I. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order by Mr. Boyle at 4:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL
Howard Boyle, Dennis Saxe, David Basista, Kevin Koogle, and Bridget Tipton 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. ARB20-010 WOODSY’S MUSIC, INC.
118 East Main Street

The applicant is requesting a review of the proposed signs.

Paul Braden, 118 E. Main St., presented the amended signs for the Board’s review. Mr. Braden stated that they have adjusted the verbiage as previously requested as well as updated the background and logos.

Mr. Boyle stated that while he appreciates Mr. Braden’s work and the new verbiage, he feels that the size of the sign should match the neighboring sign. He stated that he feels that the size of the logo detracts from the rest of the sign.

Mr. Braden stated that the new logo stems from the original stain glass’s fleur de lis. He stated that he can change the look of the design somewhat but they added the fleur de lis to mimic the other signs. Mr. Braden stated that the Troy Grille sign is 8’ x 3’ where their signs are 7’ x 4’ each. He noted that the sign that was previously approved for the rear was also 7’ x 4’.
Mr. Koogle questioned the chances of both tenant signs having the same proportions.

Mr. Braden stated that he has offered to share the expense of changing the sign with the Troy Grille owner but he first needs to know what the cost of his new sign is going to be. Mr. Braden stated that the Troy Grille sign is not currently symmetrical vertically between the windows.

Mr. Boyle stated that he would like to see the proposed text on a 3’ x 8’ sign that would match Troy Grille.

Mr. Braden stated that he feels that the sign he is offering looks much better than what is next door.

Mr. Basista stated that he likes the look of the sign but he would also like to see the front signs match dimensionally. He feels that it would be a much better presentation.

Mr. Boyle stated that he feels that the sign in the back appears to be too large.

Mr. Basista agreed that it does appear to be oversized.

Mr. Braden stated that it is the same size as the sign that has been on the building for the last 25 years.

Mr. Koogle stated that he doesn’t feel that the rear sign needs to relate to the sign on the front of the building. He stated that regretfully the Woodsy’s signs are being based on the Troy Grille’s existing sign. Mr. Koogle stated that it would be good if both tenants came before the Board with a plan for both signs. He concluded that he would like to see both signs match.

Mr. Braden stated that the rendering of the rear sign looked big to him too and he isn’t sure that the rendering is correct. He stated that he will mark off the sign area on the building to give an accurate representation.

Ms. Tipton stated that she likes the reference to the stained glass but also feels that the fleur de lis is too prominent to the name; the name should be the first and largest. Ms. Tipton feels that the trim on the sign makes it a nicer sign than the Troy Grille sign but would like to see the outside proportions be the same as the neighboring sign. She stated that she also feels that the rear sign needs to be a little smaller. She stated that she likes the amended sign better in terms of the typography and design more than the original sign.

Mr. Saxe stated that he agrees that the sign should match the size of the Troy Grille sign but definitely feels that they should keep the trim.
MOTION: In case ARB20-010, Woodsy’s Music, Inc., 118 East Main Street, Mr. Koogle moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the signs with the following conditions:

- The overall proportion of the front sign to match the proportions of the Troy Grille sign, which is 8’ x 3’
- The rear sign will be 7’ x 4’ or smaller
- The verbiage of the sign as presented today

Mr. Braden stated that Ms. Tipton has some good ideas regarding the fleur de lis and he would like to make some adjustments. He stated that his issue is with the 8’ wide sign not being symmetrical and also not being what he wants for his sign; he feels that he won’t be able to fill the space. Mr. Braden stated that he would like to revise and bring it back to the Board after he speaks with Troy Grille to see if they are willing to make changes. He stated that he doesn’t want to sacrifice his sign just to make them match.

Ms. Tipton seconded the motion.

The applicant requested his case be continued to the August meeting but asked if the rear sign could be approved.

MOTION: In case ARB20-010, Woodsy’s Music, Inc., 118 East Main Street, Mr. Koogle moved to amend the previous motion to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the rear sign as presented or smaller.

Ms. Tipton seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

MOTION: In case ARB20-010, Woodsy’s Music, Inc., 118 East Main Street, Mr. Koogle moved to continue the case until the August 4, 2020 meeting.

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

B. ARB20-011 CITY OF KENT
   164 NORTH WATER STREET

The applicant is requesting a review of the proposed construction banner.

Harrison Wicks reviewed the construction banner as presented. He stated that the North Water Street Improvement Project will commence later this year.

Cait Giambroni, Each + Every, explained the artwork for the banner.

Jim Bowling, City Engineer, stated that the construction will begin in August 2020. He stated that they are entering into a contract with the contractor and will have their pre-construction meeting within the next 2-3 weeks.
MOTION: In case ARB20-011, City of Kent, 164 North Water Street, Ms. Tipton moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction banner as presented.

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

C. ARB20-012 DUNKIN DONUTS
1625 SOUTH WATER STREET

The applicant is requesting a review of the proposed new business.

Elizabeth Eaken with Metis Construction, reviewed the proposed Dunkin Donuts building and signs as presented. Ms. Eaken stated that the photographs provided are of another structure owned by the same franchisee, which would be the same as what they would construct at this location. Ms. Eaken stated that the main sign includes a message board at the bottom and explained that typically the owner only changes the sign for morning, lunch, and evening.

Mr. Boyle questioned what is in the flat roofed area of the building.

Ms. Eaken stated that the mechanical units are located on the roof and the freezer/coolers are inside.

Ms. Basista stated that he feels that the flat roofed area of the building is out of proportion with the rest of the building. He also stated that it looks like a service area.

Mr. Boyle stated that he feels that the flat roofed area of the building should not be on the south end of the building.

Ms. Eaken stated that the function of the store dictates the shape of the building. She stated that they cannot flip the building from a practical and functional standpoint.

Mr. Boyle questioned if they have considered the impact if Stated Route 261 were to be reduced to a two lane road.

Ms. Eaken stated that she is unaware of this but will check with the City Engineer.

Mr. Koogle questioned if the roof forms could be flipped without impacting the interior function of the building.

Ms. Eaken stated that they can look at flipping the gable and the tower.

Mr. Koogle stated that he would like to see the flat roofed portion of the building lowered if at all possible. He feels that it overshadows the gable roof.
Mr. Basista noted the plain brick on the west side of the flat roofed area, which makes it look like warehouse or a gym.

Mr. Koogle questioned the location of the roof access ladder.

Ms. Eaken stated that she will look into alternate locations.

Ms. Tipton stated that she appreciates that the most residential portion of the building faces the residential neighborhood. She feels that this is more important than the public opinion of the south face. Ms. Tipton noted that the south elevation is set in from the property line quite a bit and suggested screening of other types such as landscaping. Ms. Tipton stated that the height of the flat roofed area doesn’t really bother her.

Mr. Saxe stated if possible he would like to see the mechanical area lowered.

Mr. Saxe questioned the multiple materials being used.

Ms. Tipton stated that she appreciates that the most residential portion of the building faces the residential neighborhood. She feels that this is more important than the public opinion of the south face. Ms. Tipton noted that the south elevation is set in from the property line quite a bit and suggested screening of other types such as landscaping. Ms. Tipton stated that the height of the flat roofed area doesn’t really bother her.

Mr. Koogle questioned whether or not the height bar was necessary.

Ms. Eaken stated that it is necessary.

Mr. Koogle questioned the colors.

Ms. Eaken stated that the colors in the rendering are supposed to represent the colors in the actual photograph; the photograph colors are more accurate.

Mr. Koogle noted the 6’ masonry wall along the north and east side of the parking lot.

Ms. Eaken stated that the ladder access will not be able to be moved to the east side of the building for safety reasons. She stated that she does like the idea of more landscaping on the south end of the building in the landscaping area.

Mr. Boyle stated that he would like to see the project again before making any recommendation to the Planning Commission.

**MOTION:** *In case ARB20-012, Dunkin Donuts, 1625 South Water Street, Mr. Basista moved to continue the case until the August 4, 2020 meeting.*

*Mr. Saxe seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-1.*

V. **MEETING SUMMARIES**

**MOTION:** *Mr. Basista moved to approve the May 5, 2020 Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes as presented.*
Mr. Koogle seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-1. Ms. Tipton abstained.

MOTION: Mr. Koogle moved to approve the June 2, 2020 Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes as presented. Ms. Tipton seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS
None

VII. ADJOURNMENT
MOTION: Mr. Koogle moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.