

**ITALIAN VILLAGE COMMISSION
MINUTES**

Tuesday, April 15, 2014

6:15 p.m.

50 W. Gay St. – First Floor - Conference Room B

Commissioners Present: Todd Boyer, David Cooke, Ben Goodman, Rex Hagerling, Joshua Lapp, Jason Sudy

Commissioners Absent: Charmaine Sutton

City Staff Present: Connie Torbeck

- I. CALL TO ORDER (6:16 p.m.).
- II. NEXT COMMISSION MONTHLY BUSINESS MEETING – 12:00 p.m. (Noon), Tuesday, May 13, 2014 – 50 W. Gay Street, 1st Floor, Conference Room A.
- III. NEXT COMMISSION MEETING – 6:15 p.m., Tuesday, May 20, 2014 – 50 W. Gay Street, 1st Floor, Conference Room B.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Tuesday, March 18, 2014.
MOTION: Cooke/Sudy (6-0-0) APPROVED
- V. PUBLIC FORUM
- VI. STAFF APPROVALS
The Italian Village Commission hereby accepts all Staff Approved items into the formal record. Votes are as indicated, with abstentions (if any) shown in brackets immediately following the specific application.
MOTION: Sudy/Cooke (6-0-0) APPROVED
- VII. APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS

1. 13-12-7

940 North High Street

Larry Robertson (Applicant)

Robert E. Brunner (Owner)

Following the presentation of the staff report, a motion was made, vote taken, and results recorded as indicated.

Continue Application # 13-12-7, to allow time for HPO staff to meet with the Applicant and property owner on April 21st, and direct staff to place on the May 20, 2014 Italian Village hearing agenda. Applicant is to submit revised application materials for all existing and proposed signage by the May 6 application deadline.

MOTION: Cooke/Sudy (6-0-0) APPROVED

2. 14-4-18

1024 North High Street

Fireproof Partners, LLC (Applicant/Owner)

Following the presentation by the Applicant, and additional discussion and review, a motion was made, vote taken, and results recorded as indicated.

Approve Application # 14-4-18, 1024 North High Street, with all clarifications, as noted.

Modify Exterior Cladding on East Elevation of Existing Fireproof Building

- Exterior wall to be brick with concrete banding, per the submitted drawing and renderings dated 04-01-14.

Modify Windows on East Elevation of Existing Fireproof Building

- Modify the windows on the east elevation of the existing building (this modifies the modification that was approved 2-18-2014/COA #14-2-10b[1]).

- Window cut sheet/specifications to be submitted to Historic Preservation Office staff for final review and approval by Commissioners Hagerling and Cooke.

Modify East Elevation of New Construction

- Add triple window to the first floor of the section of new construction south of the connector, per the submitted drawing and renderings dated 04-01-14.

Install New Awnings on Existing Fireproof Building & New Construction

- Install new awnings (8 total), per the submitted drawing and renderings dated 04-01-14.
- The awning frames are to be painted to match the awning fabric.

MOTION: Cooke/Sudy (6-0-0) APPROVED

NEW APPLICATIONS

3. 14-4-19 and 20

1024 North High Street

Fireproof Partners, LLC (Applicant/Owner)

14-4-19

Landscaping

- Install new landscaping, per the submitted

Following the presentation by the Applicants, Chair Hagerling called all those wishing to speak in order of speaker slip received.

<u>Name, Address, Affiliation:</u>	<u>Issues/ Comments:</u>
Larry Totzke 191 E. Third Ave. Neighboring property owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked for clarification regarding users of the patio on the northeast corner (to be residential). • Asked for clarification that the fence along the alley will be 6' H and covered with ivy (yes). • Likes that the parking lot is 2' below the alley and ivy may limit graffiti .
Phil Herren 43 E. Third Ave. Neighboring property owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voiced concerns about access to existing transformers. • Commented on trees along the alley. • Has interest in the clearance and design of the dumpster/compactor enclosure. • Concerns regarding grease bins.
Kevin Pendleton 25 E. Third Ave. Neighboring property owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked for clarification regarding the material of the wall. • Does not have an issue with the patio.

Following the speakers and further presentation by the Applicants, Chairman Hagerling opened the discussion, and the following observations were made regarding the proposed project to assist the Applicant/Owner in preparing for further review at a future IVC hearing.

Comments

Jason Sudy:

- Regarding the future final approval of a front landscape plan, the design should be incumbent upon the in-progress, overall City design plan for High Street. Should that City plan not happen for some reason, then the landscape plan for the Fireproof and addition should not include a plain concrete walk on High Street.
- The approach being taken on High Street seems smart. Will be interested to see more details, and how the Fireproof landscape plan works with the High Street plan.
- How high is the curb? A lower 6-8 curb seems a good approach.
- A bit concerned about the rear patio.

- Regarding the north edge, it seems the neighbors are pretty satisfied with the wood fence. Had expected it might be something like brick pillars with fencing in between, but doesn't necessarily feel strongly about that.
- The trees are a good idea. A deciduous canopy would be appropriate, not a low evergreen. Could block the parking lot lights over a time.
- The mounding is more suburban, but there is a need to screen the parking lot and lights. Decreasing the slope from the Mt. Pleasant side and not placing the fence right in the middle could help.
- Need to make the dumpster enclosure high enough to cover any of the equipment located inside.

David Cooke:

- Regarding the High Street landscape, would like to see details of the previously discussed historic plaque in next set of drawings.
- Need to see the fence detail for the front. Its design/materials need to speak to High Street. Iron or metal.
- Would like to see a plan for low level lighting, which was well done in the Hubbard project.
- Pleased with the garden space for the residents. Trees woven throughout could be good. Consider Locust trees.

Ben Goodman:

- The overall landscape design has been very good.
- Would like to see the garden space fence design carried into the north fence line. Would not be supportive of the slatted fence. Had expected a masonry wall, but if sufficient trees are added, wood could work. Continuity is important.
- Will be interested in lighting details in the front plaza and in the parking lot so it does not spill into the adjacent properties.

NO ACTION TAKEN

14-4-20a

Restore Existing "Fireproof" Sign / Existing Fireproof Building Façade

- Remove and retain the existing "Fireproof" sign and restore to a working condition.
- Restore the existing sign retaining as much of the original metal cabinet as possible. Repair/replace any deteriorated sections of the existing cabinet with like materials.
- Restored sign to accurately reflect the same historic, original materials, dimensions, shape, design, and colors as existing.
- Upon removal, the existing conditions of the sign are to be photographically documented.
- Prior to commencement of restoration, the Applicant is to submit a brief conditions assessment and restoration plan to Historic Preservation Office staff for final review and approval, in consultation with a sub-committee of two Commissioners.

MOTION: Sudy/Cooke (6-0-0) APPROVED

14-4-20b

Signage/Existing Fireproof Building Façade

David Cooke:

- The large "1024" sign numbers would be most beneficial on the rear elevation to separate the commercial from the residential uses.
- Regarding the front entrance location, consider bringing the "1024" down to the spandrel panel of the awning which could be lit with lighting beneath the awning, or, consider a different, more pedestrian location and scale.

Ben Goodman:

- Consider a more pedestrian approach to the signage on High Street. Perhaps bring it into the alcove at street level.
- If placed above the door rather than in the alcove area, agrees that locating "1024" on the front of the canopy or on the wall might be a better solution.
- Applicant should avoid any sort of internally illuminated signage.

NO ACTION TAKEN

4. 14-4-21

964 North High Street

Mallory McClellan (Applicant)

Kevin Lykens (Owner)

Following the presentation of the staff report, and additional discussion and review, a motion was made, vote taken, and results recorded as indicated.

Approve Application # 14-4-21, 964 North High Street, with all clarifications, as noted.

Install New Projecting Sign

- Install one (1) new projecting sign, per the submitted rendering and drawing.
- Sign to be aluminum composite (aluminum with a plastic or wood interior).
- Oval sign to measure approximately 35” high by 25” wide.
- Metal bracket to measure 3’ long.
- Overall area of sign with bracket, approximately 4’ high x 3’ wide.

MOTION: Sudy/Boyer (6-0-0) APPROVED

5. 14-4-22

844-850 North High Street

Larry Lab/Morrison Sign Co. (Applicant)

One Short North (Owner)

Following the presentation by the Applicant, and additional discussion and review, a motion was made, vote taken, and results recorded as indicated.

Approve Application # 14-4-22, 844-850 North High Street, with all clarifications, as noted.

Install New Signage – Three Storefronts

- Install new signage for three of the four storefronts facing onto High Street.

Edward Jones Investments (850)

- Retain and move existing sign upward to be within the existing sign band.

Sole Classics – (848)

- Install one (1) new wall sign within the existing sign band.
- New sign to be polymetal backer panel attached to an aluminum tube bracket system.
- Panel and bracket system to be as unobtrusive as possible, and painted to match existing stone.
- Sign to include the words “Sole Classics” in black, halo-lit, aluminum channel letters.
- Revised drawings to be submitted to Historic Preservation Office staff for final review and approval, in consultation with Commissioner Goodman.

Prime – (846)

- Install one (1) new wall sign within the existing sign band.
- New sign to be polymetal backer panel attached to an aluminum tube bracket system.
- Panel and bracket system to be as unobtrusive as possible, and painted to match existing stone.
- Sign to include the word “Prime” in white neon backed in black vinyl for day and nighttime visibility.
- Revised drawings to be submitted to Historic Preservation Office staff for final review and approval, in consultation with Commissioner Goodman.

Couture on High (844)

- Install one (1) new wall sign within the existing sign band.
- New sign to be polymetal backer panel attached to an aluminum tube bracket system.
- Panel and bracket system to be as unobtrusive as possible, and painted to match existing stone.
- Sign to include the raised letters/words “Couture on High” with external up/down lighting.
- Revised drawings to be submitted to Historic Preservation Office staff for final review and approval, in consultation with Commissioner Goodman.

MOTION: Goodman/Sudy (6-0-0) APPROVED

6. 14-4-23

185 East Second Avenue

Benjamin Davis (Applicant/Owner)

Following the presentation by the Applicant, and additional discussion and review, a motion was made, vote taken, and results recorded as indicated.

Approve Application # 14-4-23, 185 East Second Avenue, with all clarifications, as noted.

Construct New Front Porch

- As part of the ongoing renovation, construct a new front porch, based on the visible “ghosting” discovered in the front ell following removal of the aluminum and asbestos cement siding.
- The Applicant is to submit final measured drawings to Historic Preservation Office staff for final review and approval, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Note: If the existing wood siding is to be painted prior to completion of measured drawings, the Commission encourages the Applicant to make a template of the existing “ghosting” to record the location and dimensions of the original porch.

MOTION: Sudy/Boyer (6-0-0) APPROVED

7. 14-4-24

1031 North Fourth Street

Lauren Culley & Jeff Excell (Applicant)

Carol Guiler (Owner)

Following the presentation by the Applicant, and additional discussion and review, a motion was made, vote taken, and results recorded as indicated.

Approve Application # 14-4-24, 1031 North Fourth Street, with all clarifications, as noted.

Renovate Garage for use as Café

- Lengthen and widen the existing windows on the east and south elevations, and install new aluminum windows.
- Remove existing front entrance door and install salvaged, wood and glass door, per the submitted photograph.
- Install new exterior lighting, per the sample photographs and lighting schedule.
- Partially remove existing fence along east side of building, per the submitted site plan.
- Remove existing fence along the west side of the building, per the submitted site plan.
- Install new patio seating area on the east side of the building, per the submitted site plan.

MOTION: Sudy/Lapp (6-0-0) APPROVED

VARIANCE RECOMMENDATIONS

8. 14-4-25

866 North Pearl Street

Prescott & Pearl, LLC (Applicant/Owner)

Following the presentation by the Applicants, Chair Hagerling called all those wishing to speak in order of speaker slip received.

<u>Name, Address, Affiliation:</u>	<u>Issues/ Comments:</u>
Cindy Dunigan 870-872 N Pearl St Neighboring property owner	• Wants to be assured that enough distance will remain between her neighboring building and the new construction to allow for maintenance.

Following the speakers, further presentation by the Applicants and additional discussion and review, a motion was made, vote taken, and results recorded as indicated.

Upon review of Application #14-4-25, 866 North Pearl Street, the Italian Village Commission recommends approval of the proposed variances, as follows:

Request Variance Recommendations for New Construction

- 3333.12, AR-1 and AR-4 area district requirements, which section does require a lot area of 900 sq ft per apartment dwelling units on corner lots. Applicant requests a variance to permit a lot area of 413.8 square feet per apartment dwelling unit.
- 3333.15(c), Basis of computing area, which section does not allow a building to occupy greater than 50 percent of the lot area. Applicant requests a variance to permit this building to occupy 88 percent of the lot area.
- 3333.18(d), Building lines, which section does require a building line of 10 feet or more. Applicant requests a variance to permit a building line of 2 feet.
- 3333.22, Maximum side yard required, which section does require the sum of the side yard to equal or exceed 20 percent of the width of the lot, or 12.3 feet. Applicant requests a variance to allow a side yard of 8 percent, or 5.5 feet.
- 3333.23, Minimum side yard permitted, which section does require a minimum side yard of 5 feet. Applicant requests a variance to allow a minimum side yard of 2 feet.
- 3333.24, Rear yard, which section does require a rear yard totaling no less than 25 percent of the total lot area. Applicant requests a variance to allow a rear yard of 2.3 percent of the total lot area.
- 3312.49, Minimum number of parking spaces required, which section does require a minimum of 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit, or 36 parking spaces. Applicant requests a variance to allow .83 parking spaces per dwelling unit, or 20 parking spaces.

MOTION: Sudy/Lapp (5-0-1 [Cooke]) APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

9. 14-4-26

21 East Fifth Avenue

Richard T. Day (Applicant)

Stickmen Properties (Owner)

Following the presentation of the staff report, and additional discussion and review, a motion was made, vote taken, and results recorded as indicated.

Approve Application # 14-4-26, 21 East Fifth Avenue, with all clarifications, as noted.

Install New Canvas Awning

Install new, black canvas awning over gate entrance to courtyard, per the submitted drawing, for protection from weather.

MOTION: Lapp/Boyer (6-0-0) APPROVED

10. 14-4-27a

1111 Hamlet Street

Julio Valenzuela/Urban Restorations (Applicant/Owner)

Following the presentation by the Applicant, and additional discussion and review, a motion was made, vote taken, and results recorded as indicated.

Approve Application # 14-4-27a, 1111 Hamlet Street, with all clarifications, as noted.

Install New Fence

- Install a new six-foot-high (6'H) fence in the rear yard, per the submitted site plan and example photographs.
- Fence to be horizontally applied 1" x 6" cedar boards and 4" x 4" posts, per the submitted example photograph.
- Fence to be double-sided, with no stringers or posts facing neighboring properties. Spacing between the boards to be no wider than one-half inch (1/2").
- Finish to be natural cedar.

MOTION: Boyer/Lapp (6-0-0) APPROVED

14-4-27b

Foundation

Following discussion of the fence, the Applicant requested guidance from the Commission regarding an issue that has arisen with the foundation of the house, already under construction.

Comments

- Would be opposed to anything too rustic
- Applicant should return to the May 20 IVC hearing with proposed solutions. Suggest submitting photos of other new construction showing proposed solution options.
- Stucco would not be appropriate.
- Need a break from the ground to keep moisture from wicking up.

NO ACTION TAKEN

11. 14-4-28

612 North High Street

Nicole Bailey/Sign Vision (Applicant)

Charles, Jr. & Marjorie Warner (Owner)

Following the presentation by the Applicant, a motion was made, vote taken, and results recorded as indicated.

Continue Application # 14-4-28, to allow the Applicant time to submit revised drawings, and direct staff to place on the May 20, 2014 Italian Village hearing agenda.

MOTION: Goodman/Cooke (6-0-0) CONTINUED

Commissioner Comments:

Ben Goodman:

- The proposed sign seems to be projected a sizable distance from the building. It would be more appropriate to be closer to the building.
- Any bolts need to be inserted into the mortar rather than the face of the brick or stone.
- Moving to a rear illuminated letter is a step in the right direction, however, the sign seems too thick.
- Part of Blick's identity is a palette with paints on it. It may be more appropriate to incorporate that element into the design of a projecting sign.

David Cooke:

- A plastic, glossy appearing material for awnings would not be approved. A non-illuminated Sunbrella or canvas would be appropriate.
- The profile of the awning is not per the Short North Design Guidelines. Since the existing awning is being removed, any new awning will be required to meet the current guidelines.

Todd Boyer:

- Does not think the size and scale of the proposed blade sign is at all appropriate for the building.
- Thinks that approving too many large blade signs along High Street would be the wrong direction.
- The proposed sign has no relationship to the architecture or the store entrance.

Josh Lapp:

- A smaller, more pedestrian scale, rather than vehicle oriented projecting sign would be more appropriate.
- Agrees with the idea of utilizing a paint palette.

Rex Hagerling:

- The red on the white seems harsh. The sign seems awfully heavy.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

12. 14-4-29

106 East Lincoln Street

Simes Landscape (Applicant)

Philip Davis (Owner)

Following the presentation of the staff report, and additional discussion and review, Application # 14-4-29 was moved to final review. A motion was made, vote taken, and results recorded as indicated.

Approve Application # 14-4-29, 106 East Lincoln Street, with all clarifications, as noted.

Install New Patio

- Remove the existing wood and wire fence at the front/side yard.
- Remove the existing stone pavers and the stone retaining wall in the rear yard, and install new, approximately six-inch-high (6" H) Edington Wall Stone retaining wall in the same location, per the submitted specifications and site plan.
- Retain existing fence and bushes along the east property line.
- Retain existing fence along the north property line.
- Install new Monroe "Antique Blend" patio pavers, per the submitted site plan.
- Install one stone step to connect the rear patio to the paved walkway along the west side of the house.

MOTION: Lapp/Sudy (6-0-0) APPROVED

13. 14-2-11

No Address (formerly 81 E. Fourth Ave./Southeast Corner of Fourth & Say Avenues)

Juliet Bullock Architects (Applicant)

New Victorians (Owner)

New Construction

- Construct a new 4-unit residential building.

Prior to review of Application 14-2-11, Commissioner Sudy noted the need to abstain from the proceedings and exited the hearing room. Following presentation by the Applicants, Chairman Hagerling opened the discussion, and the following observations were made regarding the proposed project to assist the Applicant/Owner in preparing for further review at a future IVC hearing.

Commissioner Comments

David Cooke:

- Concerned about new construction throughout the district that is out of the ground too high. Height above grade needs to be firmly set.

Josh Lapp:

- The balconies seem foreign on this building.

Ben Goodman:

- The overall architecture seems a strange amalgam of styles.
- Need to understand how the porches relate to the streetscape.
- The meeting of the two roof lines seems odd.

Rex Hagerling

- Concerned how the building is sited. The building setbacks on the street are not consistent, but would like to see the new building moved back a bit.
- Would like more information to understand the grade change in the elevation better.
- Would like to see the building relate a bit better to the main masses of adjacent buildings.

Todd Boyer

- The Say Avenue elevation may have too many windows. The windows may not need to be symmetrical.
- Splitting the buildings up more could help, especially on Fourth St side. Could the taller piece be just two-bays wide?
- Also needs more details on how the sidewalks/stoops relate to the street.
- Generally supportive of the design, just needs some small changes.

NO ACTION TAKEN

14. 14-4-30

307 East Fifth Avenue

Juliet Bullock Architects (Applicant)

New Victorians (Owner)

New Construction

- Construct a new 2 ½ story mixed use building at the Fifth Avenue frontage.
- Construct a new 2 ½ story carriage house at the Greenwood Avenue frontage.
- Existing paved surface parking to be reconfigured and re-stripped.

Prior to review of Application 14-2-11, Commissioner Sudy noted the need to abstain from the proceedings and exited the hearing room. Following presentation by the Applicants, Chairman Hagerling opened the discussion, and the following observations were made regarding the proposed project to assist the Applicant/Owner in preparing for further review at a future IVC hearing. A brief overview of the proposed variance package was presented by Connie Klema.

Commissioner Comments

Ben Goodman:

- Regarding The Fifth Ave building, will be interested in details of how the industrial windows relate to the doorways.
- Some sort of building naming in stone or a contrasting colored tile at the top of the building could be appropriate.

David Cooke:

- The carriage house should have two single doors rather than a large double door.
- Consider other materials that could work for the Fifth Avenue building like a glazed block.
- Goose neck lights could be a good addition on Fifth Avenue.

Todd Boyer

- Conceptually, has no issue with the Fifth Avenue building, but would like to see two big windows on the second floor, less of a residential scale.
- The simple industrial type windows on the first floor is the way to go, but need to see more on the doors/entrances. Will be interested to see how the two resolve each other.

Josh Lapp:

- Is very supportive of small commercial spaces.

NO ACTION TAKEN

15. 14-4-31

150 Detroit Avenue

Juliet Bullock Architects (Applicant)

Urban Restorations (Owner)

Commissioner Sudy returned to the table. Following presentation by the Applicants, Chairman Hagerling opened the discussion, and the following observations were made regarding the proposed project to assist the Applicant/Owner in preparing for further review at a future IVC hearing

New Construction

- First conceptual review of proposed new construction to include a two-story, two-unit residential building and a warehouse style carriage house with two residential units above, per the submitted site plan.

Commissioner Comments

Jason Sudy:

- Two story residential is in keeping with the context of the street.
- Following the angle of Beacon Alley is appropriate.
- If one of the alleys is preserved, Beacon Alley is the right one (re: curb cuts).
- Appreciates sensitive approach of not trying to utilize every access point off of the alleys.
- The structure at the rear is larger than the one at the front (Detroit Ave). The rear building should either relate to the vernacular of the front building or to similar carriage houses in the area. In this area, the appearance of being developed at two different times could be appropriate.
- From site plan perspective, the applicant is doing the right thing.

Rex Hagerling

- Has some concerns about the size of the building at the rear, but needs to visit the site.

Todd Boyer

- Conceptually, has no issues with the site plan.

Josh Lapp:

- Also has no issues to raise with the proposed site plan.

Ben Goodman:

- Consider a permeable material for the parking/driveway.

Reacting to a modern style building photo submitted by the applicant at the hearing, Commissioners Sudy and Boyer responded that either traditional or modern could work if done well.

NO ACTION TAKEN

16. 14-4-32

51 East Fourth Avenue

Michael Mahaney/MM Developing, LLC (Applicant/Owner)

New Construction

- Construct new single-family home with detached garage, per the submitted drawings and specifications

Following presentation by the Applicants, Chairman Hagerling opened the discussion, and the following observations were made regarding the proposed project to assist the Applicant/Owner in preparing for further review at a future IVC hearing.

Commissioner Comments

David Cooke:

- Concerned about the height of the proposed building. The number of steps to the front porch indicates that it is higher than typical in the neighborhood.
- Front door is not of typical Italian village vernacular, including the flanking light fixtures.
- A large double door on the garage does not meet the guidelines.
- Appreciate the completeness of the submitted materials packet.

Josh Lapp:

- The traditional style could work with modification of some materials.

Jason Sudy:

- Agrees that it seems too high out of the ground.

Rex Hagerling

- The porch needs to be integrated into the elevation and possibly into the bay window.
- The stoop and steps are up too high.
- Need to see the eave/fascia/cornice detail. The overhang needs to be deeper. Not a huge change needed.
- Everything is fixable, just need additional details for review.

Todd Boyer

- The proportion of the windows should be a bit taller and skinnier to fit the character of the neighborhood.
- Need to see more detail of the soffit/fascia area and how the windows meet the fascia.
- The doors and lighting don't seem typical to the character of the neighborhood.

NO ACTION TAKEN

17. 14-4-33

270 East Third Avenue

Jody Dierksheide (Applicant/Owner)

New Construction

• Construct new single-family home on the existing vacant lot, per the submitted example photographs.
Following presentation by the Applicants, Chairman Hagerling opened the discussion, and the following observations were made regarding the proposed project to assist the Applicant/Owner in preparing for further review at a future IVC hearing.

Commissioner Comments

Jason Sudy:

- Infill with a single-family house on a single lot would be appropriate.
- Historically, the Commission has been open to a variety of styles for infill, including modern, industrial and traditional.
- Need clarification on a proposed setback for the building (including edge of pavement, center line, etc).
- Because the submitted examples are modern, conceptually, the proposed materials and window placement seems appropriate. A traditional style would need to include tall, narrow windows and other elements typical to the area.

Rex Hagerling

- Determining the setback is dependent on the neighborhood. Since the block is vacant, it may be appropriate for this house to set the precedent for the block.
- No need to complete construction drawings before returning for a second conceptual review of elevations and site plan.

Todd Boyer

- Asked whether the proposed is a pre-fab home.
- Would not have an issue with a gabled roof, but it would likely affect the window and door placement.

Ben Goodman:

- The proposed concept seems to be a good direction. Encouraged by what is shown.
- Thinks that a setback nearer to the street, with front porches and entrances, adds vitality to the neighborhood.
- The proposed styles have good proportions, taller and narrower, relates to the rhythm of the streetscape.

NO ACTION TAKEN

18. 14-4-34

Sixth Street and Auden Avenue (no address/former Jeffrey Mining site)

Meyers & Associates Architects (Applicant)

Chad Seiber (Owner)

New Construction

- Conceptual review of new construction on a .964 acre site.
- New construction to consist of twenty-six townhomes.

Following presentation by the Applicants, Chairman Hagerling opened the discussion, and the following observations were made regarding the proposed project to assist the Applicant/Owner in preparing for further review at a future IVC hearing.

Commissioner Comments

Josh Lapp:

- Really likes the architecture, but not comfortable with the courtyard site plan and the multiple curb cuts.
- The proposed plan does not include the existing streets that were laid out in the traditional streetscape of the neighborhood. There is no appearance of human entry. It is largely inward looking.

Jason Sudy:

- Also loves the architecture, but would want to see a more traditional urban infill site plan.
- The scale and proportion seem right, but would not feel comfortable approving a site plan that has more vehicular entrances than human entrances on the exterior elevations.

- Understands the idea of providing a courtyard for the residents, but thinks it is more appropriate to have the parking on the inside so the residents are more engaged with the neighborhood, the street, the parkland, etc.
- Try to limit the vehicular access points. It needs to be a walkable streetscape.

Todd Boyer:

- It is an internal facing building, and does a good job of making the courtyard a successful inviting space as opposed to just a parking lot.
- Does not mind a contrast to the context that will be created by the Jeffrey Park development.
- The rear traditional townhomes have a bit more of a pedestrian entrance. If things could be switched a bit, perhaps there could be more of a middle ground.
- One too many materials. Simplification of materials could reduce the massiveness.
- Appreciates that it is not the traditional pattern of “A”, “B”, “A”, “B”, “A”, “B” designs.

Ben Goodman:

- If there were a way to relate the car to urban living and make a parking spot integrated into an elevation attractive, this design has gone a long way to make that seem possible.
- Alleyways are a characteristic of old urban space and the neighborhood that shouldn't be overlooked. There may be ways to utilize alleyways and allow for some curb cuts in this proposal. Consider ways to reduce the curb cuts. Consider creating some back spaces that are not just part of the complex, but can be used by anyone.
- Does like the rhythm of the architecture and thinks it is moving in the right direction.

David Cooke:

- Will want details of trash and recycling handling; bike parking; mail delivery.
- The density feels excessive.
- Not in favor of so much black on exterior materials. Would favor more red brick being brought in.
- Also feels it needs to be downscaled. Too many boxes hanging off etc.

NO ACTION TAKEN

19. 14-4-35

East Fifth Avenue (no address- between Say Ave. & Summit St.)

Karrick Sherrill/Shremshock Architects (Applicant) Brad Howe/Burwell Investments, LLC (Owner)

New Construction

- Conceptual review of new construction to include a two-story, frame apartment building with three two-story townhomes facing Fifth Avenue and a eight flats in two-stories, extending the depth of the property.
- To be brick veneer with some cementitious siding.
- Parking level with 14 spaced to be below first floor level.

Following presentation by the Applicants, Chairman Hagerling opened the discussion, and the following observations were made regarding the proposed project to assist the Applicant/Owner in preparing for further review at a future IVC hearing.

Commissioner Comments

Jason Sudy:

- Thinks the adjacent parcels to the east will likely be developed at some point. It is difficult to imagine that whatever is built there could respond to a façade of entrances on the east side of the proposed building.
- The photo example of the two apartment buildings facing each other seems more interesting for this site than the current proposal.
- Just because the site is a certain size, does not mean the building has to be a certain size. It could be two buildings.

David Cooke:

- Appreciates the submission showing the relationship to adjacent contributing buildings. Would also like to see the rear elevation and comparison of height to buildings at the rear of the lots.

- The mass of the roofline seems overwhelming when compared to adjacent buildings. Consider adding some chimney elements to break it up. It might be better to look like three units rather than one massive roof structure.
- Split stone lintels will not be supported.
- Also has some concerns about units facing onto the current taxi stand.

Josh Lapp:

- Also would expect the adjacent lots to be redeveloped at some point, at which time, a more massive structure, such as this conceptual proposal, might be built. Perhaps this proposal leads into that.

Ben Goodman:

- As currently proposed, the hipped roofline seems too mansion-like. The key is rhythm. Perhaps if it were, in some way, broken down. Building off of the rhythm of the adjacent houses may be the way to go. Maybe build the perception of two structures on the lot and entering onto a courtyard.
- Less concerned about the presentation to the east.
- Appreciates that creating a relationship with Fifth Avenue will be a challenge. Wonders if the front doors, as proposed, would really be used.

Todd Boyer

- Thinks the front doors, at least on Fifth Avenue, need some sort of front porch to separate from the street and bring down the scale of the building.
- The precedents submitted are the right ones to follow, but need to be looked at more closely.
- The long hall between the two units seems scary. Would prefer to see it split into two buildings.
- The lot is a challenge, and this proposal, with the garage at the rear, is an interesting adaptation to an odd site.

Rex Hagerling

- Would not like to see the building setback any closer to Fifth Avenue than the faces of the adjacent houses.
- Believes that the adjacent houses would have had porches originally.

NO ACTION TAKEN

STAFF APPROVALS

- **14-4-1**

919 North Fourth Street

Helen Zapol (Applicant/Owner)

Approve Application 14-4-1, 919 North Fourth Street, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:

Eave Soffit & Fascia Repair:

- Repair and/or replace all damaged, deteriorated, and missing wood eave soffit and fascia on all elevations as necessary with new wood of exact same profile and dimension; like-for-like. Paint to existing trim color.

Repair/Replace Downspouts

- Examine all existing, metal, ogee (k-style) gutters on the house and make any repairs and/or replace the existing gutter system on all elevations with new metal, ogee (k-style) gutters.
- Install new, corrugated metal downspouts in the appropriate locations to assure proper drainage.
- Examine the existing storm water drainage system for soundness and proper function. Make any/all necessary repairs to the existing storm sewer tile system to assure proper drainage away from the foundations of this and neighboring properties. If deemed necessary, install a French drain system or similar, appropriate drainage system in accordance with all applicable City Building Codes and industry standards.

- **14-4-2**

935, 937, 939, 941, 943, 945 Summit Street (New Village Homes/Bldg. # 5)

Michael B. Rogers/Tri-State Renovations (Applicant)

Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority (Owner)

Approve Application 14-4-2, 935, 937, 939, 941, 943, 945 Summit Street, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:

Repair/Replace Siding / Building #5

- Existing wood siding and trim to be removed down to existing structural substrate(s).
 - Replace deteriorated wood siding, trim, and column covers on the ca. 2001 building, as needed, with new, smooth HardiePlank lap siding and trim to match existing wood siding in profile, per the submitted cut sheet and product specifications.
 - New siding and trim to be primed and painted. All colors to match existing as closely as possible, per the submitted paint schedule.
 - Install new wood soffits, per the submitted specifications.
 - All existing penetrations, i.e. doors, windows, etc., to have new sealants.
- **14-4-3**
921, 923, 925, 927, 929 Summit Street (New Village Homes/Bldg. # 7)
Michael B. Rogers/Tri-State Renovations (Applicant)
Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority (Owner)
Approve Application 14-4-3, 921, 923, 925, 927, 929 Summit Street, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:
Repair/Replace Siding / Building #7
 - Existing wood siding and trim to be removed down to existing structural substrate(s).
 - Replace deteriorated wood siding, trim, and column covers on the ca. 2001 building, as needed, with new, smooth HardiePlank lap siding and trim to match existing wood siding in profile, per the submitted cut sheet and product specifications.
 - New siding and trim to be primed and painted. All colors to match existing as closely as possible, per the submitted paint schedule.
 - Install new wood soffits, per the submitted specifications.
 - All existing penetrations, i.e. doors, windows, etc., to have new sealants.
- **14-4-4**
130, 132, 134, 136, 138, 140 Piscitelli Street (New Village Homes/Bldg. # 8)
Michael B. Rogers/Tri-State Renovations (Applicant)
Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority (Owner)
Approve Application 14-4-4, 130, 132, 134, 136, 138, 140 Piscitelli Street, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:
Repair/Replace Siding / Building #8
 - Existing wood siding and trim to be removed down to existing structural substrate(s).
 - Replace deteriorated wood siding, trim, and column covers on the ca. 2001 building, as needed, with new, smooth HardiePlank lap siding and trim to match existing wood siding in profile, per the submitted cut sheet and product specifications.
 - New siding and trim to be primed and painted. All colors to match existing as closely as possible, per the submitted paint schedule.
 - Install new wood soffits, per the submitted specifications.
 - All existing penetrations, i.e. doors, windows, etc., to have new sealants.
- **14-4-5**
113 and 115 Grunwell Street (New Village Homes/Bldg. # 14)
Michael B. Rogers/Tri-State Renovations (Applicant)
Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority (Owner)
Approve Application 14-4-5, 113 and 115 Grunwell Street, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:
Repair/Replace Siding / Building #14
 - Existing wood siding and trim to be removed down to existing structural substrate(s).

- Replace deteriorated wood siding, trim, and column covers on the ca. 2001 building, as needed, with new, smooth HardiePlank lap siding and trim to match existing wood siding in profile, per the submitted cut sheet and product specifications.
 - New siding and trim to be primed and painted. All colors to match existing as closely as possible, per the submitted paint schedule.
 - Install new wood soffits, per the submitted specifications.
 - All existing penetrations, i.e. doors, windows, etc., to have new sealants.
-
- **14-4-6**
92, 94, 96, 98 First Avenue (New Village Homes/Bldg. # 17)
Michael B. Rogers/Tri-State Renovations (Applicant)
Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority (Owner)
Approve Application 14-4-6, 92, 94, 96, 98 First Avenue, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:
Repair/Replace Siding / Building #17
 - Existing wood siding and trim to be removed down to existing structural substrate(s).
 - Replace deteriorated wood siding, trim, and column covers on the ca. 2001 building, as needed, with new, smooth HardiePlank lap siding and trim to match existing wood siding in profile, per the submitted cut sheet and product specifications.
 - New siding and trim to be primed and painted. All colors to match existing as closely as possible, per the submitted paint schedule.
 - Install new wood soffits, per the submitted specifications.
 - All existing penetrations, i.e. doors, windows, etc., to have new sealants.
-
- **14-4-7**
943 and 945 Roberson Street (New Village Homes/Bldg. # 20)
Michael B. Rogers/Tri-State Renovations (Applicant)
Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority (Owner)
Approve Application 14-4-7, 943 and 945 Roberson Street, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:
Repair/Replace Siding / Building #20
 - Existing wood siding and trim to be removed down to existing structural substrate(s).
 - Replace deteriorated wood siding, trim, and column covers on the ca. 2001 building, as needed, with new, smooth HardiePlank lap siding and trim to match existing wood siding in profile, per the submitted cut sheet and product specifications.
 - New siding and trim to be primed and painted. All colors to match existing as closely as possible, per the submitted paint schedule.
 - Install new wood soffits, per the submitted specifications.
 - All existing penetrations, i.e. doors, windows, etc., to have new sealants.
-
- **14-4-8**
97 and 99 Second Avenue (New Village Homes/Bldg. # 27)
Michael B. Rogers/Tri-State Renovations (Applicant)
Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority (Owner)
Approve Application 14-4-8, 97 and 99 Second Avenue, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:
Repair/Replace Siding / Building #27
 - Existing wood siding and trim to be removed down to existing structural substrate(s).
 - Replace deteriorated wood siding, trim, and column covers on the ca. 2001 building, as needed, with new, smooth HardiePlank lap siding and trim to match existing wood siding in profile, per the submitted cut sheet and product specifications.

- New siding and trim to be primed and painted. All colors to match existing as closely as possible, per the submitted paint schedule.
 - Install new wood soffits, per the submitted specifications.
 - All existing penetrations, i.e. doors, windows, etc., to have new sealants.
-
- **14-4-9**
122 and 124 Grunwell Avenue (New Village Homes/Bldg. # 28)
Michael B. Rogers/Tri-State Renovations (Applicant)
Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority (Owner)
Approve Application 14-4-9, 122 and 124 Grunwell Avenue, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:
Repair/Replace Siding / Building #28
 - Existing wood siding and trim to be removed down to existing structural substrate(s).
 - Replace deteriorated wood siding, trim, and column covers on the ca. 2001 building, as needed, with new, smooth HardiePlank lap siding and trim to match existing wood siding in profile, per the submitted cut sheet and product specifications.
 - New siding and trim to be primed and painted. All colors to match existing as closely as possible, per the submitted paint schedule.
 - Install new wood soffits, per the submitted specifications.
 - All existing penetrations, i.e. doors, windows, etc., to have new sealants.
-
- **14-4-10**
No Address/Garage Type 3 (New Village Homes/Bldg. # 29)
Michael B. Rogers/Tri-State Renovations (Applicant)
Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority (Owner)
Approve Application 14-4-10, No Address/Garage Type 3, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:
Repair/Replace Siding / Building #29
 - Existing wood siding and trim to be removed down to existing structural substrate(s).
 - Replace deteriorated wood siding, trim, and column covers on the ca. 2001 building, as needed, with new, smooth HardiePlank lap siding and trim to match existing wood siding in profile, per the submitted cut sheet and product specifications.
 - New siding and trim to be primed and painted. All colors to match existing as closely as possible, per the submitted paint schedule.
 - Install new wood soffits, per the submitted specifications.
 - All existing penetrations, i.e. doors, windows, etc., to have new sealants.
-
- **14-4-11**
108, 110, 112, 114, 116, 118 Grunwell Street (New Village Homes/Bldg. # 30)
Michael B. Rogers/Tri-State Renovations (Applicant)
Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority (Owner)
Approve Application 14-4-11, 108, 110, 112, 114, 116, 118 Grunwell Street, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:
Repair/Replace Siding / Building #30
 - Existing wood siding and trim to be removed down to existing structural substrate(s).
 - Replace deteriorated wood siding, trim, and column covers on the ca. 2001 building, as needed, with new, smooth HardiePlank lap siding and trim to match existing wood siding in profile, per the submitted cut sheet and product specifications.
 - New siding and trim to be primed and painted. All colors to match existing as closely as possible, per the submitted paint schedule.
 - Install new wood soffits, per the submitted specifications.

- All existing penetrations, i.e. doors, windows, etc., to have new sealants.

- **14-4-12**
944 and 946 Roberson Street (New Village Homes/Bldg. # 31)
Michael B. Rogers/Tri-State Renovations (Applicant)
Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority (Owner)
Approve Application 14-4-12, 944 and 946 Roberson Street, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:
Repair/Replace Siding / Building #31
 - Existing wood siding and trim to be removed down to existing structural substrate(s).
 - Replace deteriorated wood siding, trim, and column covers on the ca. 2001 building, as needed, with new, smooth HardiePlank lap siding and trim to match existing wood siding in profile, per the submitted cut sheet and product specifications.
 - New siding and trim to be primed and painted. All colors to match existing as closely as possible, per the submitted paint schedule.
 - Install new wood soffits, per the submitted specifications.
 - All existing penetrations, i.e. doors, windows, etc., to have new sealants.

- **14-4-13**
115, 117, 119, 121, 123, 125 Sommerfeld Place (New Village Homes/Bldg. # 34)
Michael B. Rogers/Tri-State Renovations (Applicant)
Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority (Owner)
Approve Application 14-4-13, 115, 117, 119, 121, 123, 125 Sommerfeld Place, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:
Repair/Replace Siding / Building #34
 - Existing wood siding and trim to be removed down to existing structural substrate(s).
 - Replace deteriorated wood siding, trim, and column covers on the ca. 2001 building, as needed, with new, smooth HardiePlank lap siding and trim to match existing wood siding in profile, per the submitted cut sheet and product specifications.
 - New siding and trim to be primed and painted. All colors to match existing as closely as possible, per the submitted paint schedule.
 - Install new wood soffits, per the submitted specifications.
 - All existing penetrations, i.e. doors, windows, etc., to have new sealants.

- **14-4-14**
345 East Second Avenue
Darin Ranker/Carney Ranker Architects (Applicant) Anchor Government Properties, III, LLC. (Owner)
Approve Application 14-4-14, 345 East Second Avenue, for renewal of expired COA # 13-2-8b (Expired: March 19, 2014), exactly as previously approved, for a period of one (1) year.
Install Store Front
 - Raise the existing overhead door to align with the adjacent windows, and bolt into position. Current 12' W x 15' H door opening will not be changed.
 - Install new storefront system consisting of two (2) new, 4'-0" x 7'-0", black, anodized aluminum storefront doors centered in the opening with equally sized aluminum storefront sidelights on either side, per the submitted drawings.
 - Install new aluminum storefront glazing above the new doors, per the submitted drawings.

Note: It was noted that all revisions requested by the commission at the February 19 hearing had been made. While removing the existing glass service door and infilling the door opening with block was suggested, it was not required.

MOTION: Sudy/Goodman (5-0-0) APPROVED

- **14-4-15**

1007 Summit Street

Stacy Woodford (Applicant)

Approve Application 14-4-15, 1007 Summit Street, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:

Removal of Graffiti

- Remove any/all existing graffiti from the wood siding on the front elevation of the building using “Motsenbocker’s Lift Off,” as tested on the building.
- Graffiti abatement to be conducted in a manner that does not damage or deface the building finish and/or trim surface material(s) (eg. stone, brick, tile, terra cotta, stucco, wood, aluminum, vinyl, steel, etc.). If air pressure is needed for either the cleaning or the rinsing procedures, only a broad fan tip is to be used to prevent surface etching. (Refer to Preservation Brief 1- “The Cleaning and Waterproof Coating of Masonry Buildings”). Mechanical treatments including the following: high pressure wet or dry blasting, abrasive grits, such as sand, dolomite powder, aluminum oxide, ground-walnut shells, sodium bicarbonate (baking soda); high pressure water washing and mechanical sanding or grinding, should never be considered as a method of removing graffiti from historic masonry.

- **14-4-16**

1087 Say Avenue

Urban Order Architecture (Applicant)

Audra Wheeler

Approve Application 14-4-16, 1087 Say Avenue, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:

Repair Exterior Brick Wall/North Elevation

- Repair/replace the section of the exterior, north elevation brick wall that was destroyed in an auto accident.
- New construction to match and align with existing, reusing the existing salvaged brick. Any new brick to match existing brick shape, dimension, and color; like-for-like.
- Re-install existing wood window and stone lintel and sill in the original location. Head and sill height to match adjacent existing windows.

Eave Soffit & Fascia Repair:

- Repair and/or replace any damaged, deteriorated, and missing wood eave soffit and fascia, as needed, with new wood of exact same profile and dimension; like-for-like. Paint to match existing colors.

Repair Bay on South Elevation

- Repair existing, damaged bay on south elevation, only as needed, to match existing construction and dimensions, reusing existing brick, wood windows and stone lintels and sills.

Note: Damage was caused by the auto accident, which shifted the bay and cracked the mortar.

- **14-4-17**

682 North High Street

Rachel Ferguson/for Global Gifts (Applicant)

The Wood Companies (Owner)

Approve Application 14-4-17, 682 North High Street, as submitted, with all clarifications as indicated:

Install New Door

- Remove the existing, non-original, non-contributing, six-panel, northward facing storefront entrance door.
- Install a new full-light, wood framed door with thermal glass in the same door opening, per the submitted product cut sheet. The size of the door opening is to remain the same as existing.
- Reinstall existing brass hardware.
- Door to be painted dark green/gray, to match existing exterior trim.
- Install a new window graphic on the door to match existing. Rendering of the door graphic is to be submitted to Historic Preservation staff for final review and approval, prior to installation.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

• 13-12-10

875 Summit Street

Wood Run Partners, LLC/Truberry Custom Homes (Applicant/Owner)

This application was conceptually reviewed at the December 17, 2013, January 21 and February 18, and March 18, 2014 IVC hearings. Revised drawings of traditional and modern design options have been submitted.

Demolition

- Demolish the existing ca. 1938 gas station building.

New Construction

- Construct seven (7) new, three-story dwellings, per the submitted site plan and renderings.

Commissioner Comments

Jason Sudy:

- The changes made for this submission work well.
- Feels there are far better examples representative of the gas station vernacular in the district. Would like to have seen a positive adaptive reuse of the existing building, but thinks the proposed development is a reasonable use that does fit within the scale of the neighborhood.
- Will let others speak to the details of the architecture, but thinks that the current submission is a good direction that will contribute to the neighborhood.
- Still uncertain about the sunscreens at the top.
- The first three issues to resolve are demolition, massing, and site plan. Then follows architecture.
- Think about how the sidewalk and landscaping will look.

Josh Lapp:

- No comments to add.

Ben Goodman:

- Appreciates that an entrance has been added on First Avenue, but the corner now looks a bit vacant where the entrance was subtracted.
- The north corner facing onto Fifth Avenue seems a bit heavy now.
- Thinks the Commission needs to communicate to the applicant what it envisions for this corner, and give clear direction as to what could make it successful, be it removing a unit or two, or putting a second entrance on First Ave, or pulling it back on First Ave, or varying materials.
- Does the Commission see enough before it to act on demolition?

Todd Boyer

- Really appreciates all the work has been done.
- Still has concerns about the siting and details. The balconies with sliding doors seem too accessible. Would not be comfortable with final approval of the current proposed design.
- Regarding site plan, the setback of the north edge is not resolved, and that would include changing the architecture, not just the materials. Does not have issues with the height, massing, size, rhythm.

David Cooke:

- A number of different proposals with different styles and forms have been submitted. Thinks that the current proposal is still too much building for the site. Does not think the current proposal is enough of an improvement or contribution to the site to warrant going forward.
- Greatly appreciate that the architect has tried so many different proposals, but the core problem is that it is too much on the site.
- Thinks single family houses would be a better solution.

Rex Hagerling:

- Thinks the applicant has done much of what the Commission has asked, such as reducing the scale.
- Not ready to approve details, but appreciates that the design has been simplified.

Following the Commissioners' comments and additional presentation by the Applicant, a motion was made, vote taken, and results recorded as indicated.

Direct Historic Preservation Office staff to schedule a special meeting for review of the demolition and new construction project at 875 Summit Street, to take place before the May 20, 2014 Italian Village Commission hearing.

MOTION: Cooke/Lapp (6-0-0) APPROVED

- **14-4-36**
618 North High Street/Joseph Hotel
Pizzuti Companies (Applicant/Owner)
Install New Canopy

- Install a new canopy at the west elevation entrance, per the submitted rendering.

Following presentation by the Applicants, Chairman Hagerling opened the discussion, and the following observations were made regarding the proposed project to assist the Applicant/Owner in preparing for further review at a future IVC hearing.

Commissioner Comments

David Cooke:

- Concerned that the canopy could conflict with the street trees. Understands that the streetscape plan is an unknown at this point.
- Noted that the previous submission included sloped glass shades that were closer to the building.
- Concerned about the height, depth, and length of the proposed canopy. Seems too massive.
- Not opposed to the change, but needs some modification and detailed drawings.

Jason Sudy:

- A metal canopy with tie backs can be okay. Just need more details.

Rex Hagerling

- The Commission needs to see more context, i.e., an overall elevation, site plan, and sections.
- Some kind of canopy would be appropriate, but concerned about the deep shadow.

Ben Goodman

- How the canopy will work with the signage is important.
- Not opposed to the canopy in general. Need details of the structure and context.

Todd Boyer

- The proposed awning doesn't seem to fit with the rest of the building. It creates a large shadow. Could a more transparent material, like glass, be used?

NO ACTION TAKEN

IX. NEW BUSINESS

X. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Sudy/Boyer (6-0-0) ADJOURNED (11:04 p.m.)