, the door opened directly to the staircase. Moving the door would remove direct access to the staircase and would help to provide a secure lobby and waiting room. He added that the other idea they had, as an alternative, was to have a fake front door.

Board Member Iten noted the design guideline criteria, and asked whether staff had a view about having a fake front door.

Chair Hinson noted that there were other fake doors in the Village Center, for instance the post office.

Planning Manager Mayer responded that the design guidelines require the front door to face the street, and further noted an additional requirement for that commercial structures have an operable and active front door.

Mr. Parker added that the New Albany Country Club was approved for main entrance that does not face the main street.

Chair Hinson remarked that the door could be placed where the windows were located in order to create an asymmetrical, but front-facing, entrance.

Board Member Maletz stated that the front porch would resolve any confusion about the entrance and as a result he did not find the fact that the door did not face Dublin-

Granville Road objectionable. He asked the applicant about lighting, was it included or omitted because that could assist with the location of the door.

Mr. Parker responded that there would be lighting and that it would be recessed can.

Jason Sakasci, applicant, remarked that relocation of the door was an attempt to increase functionality and security. He stated that he wanted to preserve as much of the existing character of the cottage as possible, that he was willing to install any recommended lighting, and also that he was anticipating risk mitigation issues that his insurer would raise.

Board Member Iten asked staff to display the waiver standards and pointed out that he struggled with finding that (b) was being met in this application ((b) Substantially meet the intent of the standard that the application 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). He would be happier with saying (b) was met if there was a fake door because that could be approved as part of the waiver. He pointed out that the board had approved two residences that faced each other instead of the road on SR605 but he was reluctant to do it here. He continued that it was not so much this application but the precedential value of this approval that bothered him.

Board Member Maletz distinguished the residences on SR605 from this case chiefly due to the size of the those structures. He further remarked in this case the door was still on the façade that addressed the street.

Board Member Iten responded that if that was the case, then the board has not yet confronted this issue and asked staff if they were aware of any other cases.

Planning Manager Mayer stated he was not aware of any other structures that did not have a front door that addressed the street, particularly in the Village Center due to the pedestrian orientation of the built environment.

Board Member Iten agreed and continued that he did not know that he could find (b) had been met in this application without a faux door. He further remarked that there were no windows on the east elevation that faced BrewDog.

Board Member Brown added that he was going to comment on the same issue. He remarked that the applicant may have landscaping planned for that area, but the façade facing Dublin-Granville Road was very prominent and he wondered whether there was anything planned for that area.

Mr. Parker responded that the restroom is located on that side of the building. He also remarked that there were water issues from BrewDog on that side so there would need to be something. He added that a window could be added into the sales package, although it would not be placed in the restroom.

Board Member Maletz stated that the board had to follow the code and was likewise charged with preserving architectural appropriateness and this building was a good example of that. He noted that, without disparaging the building, that it was not an architecturally significant building. It has outlived its original use as a home and has been preserved as a commercial structure. He continued that it, like many other buildings constructed at the time, was constructed in the vernacular style which included messiness. He cautioned against creating too many false windows or doors in order to satisfy design standards because they can create operational confusion. Nonetheless, he stated that the

board was bound to apply the code and he remarked that a false window with closed shutters was preferable to a fake door.

Mr. Sackasci responded that he is a very analytical and order-based person and that he wanted to comply with the city's rules. He asserted that moving the door was an attempt to increase security and explained that although insurance could provide funds in cases of theft, family heirlooms were irreplaceable. He remarked that the proposed design was aimed at maximizing security.

Chair Hinson stated that he was torn about the long uninterrupted side, and the lack of front door. The signage on the side of the building emphasized the long wall and he would like to see a shuttered window on the side. He further remarked, regarding security that there was a wall of glass all across the back of the building facing the creek. If someone wanted to get into the building, they would be able to do so.

Board Member Brown agreed and added that the Dublin-Granville Road side of the building would be the most difficult side to break into.

Board Member Moore agreed.

Council Member Wiltout agreed and added that the Dublin Granville Road side was the most public side.

Board Member Iten reiterated that he was concerned about the precedential value of granting this waiver and asked whether the applicant had a solution.

Mr. Parker responded that had discussed this issue with Mr. Sakasci and they discussed converting the current door to an inoperable door and the proposed door as the working door.

Board Member Iten stated that it was a fudge but it was better than setting a precedent and he further mentioned that Hudson 29 and Haley Gallery had similar architectural features. The board was charged with being true to the code.

Board Member Moore commented that perhaps the new door could be angled.

Planning Manager Mayer remarked that fake doors had been approved as was the case with Hudson 29 and Haley Gallery.

Board Member Maletz commented that that was probable the cleanest way.

Chair Hinson agreed and stated that he was in favor of the non-operable front door and some sort of window on the east side.

The applicants agreed to an inoperable front door and window on the east side.

Board Member Item moved for approval of ARB-75-2023 subject to the following conditions:

1. An inoperable front door be added in the location of the current operable front door; and
2. A window or non-operable window with shutters be added on the east façade.

Board Member Maletz seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Iten yes; Mr. Maletz yes; Mr. Brown yes; Ms. Moore yes; Mr. Hinson yes. Having five votes in favor the certificate of appropriateness was granted subject to the conditions stated above.

The board thanked the applicants, wished them good luck.

VII. Other business

Chair Hinson asked whether there was any further business before the board.

Planning Manager Mayer answered that there were none from staff.

VIII. Poll members for comment

Chair Hinson polled the members for comment.

The board thanked each other and staff and wished each other a good evening.

IX. Adjourn

Chair Hinson moved to adjourn the meeting. Board Member Iten seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Hinson yes; Mr. Iten yes; Mr. Maletz yes; Ms. Moore yes; Mr. Brown yes. Having five votes in favor, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.


Submitted by Deputy Clerk Christina Madriguera, Esq.

Appendix:

ARB-75-2023

Staff Report

Record of Action


**NEW
ALBANY**
COMMUNITY CONNECTS US
Architectural Review Board Staff Report
August 14, 2023

**153 EAST GRANVILLE STREET EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

LOCATION: 153 East Granville Street
APPLICANT: F5 Design c/o Todd Parker
REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness
ZONING: Urban Center, Historic Center Sub-District
STRATEGIC PLAN: Village Center
APPLICATION: ARB-75-2023

Review based on: Application materials received on July 28, 2023.

Staff report prepared by Chris Christian, Planner II.

I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant requests a certificate of appropriateness to permit the following exterior modifications at 153 East Granville Street for Sakasci Diamonds.

- A 370 sq. ft. building addition on top of an existing, elevated porch at the rear of the building;
- Relocation of the front door on the front elevation of the building;
- New white hardie plank siding on all building elevations, replacing existing vinyl siding;
- New windows on the existing structure and building addition

On June 12, 2023, the ARB approved a certificate of appropriateness permitting two new wall signs to be installed on the building (ARB-57-2023).

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

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 should be evaluated on these criteria:

1. *The compliance of the application with the Design Guidelines and Requirements and Codified Ordinances.*
 - The applicant proposes the following exterior modifications to the existing structure located at 153 East Granville Street:
 - A 370 sq. ft. building addition on top of an existing elevated porch at the rear of the building;
 - Relocation of the front door on the front elevation of the building;

- New white hardie plank siding on all building elevations, replacing existing vinyl siding;
- New windows on the existing structure and building addition.
- The new single-story addition will be constructed on top of an existing, elevated porch at the rear of the building. The existing building materials include horizontal vinyl lap siding and stone veneer on a portion of the front elevation. The applicant proposes to remove the vinyl siding and replace it with new 6” white hardie plank lap siding.
- Section 3 (II.E.1) of the Design Guidelines & Requirements states that wood siding and brick are the most appropriate exterior materials. Use of other façade materials requires approval of the Architectural Review Board. Section 3 (II.E.2) states that the use of alternate materials such as vinyl, aluminum, and other modern materials may be appropriate when they are used in the same way as traditional materials would have been used. This means that the shape, size, profile, and surface texture of alternate materials must exactly match historical practice when these elements were made of wood.
 - The applicant proposes to use 6” hardie panel board (fiber cement) panels to replace the vinyl lap siding. Hardie panel board material has a similar surface texture as wood and has been used successfully in other places in the Village Center.
 - Stone veneer is currently used on a portion of the front building façade and around the front door. The applicant proposes to relocate the front door to a different portion of the front building façade. The applicant proposes to use stone veneer in place of the existing door location so that the building material is consistent on that portion of the elevation.
- DGR section 3(II.B.2) states that the orientation of main building facades, those with primary entrances, shall be toward the primary street on which the building is located. The applicant proposes to relocate the front door or the building to face the western side yard therefore this requirement will not be met. The board should evaluate the appropriateness of relocating the front door. If the board determines that is appropriate, a waiver is necessary.
- Section 3(II.E.7) states that when a window design has been selected for a building, the same design must be used on all elevations. Use of other window designs as “accent” windows must be appropriate for the architectural style of the building.
 - Currently, there is a mixture of double hung and casement/picture style windows on the building. All of the existing windows are simulated divided light. The simulated divided light grid pattern differs between each style of the existing windows on the building.
 - All existing double hung windows will remain on the building with the exception of one on the front building elevation which is to be replaced with two larger casement/picture windows with a simulated divided light feature, matching the existing window on the western building elevation.
 - The applicant proposes to add three new casement/picture style windows with a simulated divided light feature on the western elevation of the building, matching the existing.
 - The applicant proposes to install seven new casement/picture style windows with a simulated divided light feature on the building addition. The simulated divided light grid pattern used for these windows differs than those on the primary building. The city architect states that the differentiation in the grid pattern is acceptable in this case as it provides an appropriate delineation between the addition and the existing structure.
- Design Guidelines and Requirements (DGR) section 3(II.A.2) states “building designs shall not mix elements from different styles.” The city architect reviewed the proposal and states that this requirement is met as the massing of the new addition is scaled and designed appropriately to be sensitive to the form of the existing building. In addition, the city architect states that the other exterior building modifications are appropriate.

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.*
 - There are no changes to these components of the site.

2. *The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, site and/or its environment shall not be destroyed.*
 - It does not appear that the original quality or character of the building or site will be destroyed or compromised as part of the construction of the proposed exterior modifications.
 - Based on information submitted for the adjacent BrewDog development, the building is located outside of the Rose Run 100-year floodplain.

3. *All buildings, structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time.*
 - The applicant has designed the addition in a way that is appropriate to the architectural character and design of the building.

4. *Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site shall be created with sensitivity.*
 - Based on the comments of the city architect, this requirement is met.

5. *The surface cleaning of masonry structures shall be undertaken with methods designed to minimize damage to historic building materials.*
 - Not Applicable.

2. *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 removal of the proposed addition or other modifications would harm the form and integrity of the original structure.

Urban Center Code Compliance

The site in question is located in the Historic Center area within the Urban Center District. The existing building typology is Classic Commercial. The proposal complies with some of the typology standards listed in this section of the Urban Center Code as noted in the table below. There are some existing, nonconforming conditions which are permitted to remain in accordance with Chapter 1117 (Nonconforming Uses) of the city’s codified ordinances.

1. Lot and Building Standards

Classic Commercial (UCC Section 2.78)

Standard	Minimum	Maximum	Proposed/Existing
Lot Area	4,000 sq. ft	No max	14,374.8 sq. ft
Lot Width	50’	100’	60 feet
Lot Coverage	No min	95%	unknown but appears to be less than 95%
Street Yard	0’	15’	57’(existing, nonconforming)
Side Yard	3’	16’	East Side Yard: 10 feet West Side Yard: 20+/- feet (existing, nonconforming)
Rear Yard	10’	no max	21’ 6”
Bldg. Width	70%	95%	60% (existing, nonconforming)

Stories	1.5	2	2
Height	No min	45'	22 +/- feet

- Urban Center Code Section 2.80.3 requires at least two off street parking spaces on this site and a maximum of one space per 500 sq. ft. With the addition, the building is approximately 950 sq. ft. in size, therefore a maximum of 2 parking spaces are permitted. It appears that there are 9 striped parking spaces existing on the site, exceeding the maximum permitted by code. However, this is a nonconforming condition which is permitted to remain in accordance with Chapter 1117 (Nonconforming Uses) of the city's codified ordinances.

IV. SUMMARY

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 Requirements state that the key to sensitive renovation of existing buildings, including addition and construction on existing developed sites, is to observe and respect the physical context of the property and design new elements in a sensitive way that fits in with existing structures. The proposed addition and other exterior modifications appear to meet these requirements.

Suggested Motion for ARB-75-2023:

Move to approve Certificate of Appropriateness for application ARB-75-2023 (conditions of approval may be added).

Approximate Site Location:



Source: ArcGIS Online



Community Development Department

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

Dear F5 Design/Architecture Inc.,

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

Wednesday, August 16, 2023

The New Albany Architectural Review Board took the following action on 08/14/2023 .

Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: 153 W GRANVILLE RD

Applicant: F5 Design/Architecture Inc.,

Application: PLARB20230075

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness to permit the following exterior modifications at 153 East Granville Street for Sakasci Diamonds.

- A 370 sq. ft. building addition on top of an existing, elevated porch at the rear of the building.
- Relocation of the front door on the front elevation of the building;
- New white hardie plank siding on all building elevations, replacing existing vinyl siding.
- New windows on the existing structure and building addition.

Motion: To approve

Commission Vote: Motion Approval with Conditions, 5, 0

Result: Certificate of Appropriateness, PLARB20230075 was Approval with Conditions, by a vote of 5, 0.

Recorded in the Official Journal this August 16, 2023

Condition(s) of Approval:

1. A shuttered window shall be added to the East façade.
2. An inoperable door shall be installed on the front facade.

Staff Certification:

Sierra Cratic-Smith

Sierra Cratic-Smith
Planner