CITY OF KENT
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
July 3, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT:	**Howard Boyle** **Kevin Koogle** **Allan Orashan**
MEMBERS ABSENT:	**David Basista and Steve Balazs**
STAFF PRESENT:	**Heather Phile, Development Planner** **Jennifer Barone, Development Engineer** **Eric Fink, Assistant Law Director** **Kim Brown, Administrative Assistant**

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Boyle at 4:01 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Howard Boyle, Alan Orashan, and Kevin Koogle were present. David Basista and Steve Balazs were absent.

MOTION: ***Mr. Orashan moved to excuse the absence of David Basista and Steve Balazs. Mr. Koogle seconded the motion. The motion carried 3-0.***

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 rise and 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. ARB18-011 KENT INVESTORS
1005 EAST MAIN STREET

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

Gary O'nesti, LRC Realty presented the project and the changes that have occurred to the plans as a result of the public comments received at the last meeting. Mr. O'nesti stated that they reduced the size of the street sign and egress signs while still complimenting the architecture of the building and providing identification for tenants and traffic flow.

Mr. Boyle asked staff if the plans met code.

Mr. Fink explained that the purpose of the comprehensive sign plan exempts itself from the traditional aspects of the sign code. The Planning Commission will review the request and determine if it is reasonable given the circumstances to adopt the sign plan for the project. This process is in place for multi-tenant buildings where typical sign requirements may not fit the project.

Mr. Boyle asked about the size of the free-standing ground sign.

Mr. O'nesti stated that they have reduced the size from the originally submitted plans from 11' to 8' 8". Mr. O'nesti stated that the sign does provide for 4 tenants, although currently they only have 3. They also will use space to advertise leasing information. Mr. O'nesti added that there are multiple single businesses on the same street with significantly larger signs.

The Board and Mr. Fink discussed the definition and process of a comprehensive sign package.

Mr. Orashan asked about the signage for the possible fourth unit.

Mr. Rice explained that the signs for the fourth unit are shown on the plans (Exhibit B).

Mr. O'nesti stated that signs are planned for the west, south, and east sides of the building.

Mr. Koogle asked about the types of signs.

Mr. Rice stated that they are individual, internally lit letters with black metal housing that are mounted on a rail. The street sign is also internally lit.

Mr. Koogle asked about the aesthetic qualities of the signs.

Mr. O'nesti directed the Board to the submittal which outlines each sign requirements, including size, color, location, etc.

Mr. Fink clarified the process: if the sign plan is approved, the tenant will go to the owner for their approval, and then they will submit to the City to verify that their proposed sign meets the requirements of that comprehensive sign plan and receive their permit.

Mr. Orashan stated that he feels that applicant has described the project in general terms and have adjusted the sign size as requested. He is not opposed to what has been presented.

Mr. Boyle asked for public comment.

Randall Smith, 301 Oakwood Dr., Kent asked for clarification of the size changes of the monument and directional signs.

Mr. Rice stated that the monument sign changed from 11' to 8' in height and slightly smaller in width. The ingress/egress signs are now 36" maximum height.

Dr. Smith stated that he felt that Starbuck's has an excessive number of signs.

Lee Higgins, 1232 Woodhill, asked about the elevation of the monument sign.

Mr. O'nesti stated that the main monument sign will be mounted on a 2' pedestal that will be located midway between the sidewalk and the parking lot; 10' behind the sidewalk. The bottom of the sign will be approximately at the street level.

Ed Krimmer, 318 Elmwood Dr., stated that the comprehensive sign plan is for integrated planned commercial developments, therefore since this project is not defined as such, it is not an option. He feels that the 3-4 units should be treated as in unity in the comprehensive sign plan. He asked that they clarify the zoning ordinance under which this is being considered.

Mr. Fink thanked Mr. Krimmer for his comments. Mr. Fink clarified that the type of project does not determine whether or not a project is eligible for a comprehensive sign plan. There are also other projects in the C-R district that have comprehensive sign plans such as Hungry Howies, University Hospitals, CVS; these project are not designated integrated planned commercial developments. Mr. Fink cannot find anything in the Code that requires a planned integrated development to be a requirement for a comprehensive sign plan in the City of Kent ordinances.

Dr. Terry Kuhns, 496 Overlook Dr., stated that the monument sign is a matter of safety for the intersections at East Main St. on both sides of the development. He wanted to make sure staff verified that there is a safe distance.

Mr. Boyle asked what the distance is from Luther to the main monument sign.

Mr. Koogle stated that is approximately 120 feet.

Mr. O'nesti stated that they moved the sign back far enough to not impair the visual corridor at the lighted intersection.

Mr. Boyle ask which department reviews the site distance and has the review been completed.

Ms. Phile stated that she has reviewed it and is satisfied with the distance. She also consults with the Engineering Department when a situation is questionable.

Mr. Orashan stated that given the issues that were previously brought up and the changes made to the plan, he feels that they can recommend approval to the Planning Commission.

MOTION: ***Mr. Orashan moved to recommend approval to the Planning Commission. Mr. Orashan withdrew his motion.***

Mr. Koogle asked what specifically they would be approving as the rendering do not match and will the Board have a chance to review the graphics before permits are issued.

Ms. Phile responded no.

Mr. Koogle realized that this project is outside of the district that requires that type of review.

MOTION: ***Mr. Orashan moved to recommend approval of the Comprehensive Sign Package to the Planning Commission as presented. Mr. Koogle seconded the motion. The motion carried 3-0.***

B. ARB18-012 MAIN STREET KENT
BURBICK WAY CONCEPTUAL ART PROJECT

The applicant is requesting review of the alleyway art project conceptual plans.

Heather Malarcik, Main Street Kent, introduced Kelly Dietrick who is on the design committee and is also a downtown business owner.

Ms. Dietrick stated that she would like to share some of the ideas for the cooperative art project designed to enhance the downtown area. She stated that there are 3 doors in Burbick Way that they are focusing on improving. The goal is to have small scale projects make a big impact with regards to safety, and a stronger sense of community. The upcoming project will work with an existing mural. The design committee and business owners are working together on the project.

The consensus of the Board is that it is a favorable project and look forward to reviewing the specific artwork when it is ready.

V. MEETING SUMMARIES

A. June 5, 2018

There were not enough members to vote on the acceptance of the June 5, 2018 summary.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Treno Update

Mr. Fink updated the Board. The Kent Historical Society has approved the changes of the Treno patio project. Mr. Burbick explained that some of the changes were necessary for structural support.

Mr. Boyle stated that the posts have been changed to 6 x 6 posts. He added that the Historical Society's recent approval was an unofficial approval given the work was already complete.

Mr. Fink stated that because changes were made after to the Board's approval, they will need to come back before the Board unless the Board agrees that the project is close enough to the original submittal and is approved as is.

After the Board's discussion and given the end result of the project, no further action is requested by the Board and the previous approval stands. Mr. Fink will review the last motion made to clarify if further action is needed.

B. Application form update

Mr. Boyle suggested that the Board have some time to review the draft forms and make suggestions as appropriate.

Mr. Fink stated that they could also electronically send their suggestions to staff so that they can be incorporated for the next meeting.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: ***Mr. Koogle moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Orashan seconded the motion. The motion carried 3-0.***

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.