

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Tuesday, July 7, 2009
Regular Meeting

Attendance: Ms. Heidi Miller, Chair; Mr. Charles Graham; Mr. James Treffinger; Mr. Bill Etson; Mr. Jaime Garrett. Absent: Mr. Frank Holloway; Mrs. Laverne Stebbins. Also present: Mr. Ryan Lee, Planner.

Motion to Excuse:

MOTION: Mr. Etson moved to excuse Mr. Holloway and Mrs. Stebbins from the meeting as each gave prior notice to staff. Mr. Treffinger seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

Approval of Minutes:

MOTION: Mr. Treffinger moved to approve the Board of Architectural Review minutes of June 2, 2009 as written. Mr. Garrett seconded motion. The motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

NEW BUSINESS

Sona Centerville LLC (LA Tan) - Major Site Plan

Mr. Lee stated this Major Site Plan review is for the major components directly following the Minor Site Plan that was reviewed last month by the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) concerning the landscape area to the north as well as the curbing and fence that was approved. Since that time, the fence has been installed along the north property line of 235 and 255 West Franklin Street as well as the majority of the landscaping has been completed. The area on the eastern side is awaiting engineering drawings to make sure the correct grade is achieved prior to the installation of the plantings. Also, the northern curb line has not been established or built out at this time.

The Planning Department was unable to review a complete application as a result of this Major Site Plan request. There were deficiencies with the submitted civil site plans, which depicted a different site layout than that of the submitted architectural site plan; as well as revised building architectural elevations being submitted with less than sufficient time for staff to respond to the proposed changes.

It was, therefore, staff's recommendation to table the request pending submission of additional information.

Mr. Graham asked if the only concern was that of not having the engineering drawings in order for this project to move forward the review process.

Mr. Lee stated there are additional staff concerns with architecture, grading, etc., however, with revised drawings forthcoming some of those concerns might be alleviated.

Mr. Randy Plikerd, project architect, stated he had been working on this project only over the last 6 months. He stated the contracts for the project were "let" and they were ready to begin work when the City cancelled the permits.

Ms. Miller stated it was the Board's understanding the applicant had been notified several times that the approvals would expire on a certain date.

Mr. Plikerd stated he had no knowledge of that notice of expiration. He stated he had never been involved in a project where construction was in progress and the permits were cancelled.

Ms. Miller stated the City has not had to exercise that standard in at least 30+ years or possibly never in its history as a City.

Mr. Plikerd stated they want to understand why the permits were cancelled as the City had caused the project to be delayed. He stated the cancellation of permits was not necessary.

Mr. Lee stated the City did contact the applicant on several occasions to inform them of the expiration date of the approval drawing near.

Mr. Plikerd stated he never saw a permit cancelled.

Mr. Lee stated in his years with the City, he never had an issue with an applicant not responding to warnings that approvals were going to expire. He stated every approval and permit the City issues has an expiration date if construction has not been completed or if an extension of time is not sought. The notification by the City gives that opportunity to the applicant, and in this case, the applicant did not follow through and the approval/permit expired. That being the case, that is the reason the project is in the current situation.

Mr. Plikerd stated this delay is unfortunate and will cost the applicant a substantial amount of time and money as a result.

Mr. Lee stated he and Mr. Feverston met with Mr. Tom Otachel, Sona Centerville LLC, earlier today. They discussed the possibility of allowing additional grading to be done and curbing to be installed on the eastern portion of the site and a base coat of asphalt at 235 West Franklin Street. The final cost of asphalt would be delayed until the Major Site Plan is reviewed by the BAR and the revised engineering drawings are submitted. He stated if the members wanted to allow that process to occur, the project could continue to move forward contingent on the City receiving the engineering documents.

Mr. Otachel stated he was made aware during the meeting with staff that the application would most likely be tabled at the recommendation of staff. He stated he would like to move forward with some of the site work prior to the next BAR meeting so another month does not disappear and nothing is accomplished on the site.

Mr. Lee stated the work that could be done would only include the base coat of the parking area and the eastern curb line to connect to the neighboring property. Any other improvements would have to be delayed until review of the Major Site Plan.

MOTION: Ms. Miller moved to table the Major Site Plan Application #98 submitted by Sona Centerville, LLC for property located at 235/255 West Franklin Street with the following comment:

Any work that can be done including the base coat to the parking area at 235 West Franklin Street and the east curb line will be permitted contingent on revised engineering drawings being submitted and subject to approval by staff for said work to move forward. The purpose of this allowance is to keep the project in progress until the next regular BAR meeting.

Mr. Graham seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0.

Century 21 Elite Performance - Temporary Sign

Mr. Lee reviewed Application #126 submitted by Tom Fitzgibbon for Century 21 Elite Performance located at 211 West Franklin Street in the Architectural Preservation District (APD) seeking approval for temporary signage. He stated a few years ago the applicant requested approval of a permanent ground sign at which time one of the conditions of that approval was the background color must conform to the approved color chart. The applicant is now requesting approval of a temporary sign to be located in the front of his property prior to an event scheduled to be held this month. It is the intent of the applicant to display this sign for the month of July until the event has taken place on July 23rd. The sign is to be a 12 square foot banner sign attached to 2 freestanding posts. Because the type of sign is a banner style, it requires review and approval by the BAR. The proposed sign has a vibrant yellow background with a very "busy" black lettering design.

Staff recommended approval of the of the application subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed yellow copy color shall match the background of the permanent ground sign subject to approval by the City Planning Department.
2. The Board of Architectural Review (BAR) shall approve any temporary sign to assure that the sign type, design, materials, size and color guidelines compliment the premises of which it is proposed. Specifically, the BAR must approve the 12 square foot size and banner style temporary signage.
3. Final location of temporary signage shall be subject to approval by the City Planning Department.

Mr. Lee stated in a conversation today with a representative of the applicant, it was clarified the yellow background color will match that of the permanent sign.

Mr. Garrett asked how the sign would be situated in the front yard.

Mr. Lee stated the sign will be a double-sided sign placed perpendicular to the street.

Ms. Miller asked what type of sign posts were proposed.

Mr. Lee stated he did not yet see the sign posts to be used, however, in conversations with the applicant's representative the intent is for the banner to be stretched over metal posts and the posts will not be visible.

Mr. Garrett stated he did not want the sign secured with strings like a volleyball net affect.

The members agreed they did not like the design of the sign as it was not appropriate with the characteristics of the building or the APD. Further, they did not feel a precedent should be set in allowing these types of temporary signs since standards have been adopted to allow daily temporary signs to be displayed not exceeding 6 square feet, 4 feet in height, and within 15 feet of the main entrance to the business.

MOTION: Mr. Etson moved to deny Application #126 submitted by Tom Fitzgibbon for Century 21 Elite Performance, 211 West Franklin Street, requesting approval of a temporary sign. The members suggest the applicant resubmit a revised application for a temporary sign with the following changes:

1. The sign area shall not exceed 6 square feet.
2. The sign structure shall be something other than a banner type sign.
3. The sign shall be of a professional design with a simple, legible design.

Mr. Graham seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0.

POLL OF MEMBERS

Ms. Miller advised the members she would not be in attendance at the August meeting.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Charles M. Graham". The signature is written in dark ink on a light-colored background.