

New Albany Architectural Review Board
Monday, May 13, 2024 Meeting Minutes - Approved

I. Call to order

The New Albany Architectural Review Board held a regular meeting on Monday, May 13, 2024 in the New Albany Village Hall. Chair Hinson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked to hear the roll.

II. Roll call

Those answering roll call:

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

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

Staff members present: Law Director Albrecht, Planner II Christian, Planning Manager Mayer, Clerk Mason.

III. Action on minutes: April 8, 2024

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

Mr. Iten stated that the record should reflect that the February minutes were duly adopted with three votes at the April meeting as only a majority of the quorum present was needed to adopt the minutes and there were five voting members present.

Chair Hinson stated that page three should be corrected to include that it was Board Member Iten who nominated him.

Hearing no further corrections, Chair Hinson moved for approval of the April 8, 2024 meeting minutes. Board Member Davie seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Hinson yes, Mr. Davie yes, Mr. Strahler yes, Ms. Moore abstained from the vote, Mr. Maletz yes, Mr. Brown yes, Mr. Iten yes. Having six yes votes, the April 8, 2024 minutes were approved as corrected.

IV. Additions or corrections to the agenda

Chair Hinson administered the oath to all present who wished to address the board.

Administer the oath to all witnesses and applicants who plan to address the board, "Do you swear to tell the truth and nothing but the truth."

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

Chair Hinson asked if there were any visitors present who wished to address the board for an item not on the agenda.

Hearing none, he introduced the first case and asked to hear from staff.

VI. Cases:

ARB-16-2024 Certificate of Appropriateness

Certificate of Appropriateness to allow a new patio that was installed between the shared property lines at 20 & 24 S. High Street (PIDs: 222-000027 and 222-000028).

Applicant: Lorenz Lawn & Landscape LLC

Planner II Christian delivered the staff report.

Board Member Iten asked when the inspection occurred.

Planner II Christian responded that it was earlier this year.

Planning Manager Mayer responded early this year or late last year.

Applicant Mr. Bush responded that it was in November of 2023.

Board Member Iten asked why there was a delay in bringing this before the board.

Planning Manager Mayer explained that the delay was intentional and it was to see whether additional items would need to be included in the application.

Board Member Iten asked what would happen if the application was not approved.

Planning Manager Mayer answered that the applicant would have to remove the patio or modify it to match the board's approval.

Board Member Iten asked why the approved patio was not built.

Applicant Nate Bush, owner of the three buildings, stepped to the lectern to respond. He explained that he did not put in the application, but he had requested a modification. He wanted a focal point to the back and he was unaware that it was inconsistent with what was approved. Lorenz was the original landscaper and installed both patios, he did not explain that additional approval was needed, and did not come back.

Board Member Iten continued and asked about the installation of the second patio.

Mr. Bush responded that after the original patio came out so nicely, he wanted a second and the architect said it was not a problem.

Chair Hinson noted that the walls were different.

Planner II Christian responded that the image shown was not the revised plan and it was that length because the board required a seating wall along High Street.

Chair Hinson asked about screening along the wall and noted that the mortar had a harsh appearance.

Planner II Christian agreed and responded that the landscaping plan was submitted and it was approved by the city architect.

Chair Hinson asked whether there was landscaping across the entire front area, on the street side.

Mr. Bush responded that there are two dogwood trees and three boxwood bushes that would reach the height/length of the seating wall.

Board Member Iten remarked that, notwithstanding his annoyance that it had been built, he did not find it offensive, but it was frustrating to approve something that had already been built. He continued that if it was presented as an application he would approve it, and that he was not inclined to withhold approval. He noted that he had reservations about the existing architecture of the surrounding properties.

Board Member Maletz noted that the board was rarely faced with approving something that had already been built and asked what the city's response was when this happened. Does the city levy a fine? He thought the board was trying to evaluate the merits. What is the applicant's burden in this context?

Planning Manager Mayer responded that the city will notify the owner of the violation. The goal is good design and to bring the property into compliance, not to levy fines. The delay in this case was to ensure that all necessary approvals were presented at once and not piece by piece. He continued that he thought this was additive to High Street and was not a case for changes or removals, however the city was asking for additional landscaping as a condition of approval.

Board Member Maletz evaluated lot coverage, the merits and the layout. He noted that there is some degree of variability of properties fronting High Street. This property had no relation to other properties on High Street. His concern was to be fair and reasonable, he noted that he believed there should be a high standard for the rhythm and aesthetic on High Street. This is a missed opportunity to address that. He recommended an evaluation of all three properties and the establishment of a common line of all three walls. They should be complimentary in nature. High Street is different than the others and deserves unique consideration. He asked the applicant what was the basis for the location of the screening wall.

Board Member Iten asked why the walls were not lined up.

Mr. Bush responded that it was because of the tree.

Chair Hinson stated that there is a second retaining wall with different brick, mortar, cap, and brick sidewalk. These two elements rise above and are not consistent with the architecture. In his opinion it needed to be screened with more boxwood, more complete screening.

Board Member Maletz agreed and recommended more screening, consideration of stained mortar, and reconsideration of the cap. The rest of the application is acceptable.

Chair Hinson made a motion that the applicant should work with staff, and the Architectural Review Board would approve, with the City Architect, to properly and completely screen the two new elements/retaining walls. He further noted that he was okay with the non-approved patio as built, but it needed to be properly screened from the street.

Board Member Strahler added that a light plan needed to be submitted.

Board Member Iten confirmed that the applicant was in agreement.

Mr. Bush agreed.

Ms. Moore seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Hinson yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Iten yes, Mr. Brown yes, Mr. Davie yes, Mr. Maletz yes, Mr. Strahler yes. Having seven yes votes, the motion passed.

Council Member Durik asked whether the board has considered other applications involving a resident who relied on a contractor. He further asked whether staff was familiar with this contractor, and whether this contractor was free-wheeling.

Planning Manager Mayer responded that all contractors are required to register with the city. If a contractor has repeated violations for work without permits, the city can deny registration.

Council Member Durik recommended that this contractor be notified. Chair Hinson agreed, thanked the applicant, and introduced the next case.

ARB-21-2024 Certificate of Appropriateness

Certificate of Appropriateness for a new sign on the rear elevation at 200 Market Street, the New Albany Library (PID: 222-002871).

Applicant: Morrison Sign Company Inc.

Planner Cratic-Smith delivered the staff report.

Board Member Iten asked whether staff had considered that the sign is off-center. He observed that on the front of the building, which is almost two stories, the sign is centered. On the back of the building, the sign is on the left appendage.

Planning Manager Mayer responded that staff did consider that. The side maximized visibility toward Raines Crossing, the sign was centered on that wing and there is a direct view over the bridge facing north. Staff felt like the positioning of the sign was appropriate based on area activity and gathering spaces.

Board Member Maletz asked if there was a reason that Mrs. Kessler is below on one side and above on the other.

Applicant Sean White and Applicant Kristen Sutton responded that they could propose that design if that was desired [name above library on one side and name below library on the other].

Board Member Iten remarked that it was weird that it reverses. His present concern was that there is a tree. That is the perfect reason not to put a sign there; trees die or get cut down. When the tree is gone, the approved sign is on the left when it should be centered.

Board Member Strahler noted that when Rose Run Park was being designed there was talk of putting doors on the back and asked whether there was consideration of putting doors in the back.

Ms. Sutton responded that the library was currently evaluating their cap plans, but not beyond 2025. There were no current plans to do that.

Board Member Strahler continued that if doors are installed, they should be centered.

Board Member Iten stated that if the board approved the sign on the left side and then the tree dies, the board will wish the sign was centered. He asked whether the same effect could be achieved with a post sign, rather than placing an off-center sign on this very attractive building.

Ms. Sutton responded that she believed the placement of the sign did not take the tree into consideration. The placement is an aesthetic choice, which was why it was being presented to the board today.

Board Member Iten agreed that board makes aesthetic choices.

Council Member Durik asked first, why have a second sign. Second, are there any other properties in the area with a sign in the front and in the back. Third, what about the lighting, was the front sign halo lit.

Mr. White responded that the front sign was halo lit, and that the library wanted the front and the back signs to match.

Ms. Sutton added that they should have brought Pat Losinski. The sign on the back was for the community and also followed a conversation with the donor.

Board Member Iten continued that given the ephemeral nature of the landscaping and the attractiveness of the building, he was reluctant to put large sign, such as this, off center. He preferred to put in a post sign in the back. Placing a big sign off center not doing the job of approving signs. Others may disagree.

Board Member Maletz asked what kind of tree was planted there.

Board Member Iten stated that it has red leaves and goes to the top of the building, but it is not a maple.

Board Member Maletz stated that he had mixed emotions about this. He understands the reasons of awareness and promotion. He encouraged consideration of the character of the crossing. This is a pedestrian throughway. He shares the aesthetic sentiment and there is no doubt in his mind that this should be in the center. He acknowledged that it may undermine the purpose of the sign; is tricky with a building like this, but consistency matters.

Board Member Iten added that he was happy to approve that size sign, but it has to be in the center. The sign as proposed makes no sense. He would also approve a properly placed post sign. The sign should not be placed on the left because it would be there forever.

Board Member Strahler added that he understood the capital funding timeline, and asked whether a back entrance was still on his wish list.

Ms. Sutton remarked that there was a potential for a back entrance but she had not been in on those discussions. She added that if such a project was completed, the sign could be centered. She added that the city and library had discussions about timing and improvements to the library. For funding reasons, that it was put on hold but the city is still interested in expanding that outdoor space in the future.

Board Member Brown discussed the work involved with moving a sign. The real work was involved the building penetrations. There were further discussions regarding the lettering, the brick veneer, parking, the possibility of a post sign.

Chair Hinson remarked that he had heard many conversations off record of a lot of opportunities in this parking area for future development from parking deck to farmer's market to more. He was curious whether anything unofficial had come before staff that they should consider. He stated that he thinks it is a mistake to put a sign off center given future development in the area and he would like to stay ahead of the curve based on what he's heard.

Planning Manager Mayer responded that there have been many discussions. Planner II Christian and he were looking at the 2005 Village Center plan. There have and continue to be conception planning but nothing firm. The Village Center has been outlined since late 1990s. There were certainly opportunities, including underground water storage to allow for future development in the future, but no timelines were associated. The long range plan contemplates development in Market Square area. Regarding parking decks, the city was working on a parking study and hoped to have it done by end of year.

Chair Hinson stated that he was listening comments and thoughts. He would approve a centered sign on the building, a post sign on the corner or direction, or something by Raines versus committing to an asymmetrical sign.

Board Member Davie pointed out that a loading space was under the proposed sign location.

Ms. Sutton pointed out that the positioning of the sign was directional.

Planning Manager Mayer recommended tabling the application for one month. If one month is insufficient, it can be tabled again.

Board Member Iten agreed and further remarked that he liked to say yes to libraries but it seemed like this application needed more work.

Board Member Brown recommend that the application be tabled.

Chair Iten moved to table ARB-21-2024 for one month. Board Member Maletz seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Hinson yes, Mr. Davie yes, Mr. Iten yes, Mr. Brown yes, Mr. Maletz yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Strahler yes. Having seven yes votes, the motion passed and ARB-21-2024 was laid upon the table.

Planning Manager Mayer confirmed that the application could be tabled for longer than one month, at the board's discretion.

Chair Hinson introduced the next case and asked to hear from staff.

ARB-23-2024 Certificate of Appropriateness

Certificate of Appropriateness to allow a new post sign and projecting sign to be installed at 30 W. Main Street (PID: 222-000091).

Applicant: City of New Albany

Planner II Christian delivered the staff report.

Board Member Iten noted there was no bracket.

Board Member Moore asked about the dimension of the underside of the blade-sign, noting that a minimum needed to be met.

Planner II Christian remarked that it had to be at least 8 feet.

Planning Manager Mayer added that he thought it was positioned over a planter bed as well.

Board Member Iten asked for the name of the structure

Planning Manager Mayer responded Phelps House.

Board Member Maletz asked whether this was the only annex building for city offices.

Planning Manager Mayer answered, beginning recently, yes. The city owns some other properties in the Village Center but this is the only building, outside of the public service department and the police department, where staff is being placed. There are a lot of new employees and as a result the city has a need to expand. Prior to this, the space was used for storage and New Albany Symphony used the space. Now the city is officially putting city staff here.

Board Member Maletz wondered whether the name of the building could pay some homage to the history of the structure, something more descriptive, “City Annex at Phelps House.”

Planning Manager Mayer responded that was a great comment. The sign is not permanent. There is no historical marker out there and there would be other opportunities after this to add signage. City staff would work with the Historical Society.

Board Member Maletz noted that part of the charge of the board was to recognize opportunities for education and identity in the community. This is a recognizable structure and this could raise sensitivity.

Planning Manager Mayer stated that staff was requesting approval of this signage tonight for logistical reasons, however staff would continue to look into further research.

Council Member Durik noted that there has been a lot of staff growth. The Finance Department is in a commercial building with the signage inside the building, but not outside. This structure is a building that the city owns. It has been vacant for a while. If future expansion occurs, maybe 5 years from now, they may not even be in that space. He added that a historical marker on the building is appropriate for the Historical Society. Ideally, he wants city staff in a larger single building in the future.

Planning Manager Mayer stated he could reach out to the New Albany Community Foundation, because he thought they were familiar with this.

Chair Hinson added that the house built in 1920. But was still, Phelps House or Phelps Close.

Board Member Iten moved for approval of ARB-23-2024. Board Member Moore seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Iten yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Hinson yes, Mr. Davie yes, Mr. Maletz yes, Mr. Brown yes, Mr. Strahler yes. Having seven yes votes, the motion passed and ARB-23-2024 was approved.

VII. Other business

Planning Manager Mayer introduced Planner Saumenig, who had recently joined the planning team.

The board welcomed Planner Saumenig.

Planning Manager Mayer invited the board to the open house for the US 62 Focus Area Plan on May 14th from 6:00 – 7:30, at the Heit Center. All are welcome to attend the open house. He offered special thanks to Board Member Moore for helping.

Planner II Christian showed the City's US 62 planning video.

VIII. Poll members for comment

Board Member Iten commented that it was nice to see everyone.

IX. Adjourn

Having no further business, Board Member Brown moved to adjourn the May 13, 2024 New Albany Architectural Review Board Meeting. Board Member Davie seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Brown yes, Mr. Davie yes, Mr. Hinson yes, Mr. Maletz yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Strahler yes, Mr. Iten. Having seven yes votes, the motion passed and the May 13, 2024 New Albany Architectural Review Board Meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Submitted by Deputy Clerk Madriguera, Esq., with special thanks to Clerk of Council Mason.

Appendix

ARB-16-2024

Staff Report

Record of Action – in process

ARB-21-2024

Staff Report

Record of Action – in process

ARB-23-2024

Staff Report

Record of Action



**Architectural Review Board Staff Report
May 13, 2024**

**20 & 24 SOUTH HIGH STREET PAVER PATIO
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

LOCATION: 20 & 24 South High Street (Parcel IDs: 222-000027 and 222-000028)
APPLICANT: Lorenz Lawn & Landscape LLC
REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness
ZONING: Urban Center, Historic Center
STRATEGIC PLAN: Village Center
APPLICATION: ARB-16-2024

Review based on: Application materials received on March 5, 2024.

Staff report prepared by Chris Christian, Planner II.

I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant requests review and approval for a new 955 sq. ft. patio that was installed in between the shared property lines at 20 & 24 S. High Street. In June 2022, the ARB approved a patio to be installed between the shared property lines at 14 & 20 S. High Street (ARB-55-2022). This new patio connects with the original patio that was approved by the ARB.

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. This section of city code states that patios, porches and other defined areas used for dining or other commercial activities constitutes as a major environmental change. Both properties are owned by Busch Real Estate LLC. Sycamore Wellness will occupy the building at 24 S. High Street therefore ARB review and approval is required.

II. SITE DESCRIPTION & USE

The properties are located in the Historic Village Center, are zoned Urban Center Code and the New Albany Design Guidelines and Requirements apply to the site. The properties have been converted to commercial uses. There is one single family home on each property and a detached structure at the rear of 20 S. High Street.

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 and Codified Ordinances.*
 - The applicant installed a new, 955 sq. ft. patio in between the shared property lines at 20 & 24 S. High Street. The properties each contain one single family homes, both of which have been converted to commercial uses. The building at 24 S. High Street

will be occupied by Sycamore Wellness. The main paver terrace will be located in between the existing buildings and walkways will connect the patio to existing entrances into both buildings, an accessory structure and a private site parking lot.

- C.O. 1157.07 states that patios, porches and other defined outdoor areas used for dining or other commercial areas are considered a major environmental change and ARB review and approval is required. The proposed patio area will not be used for commercial dining purposes such as a restaurant however, given the requirements of city code the ARB must approve a patio at this site.
 - New Albany Design Guidelines Section 3: Village Center Commercial section I(A)(9) states that brick pavers are the most appropriate paving material in all commercial areas of the Village Center District.
 - In June 2022, the ARB approved a patio to be installed between the shared property lines at 14 & 20 S. High Street (ARB-55-2022) with the following conditions:
 - Brick must be used on the patio walls, piers and edge. A complimentary paver must be used for the main patio terrace, subject to the review and approval of the city architect.
 - A detailed landscape and lighting plan must be submitted as part of the zoning permit for the project and is subject to review and approval of the city landscape architect.
 - The seating wall must run along the entire length of the High Street frontage where the patio is present, subject to staff approval.
 - The applicant indicates that the original patio was slightly expanded at the rear of 14 S. High Street. This new area is shown on the submitted site plan, identified in green. The ARB should evaluate the appropriateness of this additional space. It appears that the design is consistent with the rest of the patio that was approved by the ARB.
 - The new patio connects with the existing patio that was originally approved by the ARB. Both patios meet the original conditions of approval and share a consistent design. Brick is used on the patio walls, piers and edges. The city architect approved a complimentary paver that is used for the main patio terrace and a seating wall is present along High Street, where required.
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 patio appears to be appropriately located in between both sites. Based on the submittal, it appears that new landscaping and lighting may be added in the patio area as part of the project. Staff recommends a condition of approval that a detailed landscape and lighting plan must be submitted as part of the zoning permit for the project and be subject to the review and approval of the city landscape architect.
3. *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 installation of this proposed patio.
4. *All buildings, structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time.*
- Not Applicable.
5. *Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site shall be created with sensitivity.*
- It appears that the applicant has designed and located the patio on the sites in a way that is sensitive to the existing site and building conditions.

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

B. Urban Center Code Compliance

The Urban Center Code and city code do not provide regulations for commercial patios in the Village Center. The proposed patio is appropriately located on the sites.

IV. SUMMARY

The new patio space is consistent with the design of the original patio that was approved by the ARB and compliments the established character of the Village Center.

V. ACTION

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

Suggested Motion for ARB-16-2024:


Move to approve Certificate of Appropriateness application ARB-16-2024 with the following condition (additional conditions of approval may be added).

1. A detailed landscape and lighting plan must be submitted as part of the zoning permit for the project and is subject to review and approval of the city landscape architect.

Approximate Site Location:



Source: Google Earth


**NEW
ALBANY**
COMMUNITY CONNECTS US
Architectural Review Board Staff Report
May 13, 2024

**NEW ALBANY LIBRARY WALL SIGNS
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

LOCATION: 200 Market Street
APPLICANT: Morrison Sign Company Inc.
REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness
ZONING: C-PUD; Comprehensive Planned Unit Development
STRATEGIC PLAN: Village Center
APPLICATION: ARB-21-2024

Review based on: Application materials received on April 18, 2024.

Staff report prepared by Sierra Cratic-Smith, Planner.

I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant requests a certificate of appropriateness to allow a wall sign to be installed at 200 Market Street for the New Albany Library. The wall sign is proposed to be installed on the rear elevation facing Rose Run Park at the northeastern corner of the building.

II. SITE DESCRIPTION & USE

The property is zoned under the 1998 New Albany Company zoning district Subarea 4A: Market Street text.

The New Albany branch of the Columbus Metropolitan Library is located in Market Square at 200 Market Street. According to the Franklin County Auditor the building was constructed in 2002. The library's parcel is approximately 1.6558 acres and has shared parking with the surrounding retail shops.

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 appropriateness 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 Village Core sub-district shall be allowed three (3) sign types including, but not limited to, projecting, awning and wall signs. The applicant proposes to install a new sign on the rear elevation.

Wall Sign

- City sign code Chapter 1169.16(d)(2) permits a maximum area of 40 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 265.49+/- feet of frontage on Market Street and two business entrances.
 - a. Area: 22.5 square feet [meets code].
 - b. Location: the sign is proposed to be installed above the first story windows on the northeastern corner of the rear elevation of the building [meets code].
 - c. Lighting: Halo illumination [meets code].
 - d. Relief: 1.75 inch [meets code].
 - e. Colors: blue to match front elevation sign [meets code].
 - f. Lettering Height for the first sign: 13.1" maximum [meets code]
 - The sign will read "Library Charlotte P. Kessler."
 - The sign panel is made out of Aluminum which is a permitted sign material.
 - 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. The proposed material appears to be the same used on the front elevation sign.
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 sign is 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.*
 - The sign appears to be positioned in a suitable location and does 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 sign is 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.*
 - The does not appear to impair the essential form and integrity of the original structure.

IV. SUMMARY

The proposed wall sign appears to be consistent with the architectural character of the building, the overall Village Center and is 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-21-2024:

Move to approve Certificate of Appropriateness application ARB-21-2024.
(Conditions may be added)

Approximate Site Location:



Source: Near Map


**NEW
ALBANY**
COMMUNITY CONNECTS US
Architectural Review Board Staff Report
May 13, 2024

**PHELPS HOUSE SIGNAGE
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

LOCATION: 30 West Main Street (PID: 222-000091)
APPLICANT: City of New Albany
REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness
ZONING: Urban Center, Campus Sub-District
STRATEGIC PLAN: Village Center
APPLICATION: ARB-23-2024

Review based on: Application materials received on April 10, 2024

Staff report prepared by Chris Christian, Planner II.

I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant requests a certificate of appropriateness to allow one post sign and one projecting sign to be installed at 30 W. Main Street, for city of New Albany offices. There are no existing signs at the site and the proposed signs will help visitors locate the building.

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 Urban Center (Campus sub-district) therefore, the city's sign code regulations apply to the site. The existing structure on the property is commonly known as the Phelps House which was constructed in 1928. The city of New Albany owns the building which is used for city offices.

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 appropriateness issued by the Architectural Review Board. No environmental change shall be made to any property within the Village 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(c) each building or structure in the Campus sub-district shall be allowed three (3) sign types including, but not limited to, single post, projecting and wall signs. The applicant proposes to install one projecting sign and one single post sign with the following dimensions.

Projecting Sign

- City sign code Chapter 1169.16(h) allows one projecting sign per building entrance and a maximum size of 8 square feet.
 - a. Area: 8 square feet [meets code].
 - b. Location: mounted to the Main Street elevation of the building, near the building entrance that is adjacent to the parking lot [meets code].
 - c. Lighting: none proposed [meets code].
 - d. Relief: 3 inches [meets code].
 - e. Colors: blue, bronze and white (total of 3) [meets code].
 - f. Height: 6 feet [meets code].
- The sign reads “City Offices | 30 W. Main” and features the city of New Albany logo.
- The sign panel is made out of aluminum which is a permitted sign material.
- A minimum 8-foot clearance is required to be maintained from adjacent sidewalks. This will be verified at the time a sign permit is issued and the sign is installed.

Single Post Sign

- City sign code Chapter 1169.17(a) allows one single post sign per street entrance and a maximum size of 8 square feet.
 - a. Area: 8 square feet [meets code].
 - b. Location: installed along the Main Street frontage of the site, south of the building, and setback 5 feet from the property line [meets code].
 - c. Lighting: none proposed [meets code].
 - d. Relief: 3 inches [meets code].
 - e. Colors: blue, bronze and white (total of 3) [meets code].
 - The sign reads “City Offices | 30 W. Main” and features the city of New Albany logo.
 - The sign panel is made out of aluminum which is a permitted sign material. It is attached to an aluminum post that will be painted white to match other single post signs in the Village Center.
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 appropriate sign-types for this property.
 3. *The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, site and/or its environment shall not be destroyed.*
 - The signs are positioned in suitable locations and will 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 appropriately scaled for the site and building on which they are located.
 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 projecting sign will affect the original structure, if it were to be removed or altered in the future.

IV. SUMMARY

The proposed signs are consistent with the architectural character of the site and the overall Village Center.

V. ACTION

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

Suggested Motion for ARB-23-2024:

Move to approve Certificate of Appropriateness application ARB-23-2024 (conditions of approval may be added).

Approximate Site Location:



Source: NearMap



Community Development Department

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

Dear City of New Albany, c/o Adrienne Joly

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, May 14, 2024

The New Albany Architectural Review Board took the following action on 05/13/2024 .

Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: 30 West Main Street

Applicant: City of New Albany, c/o Adrienne Joly

Application: PLARB20240023

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness to allow a new post sign and projecting sign to be installed at 30 W. Main Street (PID: 222-000091).

Motion: Move to approve

Commission Vote: Motion Approved, 7-0

Result: Certificate of Appropriateness, PLARB20240023 was Approved, by a vote of 7-0.

Recorded in the Official Journal this May 14, 2024

Condition(s) of Approval: None

Staff Certification:

Chris Christian

Chris Christian
Planner II