MINUTES



HISTORIC DOWNTOWN ADVISORY COMMISSION

Village Green Municipal Building, Council Chambers 47 Hall Street Tuesday, April 28, 2015 6:15 P.M.

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Called to order: 6:15PM

Present: Tom Coffey, Larry Coolidge, marge Bennett, Deb Howell

Not present: Richard Fusch

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (March 19, 2015)

Approved

• Wait on November 20, 2014 minutes.

3. STAFF ITEMS

No items from staff

4. HEARING OF VISITORS FOR ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA

None

5. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

Applicant:

Sean Snyder

Location:

Lincoln Street

Existing Zoning:

DB, Downtown Business District

Request:

To review a final development plan for a proposed two building office

development on 1.05 acres at the request of the Planning and Zoning

Commission.

- Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) requested HDAC to review the application.
- Applicant's architect gave an overview of the office development.
- Staff Report:
 - Project has been through P&Z several times. At this point it is approved by P&Z pending HDAC review and comments. HDAC comments will be incorporated before going to council.
 - o The proposal consists of two office buildings along Lincoln Street. They will be used primarily for office with some warehouse storage space. This proposal has final approval by P&Z but comments from HDAC are necessary before advancing to City Council.
 - o Powell Architectural Guidelines:
 - Style:
 - Project is in line with 'stick' style appropriate for Powell Downtown.
 - Materials:
 - Following the stick style, building materials proposed do match guidelines.
 - Site considerations:
 - Proposal follows guidelines "rural character".
 - In terms of lot coverage, this proposal uses the least amount possible,

- following architectural guidelines. The parking lot meets minimum standards established by city code.
- Landscaping is designed to soften the access point. Landscaping is also present throughout the site.
 - Street trees will be present in the buffer between road and sidewalk. The proposal places them closer than PAG's recommended 25' apart. However, the closer grouping masks the larger scale of the buildings.
 - o A variety of tree species will be used.
- Lighting fixtures:
 - Fixtures are atypical
 - Shields are recommended on security lights to prevent light bleed.
- Signage
 - Proposed signs meet guidelines in terms of graphics, but the main sign is too big. PAG states that signs should be 12 sq. ft. The proposed is 24 sq. ft.
 - Given the larger building, a larger sign might be more in scale.
 - Proposed signs are aluminum, wood is preferred.
- New construction
 - Proposal meets recommendations set forth for new construction.
 - Roof: consistent with PAG.
 - Material: Staff defers to architectural advisor for siding material.
 - Foundation: foundation is not exposed as is typical. However, this is not a PAG requirement.
 - Windows: applicant proposes vinyl windows whereas wood is preferred.
 Window style is appropriate and the proposed building features many windows. HDAC should consider these windows.
 - Doors: Steel doors are proposed for the garage section. Defer to architectural advisor. Door trim meets guidelines.
 - Garage Doors: No PAG guideline. Defer to architectural advisor.
 - Details: cornices, gutters, and trim, all meet requirements.
- Closing comments: The applicant has done a good job meeting requirements. The stick style, barn looking, proposal matches the proposed use and neighboring downtown buildings. Staff recommends that HDAC make its recommendations and allow this proposal to move forward to City Council.
- Following the staff report, Larry Coolidge asked if there was any criteria in the PAG
 regarding wall lengths. Chris Meyers and Rocky Kambo both answered that there are no
 dimensions in the PAG, but that the PAG generally states that long walls are not
 appropriate.

Architectural Advisor:

- Opening comment: applicant has worked in good faith with P&Z. Significant changes have been made throughout that process. As a result, building placement and scale has been negotiate to meet both P&Z and the applicant's needs.
- o The delivery and truck turn radii were a defining component of the design. This somewhat dictated the placement and size of the buildings. The proposal used to have an additional building and were of larger scale.
- o The context of the site is different than the main four corners. We have to look at the building with understanding that it has a different location. It is still important but may require a different type of review with the same level of scrutiny.

- Windows: The architectural advisor noted that his window has been used in other
 Downtown locations. He noted that altering the mutton grid to a six-over-one or a two-over-one with a four pane transom. He believes this grid closer resembles the PAG.
- o Dock door: Suggested changing the color to red. White door will show wear much more prominently. This will add to the longevity of the doors.
- Landscaping: Generously places plantings along the south of the property. Density and scale of plantings will help to reduce the scale of the building. Which is a positive for the neighbor to the south of the site. Plantings along sidewalk are a good example of connectivity.
- o Long wall: The architectural advisor noted that the applicant has added significant details to this façade from the original proposal. They've used the roof line, plantings, and windows to help break up the length.
- o Lighting: Along with the gooseneck fixtures, given the location and nature of business, the advisor noted that the security lights seem appropriate.
- Siding: Given the forum and function of the proposed building, the architectural advisor believes that the use of aluminum siding is appropriate. He mentioned that aluminum lap siding would be inappropriate.
 - This is a pole barn style building not stick frame building construction. As a result, the construction method does not allow for exposed foundation.
 - The horizontal trim band should be the same around the building.
 - Add a gable vent on the rear (east) elevation
- Signage: The architectural advisor believes the signage should meet PAG required maximum size. This is especially true given that it is not a retail store or destination. People coming here know they are coming there. Maybe a graphic or logo on their entry.
- Advisor mentioned that real material samples would be helpful but in this case they may be putting together these details.
- o It was mentioned that these are not working drawings but it is headed in direction that is appropriate and is in line with PAG.
- o Construction documents would be the last piece to have a full recommendation. However, this could be a staff review once the documents are completed.

Public Comment:

- o Comments by: Terry Doodan, 162 W Olentangy St.
 - Owns property south of the subject proposal.
 - Believes proposal is a warehouse not office.
 - Said that the design is to the lowest common denominator. Not building to the preferred requirements, only barely meeting requirements.
 - Said that this is not an acceptable use in the downtown.
 - Asked about the loading dock. Whether it is at grade or lower.
 - Had issues with truck traffic and the number of trucks coming to site.
 - Mentioned the right of way vacation by the city.
 - Staff clarified the dimensions and purpose of the vacation.
- o Comments by: Bill Eddy, 140 W Olentangy St.
 - Bill expressed concern about delivery trucks bound for the proposed office turning on to Lincoln Street. Bill's comments center on conflict between drivers exiting the Traditions development meeting a truck making a tight turn.
 - Additionally, Bill mentioned signage. He does not believe signage size should be scalable to the building. They should all conform to the listed size requirements within the PAG.
 - The business owner also mentioned that they had concerns with the material of the building.

- o Comments by: Sean Snyder, Applicant
 - Stated that he likes the look of Powell, has been a part of Powell for many years.
 - His business is growing and he wants the space for his personal items as well.
 - There will be limited truck traffic. To one truck per month.
 - Mr. Snyder responded to truck traffic concerns by stating that his trucks are the same as those delivering to Downtown businesses. They'll also be delivering at a much lesser rate than those Downtown.
 - He mentioned that materials change over time. Where you can get the same look but with a better quality and more durable material.
 - Going to do same wood brackets as Auto Assets.
 - Wants to put business in Powell.
 - The site is next to the railroad. It is not the best site. Going to improve a site that may have sat unused for many years.
 - Breaking up the types of materials on the buildings. Different on the front from the back and sides. Mr. Snyder noted the main office structure will be comprised of hearty plank while the storage area is planned to be clad in aluminum siding.
- o Comments by: Ron Oman, Owner of The Collection
 - Spent a lot of time redoing The Collection building and trying to keep it historic.
 - Like to see a sample of the siding for the proposed building.
 - Concerned about the trees on the east side of the applicants site.
 - Wants to keep his property completely historic.

HDAC Comments:

- o The chairperson mentioned that commercial in the downtown is needed. That the applicant should stay in Powell and that his property is somewhat in the industrial part of downtown.
- o Deb Howell
 - Asked about the truck routes. The applicant mentioned that the trucks would schedule times for delivery.
 - Sees the proposal as a great asset to Powell.
 - Would like more details and samples.
- o Larry Coolidge
 - Would like to see the exact detail and sizes of brackets.
 - Like to see a samples, especially the standing seem material/color.
 - Liked the half round gutter and bracket details.
 - Like to see a break in the long walls. Would help to soften the look.
 - There are some warehouses in the district.
 - Would like to see a break between the warehouse and office part of the building.
 - The windows above look out of place for something in Powell.
 - Deb Howell agreed with this point.
 - Larry suggested narrowing the transom windows.
 - The applicant's designer stated that the rendering was larger than the actual windows, which would be 2 feet x 6 feet.
 - Would like proportionate drawings on the brackets.
 - Would like to see a hardiplank around the building not metal siding.

- Marge Bennett
 - Would like to see board and baton siding samples.
 - Agrees with everything in general that has been said
 - A great thing in Powell.
 - A good barrier between the railroad and other uses.
- o Tom Coffey
 - Best project seen for this site.
 - Tom clarified with staff that there is no approval, just comments for P&Z and Council.
 - Windows: 2 over 1 or 2 over 2 windows are appropriate. Does not have problem with band windows.
 - Change window gridding to match architectural advisor recommendations
 - Overhead door would like to see a different color than white, maybe grey.
 - Use of the wall pack would be okay, but need to consider shields.
 - Would like to see the band continued around the building at the same level.
 - Add a gable vent.
 - Is okay with the large size of the signage. A smaller sign would get lost in the large building.
 - Siding: Would like board and baton and not metal siding.
 - Would like to see a full set of working drawings, with dimensions and samples.
- Commission asked staff to clarify the motion and purpose of their review.
 - Staff provided the HDAC with two options. 1) To provide comments, have them incorporated into the design, reviewed by staff and then passed long council or 2) To provide comments, have them incorporated into the design, and then brought back to HDAC for review.
- Larry Coolidge made a motion that to have the applicant incorporate comments by HDAC into the building plans to include the details listed in the minutes and along with samples, resubmit for a second HDAC review.
 - o Deb Howell seconds.
 - o Approved unanimously.

6. OTHER COMMISSION BUSINESS

Staff updated HDAC on the current status of the Comprehensive Plan Update.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Next Meeting: TBD

DATE MINUTES APPROVED: