

**CITY OF KENT
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
October 6, 2020**

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

STAFF PRESENT: Eric Fink, Assistant Law Director
 Bridget Susel, Community Development Director
 Heather Heckman, Development Planner
 Jennifer Barone, Development Engineer

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Boyle at 3:04 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Howard Boyle, Dennis Saxe, Bridget Tipton, David Basista, and Kevin Koogle 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. ARB20-015 KENT SOCIAL SERVICES
 1066 SOUTH WATER STREET**

The applicant is requesting review of the proposed renovations and addition to the building.

Luke Kraft, DS Architecture, explained the project to the Board. He stated that the exterior is designed to look like a store and restaurant. He stated that they are using the dark brick from the existing structure to create the entry. He added that they will also use fiber cement lap siding. Mr. Kraft stated that the renovations will provide a better front presence off of the street. He stated that they will be installing new pavement, as well as reducing the overall amount of pavement where the dining room addition and garden will be located. Mr. Kraft showed examples of the building materials.

Mr. Boyle stated that he likes the idea of the bus looping around the building to drop off people close to the building as well as the outside seating. He stated that the building is attractive and they have done a wonderful job with the renovation design.

Mr. Saxe stated that he does not have any questions.

Ms. Tipton stated that she likes that the entry way is very prominent and feels that it is well done.

Mr. Basista stated that he feels that it is a great improvement to the building.

Mr. Koogle stated that he also feels that it is a great improvement, although he is not a fan of the single wedge design of the main entrance.

**MOTION: Ms. Tipton moved in case ARB20-015, Kent Social Services, 1066 South Water Street to recommend to Planning Commission approval of the project as presented 10/6/2020.
Mr. Saxe seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.**

**B. ARB20-016 KENT APARTMENTS
227 FRANKLIN AVENUE**

The applicant is requesting review of the proposed new apartment building.

Adam Prtenjak, LDA Architects, 5000 Euclid Ave, Suite 104, Cleveland, presented the project. He stated that the shape of the windows on the building allows them to take advantage of the sunlight and views of the downtown area and river. He stated that they have pulled the colors and materials from what has already been used in this area; reflects but does not copy. Mr. Prtenjak explained that the bottom few feet of the building are a sand color stone base for salt and water protection and grounding. He stated that the building will be a darker base brick with a slightly lighter brick banding going across each floor level line for contrast. He stated that there will also be a courtyard space between the building and the Hasawi's building to the north that will provide some amenities for the tenants.

Mr. Boyle questioned the materials in between the bay window areas.

Mr. Prtenjak stated that the materials are a type of faux wood with a similar tone.

Mr. Boyle questioned the cap of the building.

Mr. Prtenjak stated that it is a different color of brick banding with a very slight profile.

Mr. Boyle stated that he understands that the windows are designed to take in the views of the Cuyahoga River and the downtown, but feels that the building cap could be a little more prominent.

Mr. Koogle stated that the style does not fit with the style of the district as prescribed in the design guidelines with regards to the form and the massing of the building. He stated that he feels that the cap should have a continuous form. He stated that the form does not fit into the context of the district.

Mr. Basista stated that he agrees with Mr. Koogle that it is a digression from the architecture in the general area. He stated that the colors will stand out from the rest of the area but not in a good way; does not fit in with this location.

Ms. Tipton stated that she likes the reinterpretation of the windows and how it connects to the historical industrial forms. She stated that while this form doesn't exist in the district currently, she doesn't feel that they are being introduced in a way that is offensive. She feels that the wood is an interesting choice of material. Ms. Tipton stated that the way the wood material is applied on the forms makes sense. She feels that if there was a continuous cap around the top of the building it would not make sense. Ms. Tipton questioned how the shutter awning is being applied.

Mr. Prtenjak stated that the idea was that there was going to be some type of a sun shade awning for the top balconies. He clarified that the wood material would run vertical.

Mr. Saxe asked for clarification of the soldier course.

Mr. Prtenjak stated that the line drawings are a little outdated and the rendering are the truest to form. He stated that they are planning on a 2 course horizontal brick band that is a slightly different brick and color.

Mr. Saxe stated that he feels that this is a good idea as it will give the building more horizontal emphasis. Mr. Saxe suggested making all of the parapets one height and feels that this would help give a more horizontal look.

Mr. Prtenjak stated that they had considered this but felt it looked less fine-tuned.

Mr. Boyle stated that he feels that the building is not unattractive and he likes the colors but he is not sure he likes where the building is at.

Mr. Koogle stated that he doesn't feel that the detailing is the issue at all; it is the overall form and context of this building and where it sits. He stated that

the baseline is Franklin Avenue and the train depot (Treno) as far as the colors and style of buildings in this district. He stated that using the newer buildings as style references just takes proposed buildings farther from the baseline. He stated that he feels that this design is a complete turn away from the design guidelines.

Ms. Tipton stated that the design guidelines didn't take a 6 story building into consideration; difficult to compare this structure to the train depot. She stated that she doesn't feel that this has to conform to additional standards that are not written in the design guidelines regarding Franklin Avenue.

Mr. Boyle disagreed but he understands her point.

Ms. Tipton stated that she feels that they have demonstrated elements from the design guidelines. She stated that the saw toothed form is not in the design guidelines but there are elements of other newer buildings such as the curved corners that are also not in the guidelines.

Mr. Koogle stated that he is not objecting to the saw tooth form but feels that it starts to diverge from the horizontality of the guidelines; it makes it difficult to use a continuous cap and other items that are spelled out.

Steve Jennings, LDA Architects, stated that they have tried to implement the previous comments from the Board by refining the details.

Tim Dean, representative for Clairmont, stated that he feels that this is a beautiful building and would be an asset to downtown Kent. He stated that they are working with the city to improve the cinder parking lot. Mr. Dean stated that he feels that this is a 500% improvement over what Fairmount previously had approved for this project.

MOTION: *Ms. Tipton moved in case ARB20-016, Kent Apartments, 127 Franklin Avenue to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the renderings as presented but not the line drawings.*
Motion died due to lack of a second.

Mr. Boyle stated that while there are many good things about this design such as the colors and materials, there doesn't seem to be much support for it at this time. He stated that for many this is an extremely important location and they would like for this building to be something very special. He stated that this is a very nice building but this is not the location for it. He added that the Board is willing to work with them.

Ms. Susel stated that the Board members should be specific with their suggestions to guide the applicant.

Mr. Boyle suggested a more acceptable general window pattern.

Ms. Tipton stated that the Ametek building does not have a continuous roof band (displayed image on her screen for the group to see) and the curved portion of the building breaks the band in a dramatic way. She stated that she feels that part of what the Board members are asking for has already been done.

Mr. Dean asked if they should be looking at what they had approved for Fairmount as their guideline.

Mr. Prtenjak showed a picture of what was previously approved and stated that he doesn't feel that it is much different than what is being proposed.

Mr. Boyle stated that he feels that they can do better.

Mr. Prtenjak commented that he would have hoped for these types of comment at the informal review.

Mr. Boyle stated that he feels that the building should have a cap, regular lined windows, and be more traditional.

Mr. Koogler stated that horizontality of the building is important similar to the Ametek and Davey buildings, which also fit with the context of the district.

Mr. Fink explained the applicant's options.

Mr. Dean stated that they would like to continue the case to the next meeting.

**C. ARB20-017 EACH + EVERY MURAL
156 NORTH WATER STREET**

The applicant is requesting review of the proposed mural.

Alex Cantonese, Each + Every, presented the updated mural design. He stated that the concept for the abstract mural derives from the river and some of the local architecture. He explained that they lowered the height of the mural to align with the wood façade on the front of the building as well as changed the color palette and forms. He stated that the colors presented will be matched with Sherwin Williams exterior paint. He added that they will also be addressing some of the mortar on the side to provide a smooth surface for the mural.

Ms. Tipton stated that she is in support of this mural and feels that it will be a great addition. She stated that she appreciates that the content is different from the others and also likes the idea of the custom blends of colors as described. She stated that she feels that it will be an improvement.

Mr. Basista asked if the remainder of the side of the building will also be painted.

Mr. Cantonese stated that there is that potential to be painted or at least cleaned up.

Mr. Basista stated that he likes the arches portion of the design but is unsure about the railroad/river portion. He added that he like the colors.

Mr. Saxe stated that the river/railroad portion should possibly weave through the arches. He stated that the colors are good.

Mr. Boyle stated that he likes the colors as well. Mr. Boyle questioned the width of the alley and stated that the majority of people coming up North Water Street will not see it. Mr. Boyle stated that he likes that they started the mural after the façade. Mr. Boyle added that he would like to see the entire side of the building be painted.

Nate Mucha, building owner, stated that they currently have permits to start construction and at the very least, they will be repointing the entire side of the building due to run-off damage. He stated that the alley is 8 feet wide.

Mr. Koogle stated that he would also like to see the rest of the side of the building be repaired and repainted. Mr. Koogle stated that he likes the arches across the bottom and that it is less abstract than the previous version. He also likes that the cornerstone of the building was left as its own element. He questioned the dark rectangle.

The Board discussed the size of the mural and how to adjust the dark rectangle.

Mr. Cantonese stated that it is part of the arch and added as a dark color to bring some weight to the top of the mural. He stated that they can refer to the artist to make a decision on changing that color.

Mr. Boyle clarified that they would square off the dark rectangle and lighten it and bring the water back around.

Stephanie Brewer, the mural artist, stated that she can do that.

MOTION: Ms. Tipton moved in case ARB20-017, Each + Every Mural, 156 North Water Street, to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the mural as discussed with a softened or reduction of the dark rectangle.

Mr. Koogle seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

V. MEETING SUMMARIES

MOTION: *Ms. Tipton moved to approve the September 15, 2020 Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes as presented.*
Mr. Koogle seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-1. Mr. Basista abstained.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: *Mr. Basista moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Saxe seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.*