

**CITY OF KENT
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
October 5, 2021**

MEMBERS PRESENT: **Howard Boyle
Dennis Saxe
David Basista
Bridget Tipton
Kevin Koogle**

STAFF PRESENT: **Bridget Susel, Community Development Director
Heather Heckman, Development Planner
Tim Sahr, Development Engineer**

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, Kevin Koogle, Bridget Tipton, and David Basista were present.

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. ARB21-016 VALERIE LANDIS / GARAGE 108
 108 & 122 WEST COLLEGE STREET**

Review of new building windows and doors.

Valerie Landis, owner of Garage 108, presented her project, which includes replacing a window and doors for 122 W. College St. to match those on 108 W. College St, and garage shutters for 108 W. College St. She stated that she is proposing to open the blocked window on the west side of the building facing the parking area for 126 W. College Street and install a glass window that will open and look like the other windows.

Mr. Boyle questioned if the new window would be larger.

Ms. Landis stated that she doesn't have the exact measurements today, but size will remain the same and it will look like the drawing that was submitted; white framed. Ms. Landis stated that because her doors are not up to code, she will need to replace the exterior doors. She stated that the doors will be white or black and they will all match.

Mr. Boyle asked if it will be a similar design as she already has.

Ms. Landis responded yes. Ms. Landis stated that she wants to replace the metal doors on the back side of the building facing Haymaker Pkwy with out-swinging doors that are either white doors or a combination of glass and white; she stated that the 122 W. College may stay a solid door but not the 112 W. College (Kent Canadian Club).

Mr. Boyle questioned the front man door at 108 W. College.

Ms. Landis stated that that door will have glass. She stated that all the doors will match and she wants the aesthetics of the entire building to match. She stated that all three doors in the front and the two doors in the back will match.

Mr. Boyle questioned the Kent Karate doors.

Ms. Landis stated that the double mirrored doors at 122 W. College will probably stay the same because they are code compliant. She stated that this building was renovated in 2011. She stated that she would also like to add additional shutters at the top of the garage doors on the 108 W. College building.

Mr. Koogle questioned the shutters.

Ms. Landis stated that the shutters will be installed outside of the other garage door and will be flush with the building; inside the existing garage door opening. She stated that the shutters will provide a barrier to the highway and sun exposure, and also help with heating/cooling efficiency.

Mr. Boyle questioned the location of the shutters.

Ms. Landis stated that she is requesting approval of the shutters for the front and the back although she may not install the front shutter for other reasons.

Mr. Koogle expressed his concern for how the storage portion of the shutter would appear.

Ms. Landis showed Mr. Koogle a graphic of the shutter and explained that it will look like window curtains on the inside; it isn't like the coil that she just removed.

Mr. Saxe questioned if the shutter would be up or down most of the time.

Ms. Landis stated that it would depend: security at night, up or down to help regulate the inside temperature, privacy, etc.

Ms. Susel summarized that the request is for the window at 122 W. College, the 3 man doors including the 2 in the back on both properties that are limited to white color and glass panels if allowed by Code, and the rollup shutters on the front and back of 108 W. College.

Ms. Landis stated that there are actually 7 doors but the request is for 5 doors as she may not replace the other 2 at this time.

Mr. Boyle and Ms. Susel clarified that the 2 mirrored doors at 122 W. College are not included in the request.

Public Comment

None – no members of the public were present.

MOTION: *In case ARB21-016, Valerie Landis, 108 & 122 W. College St., Mr. Koogler moved to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness as presented on 10/5/21 as follows:*

- 1. Window at 122 W. College St.*
- 2. Roll-Up Shutters on the garage doors at 108 W. College St.*
- 3. Replacement of 5 man doors limited to white color and glass panels if allowed by Building Code. (Not including mirrored doors at 122 W. College St.)*

Mr. Basista seconded the motion.

Ms. Tipton questioned why the mirrored doors are being excluded and asked the applicant if she may replace them at some point in the future.

Ms. Landis stated that she does think that she will replace those doors and that she would like to keep the doors the same across the building.

Ms. Susel stated that they could include them as long as the replacement doors are white with a window. She explained that anything other than this would need to come back to the ARB.

Ms. Landis agreed.

The motion was amended to allow for the replacement of 7 man doors (Item #3)

3. Replacement of 7 man doors limited to white color and glass panels if allowed by Building Code.

The motion carried 5-0.

**B. ARB21-017 CITY OF KENT
122 WEST COLLEGE STREET**

Re-review of sign.

Ms. Susel explained that the City of Kent is bringing this case to the ARB administratively because the Certificate of Appropriateness that was issued back in February 2013 states that when the owner renovates the building facade, the signage can again be reviewed for size and placement. She stated that per the owner, the Karate sign is going to remain and not be changed. She explained that it may be advisable to continue this case until the sign is going to either be replaced or a new tenant is going to want to continue using the sign. She said that technically it has been renovated with new paint and is getting new doors and windows but suggested that the ARB make a motion to continue the case until such time that a change is made to the actual sign.

Mr. Boyle stated that it is difficult to understand what the previous ARB was considering but assumes that the owner lead them to believe that building changes would be coming soon. He stated that he doesn't feel that the façade has been changed.

Mr. Koogle stated that he feels that they should review this when the sign is changed.

Ms. Susel summarized that the ARB wants to continue the existing COA until such time that there's a change to the sign.

The Board Members agreed.

Public Comment

None – no members of the public were present.

MOTION: *In case ARB21-017, The City of Kent, 122 W. College St., Mr. Koogle moved to continue the Certificate of Appropriateness until a new sign is requested.*

Ms. Tipton seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

**C. ARB21-018 FMD ARCHITECTS
121 EAST MAIN STREET**

Review of building façade alterations.

Jennifer Hunter, Project Architect, reviewed the project as presented in the case documents. She stated that the general contractor determined during construction that the stairs needed to be relocated to fully accomplish the goals. She stated that the contractor started the relocation of the stairs and bricked up the exterior opening before she could put the Phase II plans together for approval. She explained that Phase I of the project only affected the interior of the building and Phase II was going to affect the façade with the relocation of the stairs; construction got ahead of the drawings and now the stair relocation is part of Phase I.

Mr. Boyle stated that the building had been restored by the previous owner and the stairs were the heart of the building; now there isn't a centralized exterior entrance to that building. He stated that they did a beautiful job matching the brick. He stated that if they would have come for approval before the work was done, he would have suggested installing an artificial door to keep the architectural integrity of the building.

Mr. Basista stated that he doesn't feel that it looks nice at all; it looks like a bricked up doorway. He suggested installing a door with blacked-out glass to make it not look like a bricked up doorway or possibly a planter.

Mr. Boyle stated that he feels that a planter would be just as offensive as the brick.

Mr. Basista suggested either a window or a door.

Ms. Hunter stated that the landing behind the area is 4 feet tall so whatever glass they would use will need to be opaque.

Mr. Boyle stated that it doesn't necessarily have to be glass but rather the appearance of glass.

Ms. Susel suggested to the applicant that she could ask to continue the case to give some time to establish some options.

Ms. Tipton stated that it doesn't make sense to her that they would rather see a fake opening with fake glass rather than actual brick.

Mr. Boyle stated that from a preservation basis, it makes sense as it leaves the integrity of the building as it was designed.

Mr. Koogler stated that he understands Ms. Tipton's concerns and wondered about the placement of the fake door or window; recessed or not. He noted that the recessed opening may become a nuisance.

Ms. Hunter questioned reusing the old door minus the hardware and with new glass in a faux wall in front of the brick wall; she isn't sure if the door is still available.

Many Board members liked this as one of her options.

Public Comment

None – no members of the public were present.

MOTION: *In case ARB21-018, FMD Architects, 121 E. Main St., Mr. Basista moved to continue the case for not more than 90 days.*

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

V. MEETING SUMMARIES

MOTION: *Mr. Basista moved to approve the September 7, 2021 Meeting Summary as presented. Mr. Saxe seconded the motion. The motion carried 3-0-2. Ms. Tipton and Mr. Koogler abstained.*

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: *Mr. Saxe moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Basista seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 3:37 p.m.*