

ITALIAN VILLAGE SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

1:00 p.m.

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

Commissioners Present: Todd Boyer, David Cooke (left 1:52 p.m.), Ben Goodman, Rex Hagerling, Charmaine Sutton

Commissioners Absent: Joshua Lapp, Jason Sudy

City Staff Present: Connie Torbeck, Randy Black

Applicants Present: Brad Howe, Karrick Sherrill, Jack Reynolds (Item #1)

Kevin Lykens, Karrick Sherrill (Item #2)

- I. CALL TO ORDER (1:02 p.m.)
- II. SWEARING IN OF CITY STAFF
- III. IDENTIFICATION OF COMMISSIONERS PRESENT
- IV. SPECIAL MEETING IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY CODE AND COMMISSION BYLAWS

City Code Chapter 3119.33 Italian Village Commission Organization

As soon as convenient, after the members are appointed by the mayor, the commission shall meet and organize by the election of a chairman and secretary. The commission shall adopt bylaws governing its procedure and provide for regular and special meetings. The commission shall take official action only by a vote of a majority of the members voting on the question on the table, during a public meeting at which there is a quorum. A quorum exists when a majority of the members appointed to and serving on the commission are physically present at the meeting. All commission meetings shall be open to the public. A record of proceedings shall be maintained and available for inspection. Notices of all commission meetings shall be published in the City Bulletin. (Ord. 2229-04 § 6 (part).)

Italian Village Commission Bylaws: ARTICLE VII (1): Procedures

The Chairman shall cause an agenda to be developed and available to all members five days in advance of each meeting. The agenda shall include each application for a Certificate of Appropriateness listing the applicant's name, address of the property in question and the nature of the change desired. Other agenda items dealing with demolitions, zoning changes, or other issues which come under the purview of the Commission shall also be listed. Additional items may be added to the agenda at the Chairman's discretion at any time. Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness shall be considered first in order of application at all regular Commission meetings. Other agenda items may be considered in any order, at the Chairman's determination, at Special and Emergency Meetings and at regular meetings after all Applications for Certificates have been considered.

V. APPLICATION REVIEW

1. 14-10-18

126-140 Greenwood Avenue/Burwell Court

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

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

Approve Application #14-10-18, 126-140 Greenwood Avenue/Burwell Court, as submitted, with all clarifications, as noted.

New Construction/Phase I (Burwell Court)

- Construct a new, three-story, residential building with eight (8) one-bedroom townhome units and eight (8) garage parking spaces at grade level, per the submitted site plan.
- The presented footprint, mass, and site conditions are approved with the following conditions:

- 1) Final review and approval of final architectural details (including some study of the westernmost unit) and exterior materials, (including siding materials, roofing materials, windows, dwelling and garage doors, porch railings, and light fixtures), to be reviewed and approved by a sub-committee consisting of Chair Hagerling and Commissioner Boyer. Final drawings to be submitted to Historic Preservation Office staff for final review and approval by Chair Hagerling and Commissioner Boyer.
- 2) The Greenwood Avenue frontage will be improved by the addition of a new concrete sidewalk, concrete curb, and seeded lawn, per the submitted site plan (Sheet A02, dated 11/05/14), contingent on final approval by the Department of Public Service, and with any required modifications to the street frontage improvements to return to the Italian Village Commission for further review and approval.

Note: Approval of the New Construction/Phase I (eight townhome units) is based on discussion at the December 9, 2014 special meeting and with the understanding that, for Phase II of the project, a curb cut will be allowed along Fifth Avenue or Summit Street to relieve the pressures on Greenwood Avenue and Say Avenue, in accordance with any requirements of the Department of Public Service.

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

*Following the approval of Application # 14-10-18, Historic Preservation Office staff noted the need for a modification to the related variance package that was approved at the November 18, 2014 Italian Village Commission meeting (Recommendation # 14-11-23). Attorney, Jack Reynolds discussed the need for a modification of Item # 4 only (3349.12(c) Parking Spaces).
The following motion was made, vote taken, and results recorded as indicated.*

14-12-19 (VARIANCE RECOMMENDATION)

97 East Fifth Avenue

Jack Reynolds/Smith & Hale (Applicant)

Burwell Investments LLC (Owner)

Upon review of Application #14-12-19, 97 East Fifth Avenue, the Italian Village Commission recommends approval of the proposed variances, as follows:

Variance Recommendation

1. 3356.03(C-4) – variance to allow residential use on 1st floor
2. 3309.142(a) height (35') – variance to allow building to be 72' tall (variance of 37')
3. 3332.039 (R-4) variance to allow commercial use on the residential property
4. 3349.12(c) Parking spaces – to reduce the required number of parking spaces from 150 to 112 (a reduction of 38 spaces)
5. 3312.13 Driveway width – to reduce the required driveway width from 20' to 15' (a reduction of 5')
6. 3312.21(c) – Screening – to omit screening along the west side of the ramp area
7. 3332.21 Setback (25') – to reduce the building setback from 25' to 0' (variance of 25')
8. 3332.25 Maximum sideyard (16') – to reduce the maximum sideyard to 0' (variance of 16')
9. 3332.26 Minimum sideyard (5') – to reduce the minimum sideyard from 5' to 0' (variance of 5')
10. 3332.18 lot coverage (50%) – to allow 100% lot coverage
11. 3332.27 Rearyard (25% of lot) to omit rearyard area
12. 3332.29 Height (35') variance to allow building to be 72' tall (variance of 37')

13. 3312.21 Landscaping – to omit tree requirement on surface parking lot (3 trees to 0)

Reasons for an affirmative recommendation:

1) The proposed variances are typical and consistent for the district regarding lot coverage, setbacks, sideyards, conversion of an R4 property to commercial use; etc.; 2) The property is adjacent to other existing commercial properties and properties that would be appropriate for development.

Note: The Commission's recommendation for approval of this variance package does not constitute approval of any specific building, building footprint, height, use, etc.

NOTE: This recommendation modifies Item #4 only of Recommendation # 14-11-23, previously approved on November 18, 2014.

MOTION: Goodman/Boyer (5-0-0) APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

2. 14-10-19

174 Detroit Avenue

Karrick Sherril/Shremshock (Applicant)

Detroit LLC/Lykens Companies (Owner)

Exterior Building Alteration

- Rehabilitate existing, two (2) story, brick building for use as eighteen (18) single bedroom units.
- Restore existing, bricked in window openings and install new aluminum windows.
- Remove existing awning.
- Infill existing front door with exterior cladding and window unit, and relocate entrance from Detroit Avenue to Hamlet Street.
- Remove a portion of the existing roof to create an open area well with new courtyard.

Demolition

- Demolish adjacent metal storage building and loading dock.

New Construction

- Build new 3.5 story wood frame building with thirteen (13) single bedroom units at location of existing metal storage building.
- Build new, partially below grade parking with thirty-one (31) spaces to serve both buildings.

Following presentation by the Applicants, Chairperson 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

Ben Goodman:

- Thinks that moving the garage entrance between the new construction and the existing house to the east is a good idea.
- Still not on board with the way the façade addresses the street and the existing warehouse building. In general, thinks it should be simplified more and reference just a few datum on the existing warehouse instead of one or none of them (roofline, entablature, etc.).
- Could agree with a modern approach to the new construction, even cantilevers, but thinks there are too many faces happening.
- Thinks that reflecting elements of the existing warehouse could be more important than presenting a house-like mass on the new building. If the house mass remains, then some sort of rhythm is needed.
- The rear elevation has a much simpler approach and could be a better approach for the façade.

David Cooke:

- Appreciates the changes in height and other elements that have been made from the previous presentation.
- Consider whether there is a need to connect the existing warehouse with the new construction, or if they can just be separate buildings. Let the warehouse reflect its history and the new construction read as new infill.

- Understands it is still being developed, but the “mail room” are appears to be the weakest piece at this point. Could it be a glass cube here?
- Still need more information about the materials and how they will work together.

Rex Hagerling:

- Appreciates the improvements from the previous submission, such as moving the garage entrance to the side and creating more space between the new construction and the existing house to the east.
- Has mixed feelings about the façade. It is somewhat like placing a single house in front of the rear mass. Would like to see the front piece integrated a bit more into the rear mass so it appears less like a separate house.
- Disconnecting the two buildings may be a solution. Or, look at moving the connections farther back from the façade.
- Would like more information about the windows on the east elevation. They seem a bit small.

Charmaine Sutton:

- In general agreement with Commissioner Cooke and Hagerling’s comments.
- Agrees that the front piece on the façade of the new construction does have the appearance of a contemporary piece tacked onto the warehouse piece at the rear.
- Is okay with connecting the existing warehouse and the new building, but agrees that there needs to be a datum line to connect the two. Perhaps steel connectors that appear to be extending from the floor levels of the warehouse. Referred to the Buggy Works as an example.

Todd Boyer:

- Thinks the project is going in the right direction, but right now it appears as two buildings that are trying to connect.
- Struggles with which piece should be the dominant piece, but ultimately thinks the existing warehouse should be “driving the boat.” The complexity of the new construction seems to diminish what is already there.
- Is not really supportive of the amount of units and parking, but, if it is going to be the proposed scale and mass, would not connect the two buildings in a visual way from the façade.
- Is okay with the design of the “attached house” piece as long as it relates more to the rest of the new construction, and is not connected with the existing warehouse building.

NO ACTION TAKEN

VI. OLD BUSINESS

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Boyer/Sutton (4-0-0) ADJOURNED (2:04 p.m.)