

**CITY OF KENT
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
May 4, 2021**

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

STAFF PRESENT: Eric Fink, Assistant Law Director
 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, Bridget Tipton, Dennis Saxe, Kevin Koogle, 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. ARB21-005 CITY OF KENT
 319 SOUTH WATER STREET**

The applicant is requesting review of the new City Administration Building.

Melanie Baker, Service Director, City of Kent, stated that the proposed administration building will be replacing the former police building at 319 S. Water St. She stated that the proposed structure will be approximately 28,000 sq. ft. and will house all of the administrative departments such as the City Manager, Finance, Mayor, etc. She stated that there will be two entrances, one being at street level on S. Water St., which will enter into a three story glass and steel atrium. She stated that the second entrance will be off of the parking area off of Day St., where the height of the structure will be just under 30 feet. She stated that there will be two wings off of the atrium. She stated that the exterior will be brick with some sandstone color elements both above Council chambers with an arch and the parapet area. She stated that there will be some landscaping to break up the windows and also soften the appearance. She stated that they've tried to adjust the sidewalk areas and entrances to connect with the existing bike path and S. Water St.

Mr. Boyle questioned the colors on the front of the building.

Ms. Baker stated that the brick will be a medium brick color with the central atrium being a medium gray, not silver or dark gray.

Mr. Boyle noted that the window is a single window instead of separate windows for the upper and lower levels. He stated that he doesn't feel that the architects listened to the Board's comments regarding the windows. He stated that he was looking for distinct windows up and down. He stated that he feels that the grayness of the atrium exterior area is unusual at best and gives the impression that it is a distinct appendage from the building rather than enhancing the rest of the building. He stated that he likes the cap on the building but overall, he feels that the building falls short of what he was hoping for.

Mr. Basista agreed that the atrium doesn't seem to be attached to the rest of the building. He stated that the big bold font of the "City Hall" sign on the top of the atrium seem a bit much; needs something more subtle. He stated that there are a lot of windows and they are not what they talked about.

Mr. Koogle questioned what material the top band of the atrium is made of: glass or a solid material.

Nancy Nozik, Brandstetter Carroll, Inc., 1220 W 6th St., Suite 300, Cleveland, Ohio, stated that the curtain wall assembly continues all the way up for a continuous lantern style façade at the corner of the building. She stated that it is opaque at the top because it does extend over the parapet similar to the spandrel panels. She shared a view of the atrium and pointed out which areas are glass and which are opaque. She stated that the height of the atrium also serves as a screen for the rooftop equipment.

Mr. Koogle stated that the opaque panels will not have any nighttime illumination from the interior of the structure.

Ms. Nozik stated that there will be lights at the top and the sign will also be back lit.

Mr. Koogle stated that he feels that it will look odd in the evening when the interior of the building is lit up and not the top opaque band. He questioned the height of the tower (atrium).

Ms. Nozik stated that they made it taller as a proportional element on the corner of the building.

Ms. Baker stated that the atrium of the building is only two stories tall on the inside of the building; the third story is actually a conference room. She stated that the idea of all three stories being completely lit isn't going to be doable; they will not be leaving conference room lights on all night.

Mr. Saxe stated that he feels that the spandrel panels should be brick to separate the windows as it would eliminate the long tall window element on the main masses of the building. He asked for other opinions on the atrium and how it doesn't wrap into the rest of the building on the Haymaker Pkwy side; it is an abrupt cutoff there.

Mr. Basista agreed that it doesn't seem attached.

Ms. Nozik stated that the separation is intentional.

Mr. Boyle questioned if the heights of the wings are the same height; the South Water St. side appears to be higher.

Ms. Nozik stated that they are the same height. She stated that the treatment is the same for both sides of the building except for where the Council chambers is.

Ms. Tipton stated that she shares the concerns regarding the corner piece (atrium) and feels that it is taller than it needs to be. She feels that it is problematic that they use the term "lantern" and the top piece will not be emitting light. She feels that the screening would still be effective if the parapet wall were lowered and more connected. She stated she feels that effect of the opaque panels is problematic. She stated that the medium gray is related to the materials. She stated that she is happy not to see decorative stone lentils on each windows and feels that the curved one for council chambers makes some sense as it is drawing attention to that window. She stated that the spandrel panels on the vertical panels is the biggest problem but recognizes the challenges with changing the materials of the building envelope. She stated that the renderings could also be playing a part in making the corner piece seem too tall but overall height coupled with the strange material choice seem to be the problem.

Mr. Boyle questioned if the comments from the ARB and general public would also be shared with Council.

Ms. Susel stated that they will be sent to Council and Planning Commission. She verified that the Board also received the comments in their packets as well and had time to review them.

Mr. Boyle stated that the "Kent City Hall" sign at the top of the atrium is unnecessary as there is another sign below. He suggested removing "Kent" from the sign. He stated that as far as he is concerned, it is a terribly disappointing effort for the building overall on the part of the designers.

Ms. Susel clarified that there were numerous sessions with Council on the development of this building after the meetings with the Architectural Review Board. She stated that some of the features are from Council's input and not just the design team. She stated the staff will make sure all of the comments are summarized and share with all involved.

Public Comment

None.

**B. ARB21-006 KENT CITY SCHOOLS
1400 NORTH MANTUA STREET**

The applicant is requesting review of the proposed gymnasium addition and new field house building at Roosevelt High School.

Brad Gellert, TDA Architects, shared the renderings of the proposed changes for Roosevelt High School. He stated that there has been a lot of input from both the public and the administration. He stated that there are two projects at the high school: an addition to the existing gym on the north end of the building and a new field house. He stated that the gym addition will house a new locker room, multi-purpose room, and a new varsity gym. He stated that the existing stucco panels will be replaced with metal panels and the shed will be removed. He stated that a new door will be added next to the training room per the request of the fire department. He stated that the brick that will be used for the new gym will closely match the existing brick. Mr. Gellert stated that the Rough Rider logo will be recreated by students and relocated nearby. He stated that the panels for screening for the rooftop units will also have the same logo. He stated that the new gym canopy will be constructed with an ACM or metal composite wall panel. He stated that there will be dimensional letters for the entrance to the gym and then screen printed graphics.

Mr. Boyle questioned if they would be using the random pattern with the lighter brick.

Mr. Gellert confirmed that it is.

Mr. Joseph stated that they will be using the closest match that they could have to the existing brick.

Mr. Koogler questioned the parallel parking along N. Mantua.

Mr. Gellert stated that a new lane was installed as a request from the Fire Department for fire safety.

Mr. Joseph stated that this is also to provide more parking. He stated that they hated to remove the greenspace but they were told that they could no longer park cars in the fire lane. He stated that this parking will probably not be used during the day as they are expanding the student and visitor parking lots.

Ms. Susel commented that this front parking will need further review since front yard parking is prohibited under the zoning code.

Mr. Gellert reviewed the proposed field house as shown on the renderings. He stated that the field house will have locker rooms, public restrooms, training

room, concessions, and ticket booth. He stated that the color palette is similar to the gym and the rest of the schools. Mr. Gellert stated that they will be using a 4 inch high split faced block that is similar to what is under the stadium. Mr. Koogle stated that he would like to see more windows on the south elevation.

Mr. Gellert stated that there are plumbing chases all along that wall, which eliminates the ability to install more windows on that side.

Mr. Koogle stated that he feels that the south elevation is the prominent elevation as you approach the stadium. He stated that the north elevation is articulated well with openings and the south elevation is the back.

Mr. Boyle and Mr. Saxe stated landscaping will take care of that.

Mr. Koogle stated that he would like to see the Victory Bell more accessible for other sports as well.

Public Comment

None

MOTION: *In case ARB21-006, Kent City Schools, 1400 N. Mantua St., Mr. Koogle moved to recommend to Planning Commission the approval of the proposed gymnasium addition and field house building at Roosevelt High School with the following consideration:*

- 1. The south elevation of the field house be presented as more of an entrance by adding windows or some other articulation that gives a more welcoming appearance.*

Mr. Basista seconded the motion.

The motion carried 5-0.

**C. ARB21-007 KENT CITY SCHOOLS
900 DORAMOR**

The applicant is requesting review of the proposed building addition at Walls Elementary School.

Mr. Gellert stated that the one story, two classroom addition replaces a modular unit. He stated that the addition will be constructed on the southwest side of the school and isn't visible from the street. He stated that the reason for the height is due to a required fire wall. He stated that they will use matching brick.

Mr. Koogle questioned the link that connects the addition to the existing building; why are the doors setback so deep.

Mr. Gellert stated that it is due to fire separation and to achieve proper exiting.

Public Comment

None

MOTION: *In case ARB21-007, Kent City Schools, 900 Doramor, Mr. Basista moved to recommend to Planning Commission the approval of the proposed building addition at Walls Elementary School as presented.*

Mr. Saxe seconded the motion.

The motion carried 5-0.

**D. ARB21-008 GARAGE 108 / VALERIE LANDIS
108 WEST COLLEGE STREET**

The applicant is requesting review of exterior façade and signs.

Ms. Susel stated that she is receiving private chats on Zoom and cannot respond during a public meeting as they are not a part of the public record. She stated that she also cannot dismiss someone from a public meeting as is also being requested

Valerie Landis, owner Garage 108, stated that the proposed changes includes 3 garage door replacements: 2 in the back and 1 in the front. She stated that the doors that they have selected are more of a see-through design and mimic the fire department doors. She stated that they will also be replacing the windows with windows similar to the existing to maintain the integrity of the warehouse building. She stated that there are 2 large window frames in the front and 2 smaller window frames on the side at the parking lot level. She stated that they have a proposed new building sign with the business name: illuminated white letters on a track to match the building. She stated that there will be 2 signs: one in the front and one on the back. She stated that they will also touchup some of the painting, update the landscaping to make it more ADA compliant including changes to the parking lot and loading dock area.

Mr. Boyle questioned the windows that will be replaced.

Ms. Landis stated that the top level windows in the front and the side windows. She stated that the windows will have white trim to match the trim on the building.

Mr. Boyle questioned if all of the buildings have been painted.

Ms. Landis stated that they have been working with the neighboring buildings but they are not part of this request. She described the work they have done together to clean up the block.

Mr. Boyle stated that the Board has not been approving internally lit signs in the downtown area. He stated that he doesn't have an issue with the sign as long as it meets the size restrictions and is externally lit.

Ms. Landis stated that their font choice is the same as the karate studio that is close by.

Mr. Koogle questioned what they are reviewing for this project today.

Ms. Susel stated that they are reviewing the garage doors, windows, signage, and paint color for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Tipton questioned the legality of an internally lit sign in this district.

Ms. Heckman stated that internally lit signs are permitted by Codified Ordinances but, historically the ARB has not found them to be appropriate for the downtown area.

Mr. Koogle stated that he likes the new proposed overhead doors and windows. He stated that if she was coming to the Board with the building paint color prior to the building being painted, he would be opposed. He suggested that she present a different color rather than black.

Ms. Landis stated that the building color is space gray and takes on different colors based on the lighting.

Ms. Tipton stated that she likes the uniform color and that it has cleaned up the area and looks sharp. She stated that the windows and doors will look great and will work well with the gray color. She suggested making the sign that faces Haymaker Pkwy be allowed to be internally illuminated and the sign on the front be externally illuminated. She stated that she recognized that external lighting could be tricky given the location of the windows.

Mr. Basista stated that it is a great improvement. He stated that he isn't crazy about the color but unsure of what can be done.

Ms. Susel questioned whether or not two signs are permitted.

Ms. Heckman stated that because they already had a sign on the back of the building they would have allowed it, but because it has been removed, she deferred to the Assistant Law Director.

Mr. Fink stated that if it has been removed longer than 180 days, the second sign would not be allowed.

Mr. Boyle summarized that everyone seemed to be okay with the proposed doors and windows and he likes the idea of allowing an internally lit sign on the back and externally lit sign on the front. He stated that the paint color is already done.

Mr. Koogle stated that allowing a paint color because it is already done only perpetuates the next applicant to ask for forgiveness rather than permission. He stated that he would not have approved this color but it's okay if the rest of the Board likes the color.

Public Comment

None

MOTION: *In case ARB21-008, Garage 108 / Valerie Landis, 108 W. College St., Mr. Koogle moved to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the:*

- 1. Overhead doors and windows - approved as presented*
- 2. Signs – front sign by externally lit and the back sign be internally lit if it is found to be allowed under the zoning code*
- 3. Building paint – recommend a different color*

Mr. Basista seconded the motion.

Mr. Robinette, architect, suggested moving the sign to the side of the building.

After further discussion, the applicant requested to have the sign aspect of the case continued until the next meeting.

Mr. Koogle moved to withdraw the signs from the motion.

Mr. Basista seconded the amendment.

The motion carried 3-2.

Ms. Susel summarized for the applicant that the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved for the garage and window changes as presented but she must still come back to the Board to discuss the signs and an alternate paint color.

V. MEETING SUMMARIES

The April 6, 2021 Minutes will be considered at the next meeting.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Susel stated that while reviewing the proposed new zoning code, Council requested that Public Art and Exterior Paint of Buildings be brought back to Council for consideration in removing it from the ARB Design Guidelines review process. She stated that she will send the proposed changes to the Board prior to going to Council for the Board's review and comments.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: *Mr. Basista moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Koogle seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.*