

**CITY OF KENT
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
May 3, 2022**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Howard Boyle
 Dennis Saxe
 David Basista
 Bridget Tipton

STAFF PRESENT: Bridget Susel, Community Development Director
 Eric Fink, Assistant Law Director
 Tim Sahr, Development Engineer
 Kim Brown, Administrative Assistant

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Boyle at 3:03 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Howard Boyle, Dennis Saxe, Bridget Tipton, and David Basista were present.

IV. 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 is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? Please say "I do". The participants responded, "I do".

V. PROJECT REVIEW

**A. ARB22-004 BOARD AND BEVY
 141 SUMMIT ST.**

Review of proposed building improvements.

Hayley Bennett, owner, 423 Wolcott Ave., stated that they are proposing a 26 foot addition on the back of the building. She explained that the goal is for a cohesive design that doesn't detract from the existing building. She stated that the darker color of the addition will bring out the patterned brick in the existing building and the recessed side walls of the addition help the addition blend into the environment. She stated that the selected trim color picks up some of color in the bricks.

Mr. Boyle questioned the color of the cross-cut brick design on the existing building.

Ms. Bennett stated that it is a dark plum color. She stated that the plan is to have the trim and door be a forest rich green. She stated that they will have a green vinyl sign with gold letters similar to Acorn Alley and a blade sign with the coat of arms design over the main door. She stated that they will use hardy board with batten on the addition. She stated that the horizontal trim on the addition will align with the soldier course on the existing building; a visual continuation with a different material.

Mr. Saxe questioned if the siding would be horizontal.

Ms. Bennett stated that it will be full boards and won't be horizontal as she doesn't want it to look like siding. Ms. Bennett stated that the proposed fencing is a chain on posts to satisfy the State Liquor Board requirements; it is a temporary style of fencing.

Ms. Susel reminded the Members that Ms. Tipton will be abstaining from this case as she is part of the design team for the project.

Public Comment

None.

MOTION: *In case ARB22-004, Board and Bevy, 141 Summit St., Mr. Basista moved to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the building improvements as presented on 5/3/22.*

Mr. Saxe seconded the motion.

The motion carried 3-0-1. Ms. Tipton abstained.

**B. ARB22-006 VALERIE LANDIS
 122 WEST COLLEGE ST.**

Review of proposed new building signs.

Valerie Landis, owner, 122 W. College, St. presented an overview of the future plans for all of the buildings to show how the signage all works together. She stated that the proposed new sign on the front of the building says "Galerie" and the back sign will say "Garage 108". She stated that the second floor of 122 W. College St. belongs to Garage 108. She stated that all three addresses are all one building.

Mr. Boyle questioned if there was anything that prohibited duplicate signs.

Mr. Fink stated that staff had the same concern but needs to see the presentation to make a determination.

Ms. Susel clarified that this is a request for approval of the sign design from the ARB for the replacement of an existing non-conforming use sign. She

stated that it is the same affirmation that ARB granted with the existing "Garage 108" sign that is facing SR 59; this sign would replace the existing "Karate" sign. She stated that there isn't anything that prohibits signs from having the same verbiage.

Mr. Boyle questioned if the signs were illuminated.

Ms. Landis stated that they are illuminated the same as the existing "Garage 108" signs.

Public Comment

Dale Wynns, 1061 Hudson Rd., stated that he feels that the sign is lovely.

Ms. Bennett agreed.

MOTION: *In case ARB22-006, Valerie Landis, 122 W. College St., Ms. Tipton moved to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new building signs that are illuminated as stated on 5/3/22.*

Mr. Basista seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0.

**C. ARB22-007 CLEVELAND BAGEL CAFE
 436 EAST MAIN ST.**

Review of proposed new building sign.

Gabriel Bartlett, 28 Elevator Ave, Painesville, Ohio, stated that he is here to answer any questions that they may have with the presented drawings.

Mr. Boyle questioned the brightness of the proposed sign for the west elevation (facing the parking lot); will it illuminate just the sign or also the parking lot.

Mr. Basista questioned the source of illumination.

Mr. Bartlett stated that it is internally front-lit. He stated that the letters are 3" wide and will be mounted on a raceway.

Ms. Susel stated that while there are not any illumination requirements for the ARB, Planning Commission standards are zero light at the lot lines. She stated that this could possibly be a topic for the Design Guideline Update but for now the ARB can make it part of its motion.

Mr. Boyle questioned the neon window signs that have been installed.

Ms. Susel stated that if it is not a temporary sign, it will need to come back to the ARB.

Mr. Boyle suggested a pedestrian level sign that is visible from both streets; blade sign.

Mr. Basista stated that he feels that the size of the letters are a bit out of scale with the building; a little too large.

Ms. Tipton stated that she agrees and stated that it is too close to the window trim. She suggested reducing the sign to 40 inches tall.

Mr. Bartlett stated that the “d” in “Cleveland” is what sticks out to him.

Ms. Tipton stated that she does like the way the sign sits on the top of the horizontal trim.

Mr. Boyle noted that the rendering may also not be completely accurate.

Public Comment

Valerie Landis questioned how the sign was attached.

Mr. Bartlett stated that the letters are mounted on a raceway.

Mr. Saxe questioned if the raceways are existing; they are depicted as extending past the sign.

Mr. Bartlett stated that there will be new raceways.

MOTION: *In case ARB22-007, Cleveland Bagel Cafe, 436 E. Main St., Ms. Tipton moved to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new building sign as presented on 5/3/22 with the condition that the overall height is scaled down with a height of 40 inches so that the “d” of the drawing does not encroach on the window trim and to make sure that the raceway does not extend beyond the size of the letters at either end of the sign.*

Mr. Boyle questioned the limiting of the wattage of the sign.

Ms. Tipton stated that her motion does not include a wattage limit; wattage is not a measurement of illumination.

Ms. Susel noted that the type of LED lighting can vary as well. She stated that there have been instances where after the sign was installed, the City has asked to have the bulb changed or use light shields.

Mr. Basista suggested asking for a warm white.

Ms. Tipton stated that her motion does not mention the lighting.

Mr. Saxe seconded the motion.

Mr. Basista asked Ms. Tipton if she would consider amending her motion to include specifying 3500k LED light color.

Ms. Tipton stated that she feels that they want a bright white sign given that the sign itself is white.

Mr. Boyle stated that they want the light to be seen but they don't want it to light up the neighborhood.

Ms. Tipton rejected the amendment.

Mr. Basista stated that he isn't sure that they absolutely need to specify the lighting.

Mr. Fink stated that if the light extends beyond the property line they are in violation and it will need to be corrected.

Ms. Tipton stated that this would keep the sign from being a blinding light.

Mr. Saxe questioned if the Zoning Code will take care of illumination at the property line.

Ms. Susel stated that it will and if the sign is an issue with line of sight for driving.

The motion carried 3-1, with Mr. Boyle opposing the motion.

VI. MEETING SUMMARIES

MOTION: ***Mr. Saxe moved to approve the April 5, 2022 Meeting Summary as presented. Mr. Basista seconded the motion. The motion carried 3-0-1. Mr. Boyle abstained.***

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Boyle questioned how to get case ARB22-005, City of Kent, Architectural Design Review, Overlay Amendment for the Franklin Ave. property back on the agenda.

Ms. Susel stated that a motion was made to continue the case until such time as the Design Guidelines are approved.

Mr. Boyle stated that his concern was that they may not be approved for a year. He explained that there is a short window of opportunity to have the property included

into the Overlay District because the new owner will probably not want to include it. He stated that he feels that this property should be reviewed by the ARB due to the residential housing across the street and to make sure it is compatible with the design and preservation guidelines. He stated that if Council didn't want the ARB to continue its operations, then the ARB shouldn't be approving any projects.

Mr. Fink and Ms. Susel discussed the best way to address this; a Board member could make a motion to have it brought back sooner.

Ms. Tipton reiterated why she made the motion to continue the case at the last meeting and not extend the jurisdiction at this time. She stated that they are continuing to approve projects under the current guidelines for projects that are currently in the Overlay District with only 4 members instead of 5. She stated that Council has decided to not appoint a 5th member until the revised Guidelines are in place. She stated that she feels that to change the district to include a large parcel into the Overlay now seems to be farther from the path that Council has given them.

Mr. Boyle stated that Council has never said anything about the Overlay District but rather the Design Guidelines.

Ms. Tipton stated she would not change her vote to continue the case. Mr. Boyle stated he cannot vote since Hometown Bank owns the property. Discussion was had that with only four members on the Board, Mr. Boyle needing to abstain, and Ms. Tipton not changing her vote, if a motion was made, it will fail. No additional motion was made so the case will remain categorized as continued until the Design Guidelines update is complete.

Ms. Susel stated that the Design Guideline Request for Qualifications does include the Overlay District and the Design Guidelines; the total package.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: *Mr. Saxe moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Basista seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0. The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.*