



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, October 25, 2023

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the October 25, 2023 Architectural Review Board. He stated that the meeting could also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are welcome from meeting attendees and from those viewing from the City's website.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Alexander led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board members present: Sean Cotter, Hilary Damaser, Martha Cooper, Gary Alexander, Michael Jewell

Staff members present: Sarah Holt, Daniel Klein, Brian Gable, Shawn Krawetzki

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Cooper seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 09-27-23 ARB minutes and 08-30-23 joint work session minutes.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

Mr. Alexander stated that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the Review District or area subject to ARB under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.170. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases. The Chair swore in staff and applicants who planned to address the Board on any of the cases on the agenda.

CASES

- **Case 23-090 - Trevor Furbay Sign, 63 S. High Street, Minor Project Review**

A request to install an approximately 1.5-square-foot sign beneath an existing sign on a 0.26-acre site located northwest of the intersection of South High Street and Eberly Hill Lane, zoned HD-HS, Historic South District.

Case Presentation

Mr. Klein stated that this is a request for review and approval of the installation of one hanging sign to an existing ground sign at 63 S. High Street. The .26-acre site is zoned HD-HS, Historic South District and contains an existing 1.5-story structure and detached one-story garage. The applicant is proposing to install a 1.5 square foot hanging sign to the existing ground sign. The previously approved ground sign is located 2 feet from the right-of-way, which is less than the minimum setback of 8 feet from the right-of-way. With the existing building footprint located approximately 6 feet from the right-of-way, it would be impossible for a ground sign to meet the setback requirement, and in July 2022, the Board approved the sign location. The new sign face will be approximately 6 square feet in size, 3-foot width by 6-inch height and will be double-sided with the same logo on each side. The new sign face will be 2-inch thick red cedar with ½-inch raised letters, matching the dimensions and materials of the existing ground sign. The lettering will be in Pure White, SW 7005, on a Naval, SW 6244, background, also matching the colors of the existing ground sign. The logo will read "Collections For Women". The sign meets all Code Sign requirements described in Section 153.173(M). All conditions for the Minor Review are either met or not applicable. Staff recommends approval of the Minor Project Review with no conditions.

Applicant Presentation

The applicant provided no additional presentation.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Commission Questions/Discussion

There were no questions or discussion.

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of the Minor Project.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0.]

Presentations

- **South High Street Utility Burial Project**

Staff Presentation

Brian Gable stated that he has been asked to provide an overview on phase 2 of the South High Street Burial Project, which is similar to phase 1. The area for the phase 2 portion of the project is bounded to the north by E. Bridge Street, to the south by Short Street, to the west by S. High Street and to the east by S. Riverview Street. Although the homes within that area that abut S. Riverview Street will be impacted, S. Riverview Street itself will not be included in the project. Portions of several zoning districts lie within this project area, including the HD-Historic Core, HD-Historic South and HD-Historic Residential. The underground utility extension area involves S. High Street, Short Street, Pinney Hill Lane and Blacksmith Lane, ending on Blacksmith Lane just south of Bridge Street. The least intrusive approach will be taken so as to have as little impact as possible on the mature trees and landscaping and the historical walls in that area. He described the easements that will be requested for phase 2 and the ground-mounted facilities. He reviewed

details regarding the areas impacted during the construction phase, including the easements that would be requested. A public meeting regarding the project was held in August.

Mr. Gable reviewed the details of Phase 1, which is nearing completion. In some areas the area is being finished with top soil and plantings. In tandem with this project, the location of the Indian Run Elementary School access drive was shifted and one of the J Liu restaurant access drives to Bridge Street was closed.

Board Questions

Mr. Jewell inquired if the intent was to bore beneath the historic walls that exist in the project area. Mr. Gable responded affirmatively. They will attempt to avoid any impact to the walls.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the houses on S. Riverview Street would continue to receive service via overhead lines.

Mr. Gable responded affirmatively.

Mr. Alexander inquired if there was a projected timeline for all of the properties on S. Riverview Street to receive underground service.

Mr. Gable responded that no project is currently scheduled in the City's Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) budget for utility burial along S. Riverview.

Mr. Cotter inquired if there was an estimated timeline for the utility poles on High Street to be removed.

Mr. Gable responded that the utility poles on S. High Street would not be removed until the completion of phase 2.

Mr. Cotter inquired the amount of the S. High Street utility burial budget.

Mr. Gable responded that phase 2 would be approximately \$4 million. The cost of phase 1 is approximately \$5 million.

Board members thanked Mr. Gable for the project update.

- **Historic District Bench Replacements**

Staff Presentation

Shawn Krawetzki stated that money is budgeted in the CIP for the Historic District bench replacements. The existing benches on S. High Street are wood. The life cycle of those benches is ending. The wood has started to deteriorate in places. Further north in the district there are two different types of metal benches. The intent is to replace the wood benches with metal benches, due to maintenance concerns, and unify the entire district with the same type of metal bench. Staff has selected two types of black metal benches as preferred. Both benches have higher arm rests to provide support for older patrons and horizontal banding for comfort. He noted that in the future, the trash cans in the district will be budgeted for replacement, as well, as they also are beginning to degrade. Photos of the two historic bench styles were shown and the Board's input was requested.

Board Questions/Discussion

Mr. Alexander inquired if the companies that would provide the benches also provide other street furniture that could complement the benches. He asks the question in view of the stated intent to replace the trash cans.

Mr. Krawetzki responded affirmatively. Both benches are provided by the same company, Landscape Forms, which also provides a wide range of trash cans.

Mr. Jewell inquired if the Historic District business owners have been asked for their input on the two bench choices. If not, it may be helpful to do so.

Mr. Krawetzki responded that they have not, but their input could be requested.

Board members discussed the advantages/disadvantages of the two choices, with the consensus that neither choice was objectionable.

Mr. Krawetzki thanked Board members for their input. Staff will reach out to the Historic District business owners and obtain their feedback, then would make the final selection.

COMMUNICATIONS

- **Historic District Code and Guidelines Update**

Ms. Holt stated that a second community meeting regarding the proposed changes to the Historic District Code and Guidelines was held on October 11, 2023 at the COhatch facility in the Historic District. A small but passionate group attended. They were supportive of the proposed Code changes and reiterated a preference for less formal ARB review meetings. The proposed Code and Guidelines have been revised to reflect the Board's requested changes at their September 27 meeting, and the revised documents are scheduled for Planning and Zoning Commission review on November 9, 2023.

- **Proposed 2024-2025 ARB meeting calendar**

Ms. Holt stated a proposed meeting calendar for 2024 and the first two months of 2025 has been provided for the Board's consideration. Members are asked to advise staff of any date conflicts. The proposed meeting calendar with any revisions necessary will be scheduled for adoption at the November ARB meeting.

- **Commission Attendance and Training**

Ms. Holt referred to the training and attendance memo from City Council, which was included in the packet. All Board and Commission members are required not to have absences totaling more than 20% of the number of meetings, which for this Board would be two absences.

- **2023 Annual ARB Report**

Ms. Holt stated that the annual report is being compiled, which will be scheduled for review at the Board's January meeting. Any desired updates to the members' personal biographies should be provided to staff by January 10, 2024.

- **Revised Rules and Regulations**

Mr. Alexander stated that the Board has received an updated set of Rules and Regulations, which were adopted by City Council at their October 23, 2023 meeting. In reading the document, in

which the only revision made was related to attendance, he noticed that one item [IV. Meetings, B-1] refers to the required meeting location, which specifies that the Board meetings “shall be held in Council Chamber”. He referred to the public comment at the last ARB meeting that suggested the Board have less intimidating meetings, perhaps in a less formal setting. However, the Rules and Regulations clearly specify the meeting space.

Ms. Cooper noted that the rules do not require a particular setup, however, so perhaps a table set up could be used rather than the Board being seated at the dais. She believes the new Council Chamber offers several meeting advantages, including capacity for a larger audience and ADA compliance.

Mr. Alexander stated that the rules do provide the flexibility for temporary suspension of the rules by majority vote of the members in attendance at said meeting.

Ms. Damaser stated that she believes part of the intent for the meetings to occur in this particular meeting space is for use of the meeting room technology and for the purpose of streaming the meeting.

Ms. Holt agreed, noting that the cameras are set up in a manner to focus on the dais, not the center of the room.

Mr. Cotter stated that he does not believe changing the seating location is the factor that would make a difference in the intimidation of the review process. Unfortunately, the review process itself can be perceived as intimidating.

Mr. Alexander inquired if staff had any concerns about the specification of 15 days for submission of meeting materials prior to a meeting [V. Applications, B].

Ms. Holt responded that item is unchanged; it remains consistent with the current material submission timeframe within which staff has been able to meet the public notice requirements. Staff reviews the due dates with applicants at their pre-submittal meetings.

Mr. Alexander inquired about the intent to limit public comments to 5 minutes [X. Meeting Procedure, C]. Perhaps this is an area in which the Board could exercise their judgment. He believes it is important to give the public time to share their opinions.

Mr. Cotter responded that perhaps it could be determined on a case-by-case basis. At a meeting where there are 20 people wanting to provide public comment, the time would need to be managed.

Ms. Holt suggested that perhaps at the outset of the meeting, the Chair could inform the audience of any public comment expectations for that meeting, if need be.

- The next regular ARB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 15, 2023.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Chair, Architectural Review Board

Assistant Clerk of Council