March 16, 2012

To: Members of the Municipal Planning Commission
Members of the Architectural Review Board

From: Lynda Bitar, Development Coordinator

Subject: Staff Memo for the Meeting of March 22, 2012

B. Architectural Review Board

1. New

a. Wall Sign, Awning and ATM with Sign – **6851 N. High St.** (Sign Vision Company/Huntington National Bank) **AR 15-12**

Findings of fact:

1. The freestanding, wall and directional signs for this Huntington bank branch were approved in February to be replaced. The new ATM cover was not previously approved, so is now part of this application. Also, a new awning and additional wall sign are proposed.

2. The ATM cover, which is already in place, is primarily lime green with dark gray at the top and bottom. The cover includes the word "Welcome" and a honeycomb pattern in white. A variance would be required for an additional wall sign.

3. Also, an internally illuminated box sign is proposed near the new entry door on the southeast face of the building. The proposed sign has the lime green logo with "Huntington" in white, and has a gray strip at the bottom identifying Huntington Wealth Advisors. A variance would be required for an additional wall sign.

4. An internally illuminated lime green awning is proposed above the new entry door.

5. All of the bollards will be painted white per a previous approval.

Conclusions:

1. The additional graphics on the ATM cover are not typical for the District.

2. A small non-illuminated sign identifying the wealth advisors entrance without the Huntington logo may be more appropriate than an internally illuminated box sign.

3. Illuminated awnings are not typically approved by the Board. Down-lighting would be more appropriate if illumination is necessary.

The following motion should be denied unless changes are made based on the above conclusions:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SIGN VISION COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A SIGN AND AWNING, AND RETAIN AN ATM COVER AT 6851 N. HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 15-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 15-12, DATED MARCH 9, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

b. Roof, Front Porch Alterations, Front Door and Paint – **764 Morning St**. (Scarborough LLC) **AR 16-12**

Findings of fact:

1. This house has recently been purchased by the applicant, who has already been cleaning the property inside and out, and may have the roof replaced by the time of the ARB hearing due to leaking. The proposed roof consists of dimensional shingles which are weathered wood in color.

2. In addition to the new roof, a new front door is proposed. The door material is not identified, but the look will be a wood-grain 6 panel door.

3. The front porch has a concrete base and metal supports for the roof. A wood floor and 6" x 6" wood posts are proposed.

4. Gray paint with white trim is proposed for the house, which is currently yellow and brown.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed changes will enhance the appearance of the house.

Approval of the following motion is recommended:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SCARBOROUGH LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE ROOF AND FRONT DOOR, ALTER THE FRONT PORCH, AND PAINT THE HOUSE AT 764 MORNING ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 16-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 16-12, DATED MARCH 12, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

c. Replace Front Porch – **307 E. Granville Rd.** (Paul Norman/Roehrer) **AR 17-12**

Findings of fact:

1. Composite material is proposed to replace the existing front porch floor and railing.

2. The new railing will be gray with white trim.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed replacement is an improvement.

Approval of the following motion is recommended:

THAT THE REQUEST BY PAUL NORMAN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE FRONT PORCH AT 307 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 17-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 17-12, DATED MARCH 13, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

a. Additional Multi-Family Building – **835 Proprietors Rd.** (Simsbury Investments) **ADP 01-12**

Findings of fact:

1. Background:

   After demolition of existing Worthington Foods offices, combination of lots into a single parcel, and rezoning to multi-family residential, a Development Plan was approved for this site in 2005. The plan included 2 three-story buildings with parking on the first floor that were to be mirror images of each other. Each building was to have a footprint of roughly 13,600 square foot (sf), and have 16 units ranging in size from 950 – 1530 sf. After approval, the southern building was constructed as proposed, with the intent of selling the units as condominiums. A downturn in the market left the building vacant for several years, until the current owner purchased the property at the end of 2010, and finished and rented the units. Although Franklin County shows the property as two taxing parcels, separation of parcels was never approved by the City, so this is still considered one development. The owners are aware and willing to combine the parcels.

2. Request:

   The property owner would like to construct a second building with the same number of units as were originally proposed, but a smaller footprint (9576 sf) and surface parking rather than covered parking on the first level. The proposed 16 units will range in size from 993 – 1347 sf. When the development was originally approved, a variance was granted to allow 32 units on the site. Also, a variance was granted for exceeding the maximum percentage of lot coverage by buildings, so a smaller footprint would lessen that variance.

3. Building:

   The building has been designed to be complimentary to the existing, using the same materials and basic design features. Whereas, the existing building is constructed primarily of brick with limited use of Hardieplank lap siding, the proposed will include a more prominent use of the siding. Brick detailing, roof shingles, trim, colors, windows, doors, railings and ridge vents are proposed in the same style as those on the existing building. It appears the ridge of the hipped roof on the proposed building is about 3' higher than the existing building, but the roof height still falls within the maximum height allowed by Code. In addition to four living units, a lobby, storage units and dumpster room are proposed for the first floor. Six units each are proposed for the second and third floors.

4. Parking:

   In addition to parking between the buildings, twenty-four head-in parking spaces are proposed at the north end of the property. Variances will be required for placement of the parking lot in the front yard setback and not having the required distance between drive entrances. Five Honeylocust trees are proposed for islands in and around the asphalt parking area, but an additional tree may be needed to meet the Code requirement when considering the existing parking on the site. The parking lots will be illuminated with building mounted 150 watt metal halide fixtures. The style has not been identified. A photometric plan has been submitted showing lighting levels between 0.0 and 9.2 footcandles. Typically, the level should be 0.0 at the property lines.

5. Landscaping /Site Plan:

   Norway and Colorado Blue Spruce trees are proposed along the west edge of the property as a buffer for the residential properties behind. Landscaping around the rest of the site is similar to what was approved previously, including decorative fencing approved for placement in the front yard setback. An entry sign to match the existing is proposed at the entrance to the new parking lot. Two signs were previously approved for the site, so this sign would be the second rather than being at the drive between the buildings. A gazebo between the buildings, approved for placement in the rear yard

setback, is still proposed. Placement of condensing units has not been identified. For the first building, a variance was granted for the units to be in the front yard setback.

Conclusions:

1. The proposed amendment will not substantially change the character of the development.

2. The proposed variances are not substantial.

Approval of the following motion is recommended:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SIMSBURY INVESTMENTS TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 835 PROPRIETORS RD. BY ALTERING THE BUILDING AND SITE DESIGN AS PER CASE NO. ADP 01-12, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 01-12, DATED MARCH 9, 2012, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.