

**CITY OF KENT
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
November 3, 2020**

MEMBERS PRESENT: **Howard Boyle**
 Dennis Saxe
 Kevin Koogle [arrived late]
 Bridget Tipton
 David Basista

STAFF PRESENT: **Eric Fink, Assistant Law Director**
 Bridget Susel, Community Development Director
 Heather Heckman, Development Planner
 Jennifer Barone, Development Engineer
 Kim Brown, Administrative Assistant

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Boyle at 3:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Howard Boyle, Dennis Saxe, Bridget Tipton, and David Basista were present. Kevin Koogle was not present at this time but did arrive late to the meeting.

III. ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

Mr. Fink instructed members of the audience wishing to be heard on any of the cases presented at this meeting to raise their right hand. Mr. Fink administered the oath, "Do you swear or affirm that the testimony that you are about to give this evening is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? Please say "I do". The participants responded, "I do".

IV. PROJECT REVIEW

A. **ARB20-016 KENT APARTMENTS
 227 FRANKLIN AVENUE**

The applicant is requesting review of the proposed new apartment building.

Adam Prtenjak, LDA Architects, 5000 Euclid Ave, Suite 104, Cleveland, presented the project and reviewed the changes from previous submissions. He reviewed the revised materials and colors to be used and stated that based on previous comments from the Board, the current renderings for consideration have been changed: adjusted the window proportions and replaced some of the large windows with double hung windows for a more residential feel, added a much thicker/larger cornice around the entire perimeter of the structure, less pronounced except above the window bays, accentuated the northwest corner of the building with more paneling due to constructability, and lessened the angles of the bay windows.

Mr. Boyle stated that he likes the cornice work and the only issue that he has is the top of the bay window areas, as he feels that it hangs out from the cornice. He questioned what can be done so that it isn't its own roofline.

Mr. Prtenjak stated that the interior ceiling height within the bay doesn't allow them to reduce the height of the bay area roofline.

Mr. Boyle stated that he understands but would like to see something be done to treat the top of that area.

Mr. Basista stated that he agrees and likes the softness of the building and the cornice but he also feels that the bay areas appear to be stuck on the sides of the building. He would like to see the area incorporated into the roofline. He stated that he likes the colors and the first floor.

Mr. Saxe also agreed regarding the bay areas. Mr. Saxe stated that he would like to see brick on the NW corner of the building.

Mr. Prtenjak stated that the aluminum paneling is used due to structural restrictions; there isn't a continuing masonry bearing point to support brick in that area.

Mr. Boyle questioned if the paneling could be the same color as the brick.

Steve Jennings, LDA Architects, stated they can try some different things but they were trying to tie in to the color between the windows.

Ms. Tipton stated that the reduction of glass available to the tenants that has been reduced is the disadvantage to this proposal. She stated that the height and material change of the bay windows follows the logic of the way they organized the building.

Mr. Boyle stated that he while he doesn't have an issue with the bay area, he does have an issue with bay area exceeding the height of the cornice and how it hangs on the side of the building. He questioned the Board on the next steps.

Mr. Basista stated that it would be nice to see the project again with roof line adjustments.

Mr. Prtenjak stated that lowering the bay area to allow the cornice to go across the top, will not alter the visual appeal. He stated that the intent was to recreate the roof line of the older buildings downtown where the structures are different heights and are visually different.

Mr. Boyle questioned if they could change the top material; cap it without a cornice.

Mr. Prtenjak suggested changing the top floor of the bay area with a dark color similar to the brick so that it is different from the rest of the bay area; the first floor and the top floor would be similar.

Ms. Tipton suggested that the top band could be more significant with a deeper overhang for the bay window areas. She explained that the new band would be more on the outside of the walls as opposed to the top.

Mr. Boyle questioned where the applicant is in the process of beginning construction.

Ms. Susel stated that they need to complete their case before going to the Planning Commission for approval; a Planning Commission application or drawings have not been received at this time.

Mr. Boyle asked the applicant to bring drawings back to the next meeting that would address Ms. Tipton's suggestions, as well as any other ideas they may have.

Tim Dean, representative for Clairmont, stated that they are wanting to begin construction in April of 2021 and asked if the Board could make a recommendation to PC that they look at the top of the bays.

Mr. Boyle stated that the Board has not had success with that approach and stated that they would need to come back to a meeting for review. He stated that the applicant has done a good job with their revisions according to the Design Guidelines.

Ms. Susel stated that the applicant can submit for Planning Commission while they are seeking ARB approval. She explained that Planning Commission is a much longer review time and the earliest that they could get on their agenda would possibly be February if they submitted a complete application.

Mr. Prtenjak asked Ms. Tipton to reiterate her suggestion.

Ms. Tipton stated that one option is to change the material for the entire top floor at the bay area however, what she is suggesting is to change the low profile cap to something more substantial but not quite a corbel, cornice, or anything ornate. She explained that she would like to see the depth of the cap be increased so that the surface of the cap is farther away from the surface of the building; overhang. She feels that this would emphasize the top of the bays even if it doesn't come into line with the cornice of the main building.

After discussion with the Board, the applicant asked that case be continued so that changes could be made to the top of the windows as discussed. It was decided to hold a Special Meeting to review the changed discussed on Thursday, November 19, 2020 at 3:00 p.m.

**B. ARB20-018 THE PUB
401 FRANKLIN AVENUE**

The applicant is requesting review of the proposed patio enclosure.

Rebecca Lindsey, owner, stated that due to COVID-19 the occupancy at the bar was reduced to 25 people where it is typically 88. She stated that because of the colder weather the business is starting to struggle financially as they are not able to use the outdoor patio and feel that they need the patio enclosure to sustain business. She explained that they will extend the existing roof approximately 8 feet and construct walls. She stated that this will allow them enough tables and chairs for 25 people in the enclosure with a total occupancy of 50. Ms. Lindsey stated that she believes that this will allow them to remain open and not layoff any employees.

Mr. Saxe questioned if they are closing off the area with overhead doors.

Ms. Lindsey stated that there will be garage doors with two rows of windows on the top on the patio side so that they can keep the structure and simply open the doors when the weather is nice.

MOTION: *Mr. Basista moved in case ARB20-018, The Pub, 401 Franklin Avenue to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the patio enclosure as presented.*

Mr. Saxe seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0.

**C. ARB20-019 WAR HORSE INK
107 SUMMIT STREET**

The applicant is requesting review of the proposed new building signage.

No applicant representative was in attendance to present the case.

MOTION: *Ms. Tipton moved in case ARB20-019, War Horse Ink, 107 Summit Street, to continue the case to the December 1, 2020 meeting.*

Mr. Basista seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0.

**D. ARB20-020 CVS
500 SOUTH WATER STREET**

The applicant is requesting review of the proposed Comprehensive Sign Plan amendments.

Dan Bertke, Archer Sign Co, explained that CVS is nationally rebranding its store signage to a heart symbol and "CVS Pharmacy" and more recently

the addition of “Health Hub” signs. He explained that this is to make the stores more community friendly and offer more services. Mr. Bertke stated that CVS would like to add these changes to the Comprehensive Sign Plan that has been previously approved. He also mentioned that the electronic sign board was going to be removed.

Ms. Susel reminded the applicant that they will need to get approval from the Planning Commission after this Board provides a recommendation before the sign package can go forward.

Mr. Boyle questioned the location of the “Health Hub” signs.

Mr. Bertke stated that it is on the Summit Street side of the building near the back.

Mr. Boyle questioned if the signs are internally lit.

Mr. Bertke responded that they are.

MOTION: *Mr. Basista moved in case ARB20-020, CVS, 500 South Water Street to recommend to Planning Commission to approve the revision of the Comprehensive Sign Plan as presented.*

Ms. Tipton seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0.

[Mr. Koogle arrived]

V. MEETING SUMMARIES

MOTION: *Mr. Koogle moved to approve the October 6, 2020 Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes as presented.*

Mr. Saxe seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: *Mr. Basista moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Saxe seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.*