



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES FINAL

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2023

6:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL ROOM

CALL TO ORDER: Tamie Ehinger, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M.

PRESENT: Tamie Ehinger, Chair; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair; Leslie DiCarlo; Chris Bennett, Tad Roemer, Jeff Gritsavage

ABSENT: Ellen Sheehan, Karen Cavotta (Alternate)

STAFF: Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, City of Saratoga Springs

A. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

There were no minutes to approve.

VOTE:

MOTION PASSES:

B. POSSIBLE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

NOTE: The intent of a consent agenda is to identify any application that is “approvable” without need for further evaluation or discussion. If anyone wishes to further discuss any proposed consent agenda item, then that item would be pulled from the “consent agenda” and dealt with individually.

1. **#20230829**, 72 Henry St., Shark Tooth Tattoo Sign. Architectural Review of new wall sign within the Urban Core/T-6 District
2. **#20230846**, 307 South Broadway, The Bunker Signage. Historic Review of new signage within the Urban Core/T-6 District

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone on the Board had any questions, comments or concerns on the consent agenda item. None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there were any questions or comments from the audience regarding these applications.
None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of **1.** Shark Tooth Tattoo Sign, 72 Henry St. and **2.** The Bunker Signage, 307 South Broadway

Rob DuBoff seconded the motion. There was no further discussion on the motion.

ALL IN FAVOR , NONE OPPOSED

Record of vote: motion to approve made by T. Ehinger, seconded by R. DuBoff: passed 5-0

In favor: T. Ehinger, R. DuBoff, L. DiCarlo, J. Gritsavage, T. Roemer

C. DRB APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

1. **#20230845**, 5 Cobb Alley Lot A, Modifications to an approval of Historic Review of a new single-family residence within the Urban Residential - 3 District.
2. **#20230817**, 42 Phila Exterior Modifications, Architectural Review of exterior modifications including new storefront, awning and terrace within the Urban Core / T-6 District.
3. **#20230165**, 184 Church, exterior modifications, Architectural Review of exterior modifications, including but not limited to new porches with stairs and railings within the Office Medical Business District.
4. **#20230575**, 19 Railroad, AMC Movie Signage, Advisory opinion to the ZBA regarding variances associated with new signage for rebranding of an existing movie theatre within the Urban Core UC/T-6 District.
5. **#20230752**, 17 West/Station Lane New 5-Story, Mixed-Use Development. Architectural review of a new 5-story mixed-use development within the Neighborhood Center / T-5 District.

Let the record show that Chris Bennett joined the meeting in progress.

#20230845, 5 Cobb Alley Lot A, Modifications to an approval of Historic Review of a new single-family residence within the Urban Residential - 3 District.

Tonya Yasenchak, Engineering America representing the owners of the property at 5 Cobb Alley. Tonya said the project was approved several years ago and they have been in front of the Board in the past for updates and renewals. The project was approved but they received a “Stop Work” order because there were some differences in paperwork and numbers from the approved plot plan, not the fault of the applicant. The Building Department is requiring the applicant to move the porch back which still leaves a 4.5’ front setback but they had to make the porch much smaller. They made the garage portion of the house one-foot smaller, minor modifications to the inside of the house, and moved the porch all the way to the far-right side of the house. The porch will be more of a stoop and used as an entrance. Tonya presented the house plan as approved in 2018 and showed their proposed modifications of stone, standing seam and arched elements. The original porch stuck out beyond the garage by a couple of feet, and they were required to push it back. The foundation was already in when the Building Department asked for the change so they will be cutting into the front of the foundation to make the revision. The owners are now seeking to include vertical siding on the larger gable on the front. Tonya said this would be the second change they would be making. The owner feels it would help to break up the mass of horizontal siding.

Tamie asked **Amanda** to show the comparison of the house in two separate slides - as approved and with changes. Tamie asked the Board to focus on the changes that are being proposed and the overall design that is currently approved.

Tamie asked the applicant why they moved to venting in the gables versus the previous architectural feature that was there. **Tonya** said they didn’t think the arched look would go with the vertical siding. Typically, that would be squarer - more farmhouse style. The square element in the gable also allows for more venting. **Tamie** noted that the front porch, which is now a covered entrance way is narrower, and a small, narrow window and the board and batten have been added. She said that the change in materials from horizontal plank to board and batten on the front gable is a little too much variation. Tamie said, in her opinion the stone, clapboard and board and batten together doesn’t seem aesthetically appropriate.

Chris Bennett thinks the board and batten looks like more of a cottage style, which he likes, but it fights with the stone. He thinks the clapboard may look better because there are just too many elements fighting against each other. He believes less is more.

Rob DuBoff said the change in the porch is fine. He agreed with other Board members to either go all board and batten or all clapboard. Because it's not in the Historic District he is inclined to say it's fine if that's what the applicant wants to do there. His opinion is to not mix the three materials. Pick two favorites.

Leslie DiCarlo agrees that there is just too much going on in a small space. Leslie said she would be happy to see the board and batten continued on the larger portion of the second floor, and the stone around the garage removed completely. **Tonya** said she believes the stone was required on the original plan. **Leslie** asked if they could still push the porch back but keep it centered under the upstairs window and remove the small window that was added to the left of the porch. **Tonya** said to accommodate the porch they had to make changes to the interior by moving the bathroom from the right of the porch to the left of the porch. The small window is in that bathroom. **Leslie** suggested that if they like the board and batten, then do the whole second floor and keep the curved element in the doorway and on the garage doors and continue it up on the eaves and the top of the gable.

Jeff Gritsavage suggested breaking up the siding with a band or something similar on the west elevation (Beekman Street) because it is much more visible than the Cobb Alley elevation or front of the house. Currently on the west elevation there are lots with zoning in place for houses like the applicant's that are being used as parking lots for a business and an apartment. He suggested that the material changes be made on all sides of the house. **Tonya** said they'll just take the board and batten off. **Jeff** said in that case they should return the gable trusses because they were architecturally stylized. **Tonya** said if they go back to the clapboard they'll go with the arches.

Tad Roemer had no comments.

Tonya said they're just looking to keep it very simple. They're looking to get approval for the porch setback. They will go back to the wood and the arches.

THERE WERE NO FURTHER COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD OR PUBLIC

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, said the applicant is willing to remove the board and batten and go back to what was originally proposed as a clapboard, return the gable trusses, and remove what is being proposed as venting. She entertained a motion.

Tad Roemer requested not to vote on the project because it was existing application that he didn't participate in. He also made no comments on the application.

Leslie DiCarlo made a motion to approve with the following conditions: that the remove the board and batten and restore the gable trusses to the façade of the building. **Seconded by** Jeff Gritsavage.

<p>Record of vote: motion to approve made by L. DiCarlo, seconded by J. Gritsavage: passed 5-0 In favor: T. Ehinger, R. DuBoff, L. DiCarlo, J. Gritsavage, C. Bennett. 1 abstain – Tad Roemer</p>
--

#20230817, 42 Phila Exterior Modifications, Architectural Review of exterior modifications including a new storefront, awning, and terrace within the Urban Core / T-6 District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair noted that the applicant had been before the DRB a few years ago and they approved similar changes that were not made. The applicant is before the DRB with variations on what was originally proposed.

Sue Davis, SD Atelier Architecture said the applicant came to the DRB in July 2018 to discuss the idea of putting an outside terrace to the side of the building, where Creative Sparks used to be

located. The applicant originally came before the DRB to be able to market this as a usable space. The applicant did not actually have a tenant at the time the approval was sought on a hypothetical situation. The applicant now has a tenant who would like to rent the space. Sue introduced Dennis and Brandon from Hamlet and Ghost, a new drinking and eating establishment. They are proposing new awnings, **with a garden theme on the front façade which faces Phila Street**. The green awning that is on the front will be removed. The applicant is proposing a patio on the side of the building with a handicap accessible entry into the space and onto the patio. Sue showed slides of the interior floor plan to give the Board a sense of the space. The store front area will have doors that fold up instead of opening out onto the street. They will be removing some brickwork where you exit to the outdoor dining space. The dining space will be laid out with a wrought iron fence for security measures. Sue said they are proposing to change the lighting fixtures on the front of the building to a globe light fixture. Sue said one modification from what they submitted 4 weeks ago is that the pergola is turning into a minimalist awning. They feel the awning provides better rain protection and looks less cluttered. The proposed awning is cream with wine-colored pinstripes. They are considering gravel and flagstone for the patio area. They are proposing a seating arrangement around an existing tree on the patio. Sue said they would put up a visual barrier to the cooler - a framework wall with wood slats in between. Sue showed a slide of the proposed outdoor dining elevations. There is evidence of an existing opening. The applicant was previously approved by the DRB to remove the brick and install a new door to access the terrace. Sue noted the awning will be a cream color matching the awnings on the front of the building.

Tamie Ehinger asked the height of the fence. Sue said 36". She said she has no concerns about the application.

Jeff Gritsavage said he would like to see the brick arch over the entry way be visible as you walk into the building. It's a nice feature.

Rob DuBoff asked if the lintel was still in place. Sue said she believes it is and they will work with that. Rob's preference for the patio material would be either stone or brick. He asked if the storefront window was opaque or glass. Sue indicated that it would be glass. Rob mentioned that the cream-colored awning may show dirt, mold, and algae a lot quicker than a darker color. Sue said they will talk with the interior designers and awning company to see what solutions there may be. **Chris Bennett** agreed with Rob on the awning color.

Tamie Ehinger , Chair asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to comment on the application and there was none. Tamie said she would like to see the final details of the mullion pattern worked out. She suggested that it be done administratively, and the Board and applicant agreed. Tamie said the applicant will need to submit any changes to the awning material for administrative approval. The DRB agreed that pea gravel is not appropriate.

Jeff Gritsavage made a motion to approve with the following conditions: that the applicant submit three things for final administrative approval: 1. Final mullion detail, 2. Final details on awning color and specs. 3. Flagstone to be used on the entire patio. **Seconded by** L. DiCarlo

<p>Record of vote: motion to approve made by J. Gritsavage, seconded by L. DiCarlo: passed 6-0 In favor: T. Ehinger, R. DuBoff, L. DiCarlo, J. Gritsavage, C. Bennett, Tad Roemer</p>

#20230165, 184 Church, exterior modifications, Architectural Review of exterior modifications, including but not limited to new porches with stairs and railings within the Office Medical Business District.

Jeff Gritsavage recused himself because he lives within 100 feet of the property to be discussed.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair said that this applicant was recently in front of the DRB and after a long discussion with the DRB they have returned with some changes.

John Hoch, Owner of the property noted that his engineer was sick but is watching via webcast and will be happy to answer any questions John can't answer. John said they modified the existing proposal with all wood railings, columns and bolsters and tongue and groove for the porch decking and stairs. For the concrete stairs facing Church Street will have aluminum railings. John showed slides of the specs for the porch materials. John said there are four wood windows that are rotted and not operable and he would like to change them out with wood clad windows. **Tamie** clarified that the owner proposes to replace 14 windows, four of which are wood. **John** said that the other ten windows will be replaced in kind with vinyl or wood clad as well.

Tamie suggested that the DRB talk about the porch and other changes from the last meeting and then discuss the windows separately.

- **Front staircase** - it was suggested last time that the applicant explore using masonry with a metal rail which the applicant has chosen not to do. **Tamie** said typically they would require the applicant to replace wood with wood, especially in the Historic District. **John** said they did decide to do that and it's in the notes. Trex will be used on wood lattice versus diagonal. **Chris Bennett** said this is a vast improvement. He likes the tongue and groove and lattice panels. Concrete for the longevity of the front porch is great especially considering the water that will be sheeting off there. The concrete with wrought iron is not inappropriate at all. **Rob DuBoff** said the masonry with the aluminum rail system is ideal. He said he's fine with the proposed balustrades for the porches and the Trex. Rob wanted the Board to be aware that the Trex for the stairs will be individual boards that will be spaced out because they don't make it that wide.
- **Windows** - The vinyl windows will be replaced with vinyl or wood clad. **Tamie** said she feels that the wood clad is a much better product and more likely to be approvable and she would support that choice. Three of the wood windows are on the side of the house and face the law office next door. The fourth wood window is at the rear of the house. **Tamie** said the standards and guidelines for historic preservation and restoration indicate that you should always replace in-kind if something needs to be replaced. Ideally you should do everything possible to repair the windows rather than replace them. Tamie strongly encouraged the owner to try to repair the windows because they are some of the last remaining historic items in the house. **John** said they have had people look at the windows and they feel they are not repairable. **Tamie** said she needs to see closer photos of the damage to the windows. **Rob DuBoff** asked if the owner had a contractor lined up. **John** said that he does, and they looked at the windows and determined they couldn't be repaired. **Ron Lewis**, the contractor, said that many of the sills are rotted. Rob noted that they would be removing significant historic trim. **Chris** clarified with the owner that the vinyl windows will be taken out and replaced with a unit that will sit inside the existing opening of the old windows. They will be custom windows that will fit those openings. **Ron** said the windows all measured the same - a 2605 window which is fairly standard sizing. **Chris Bennett** suggested that the owner look into Harvey's Industry who he believes still produces an aluminum clad wood interior replacement unit. They may also have vinyl. **Ron** asked if the fact that the wood windows face the west (side) and the back has any bearing on the Board's decision about replace/repair. **Tamie** said yes, the visibility of the window would be taken into consideration. **Leslie DiCarlo** agreed that replacing vinyl with vinyl is out of the Board's purview and that the wood windows should be repaired if they can be repaired.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked the audience if they had any comments. **Gina Peca**, the owner's mother, noted the low visibility location of the four wood windows and asked if the Board would

consider the windows being replaced as opposed to repaired at a very high cost. **Tamie** thanked the owner for rescuing this great little house.

Tamie suggested moving forward with an approval for the vinyl windows they are proposing to replace and to hold off on the four wood windows. **Chris** suggested that the owner check the glass on the windows as it may have already been replaced, which would reduce its historic significance. **Tamie** said they will leave it up to the owner as to whether they want vertical or horizontal squares for the lattice work. **Rob DuBoff** said he would be willing to come out and look at the wood windows. It's possible that they're not historic. Chris Bennett agreed to go along with Rob, and they will also take photos.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner responded to Tamie that the applicant can move forward with applying for a building permit tomorrow after getting the approval for everything except the four wood windows tonight from the DRB. That way they will be in the que with the Building Department. The decision on the four wood windows will follow shortly behind.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if there were any other comments from the audience. Hearing none she entertained a motion on the matter from **Rob Duboff**. The motion was seconded by **Leslie DiCarlo**.

<p>Record of vote: motion to approve made by R. DuBoff, seconded by L. DiCarlo: passed 5-0 In favor: T. Ehinger, R. DuBoff, L. DiCarlo, C. Bennett, Tad Roemer. J. Gritsavage-Abstain</p>

#20230575, 19 Railroad, AMC Movie Signage, Advisory opinion to the ZBA regarding variances associated with new signage for rebranding of an existing movie theatre within the Urban Core UC/T-6 District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair reminded the Board that this will simply be an advisory opinion to the Zoning Board of Appeals. No decisions will be made tonight. The application will come back in front of the DRB for a full review.

Ron Levesque, Sign Studio representing AMC Theatres at 19 Railroad Place. Ron said the theatre is getting totally rebranded. In 2013 the owners of the theatre came before the DRB for approval for numerous signs throughout the building on the east, west and north elevations. Ron showed slides of the previous signs that will all be removed: 1. 6 blade signs, approximately 45 sq. ft. each - aluminum, flat and project perpendicular to the building. 2. Four flat cut bow ties made of the same material as the blade signs that lay flat against the building on the east wall - not internally illuminated. The Playbill signage (posterboards) that say coming soon will remain. The marquee sign (57' wide and each letter 3' tall) on the front of the building was previously approved. **Ron said they are proposing to remove the lettering on the five panels under the marquee sign (4' high by 12' wide) and to leave them blank (white).** The BTX would be removed as well. The BTX sign on the east side of the building will be replaced like for like except that only the white AMC letters will be illuminated, not the red.

Ron said they are proposing different square footage, letter heights, and the location and number of signs. The number of signs is being reduced significantly because they are removing the bowtie and blade signs.

They are proposing internally luminated AMC letters that are red LED modules with red acrylic faces, 4.5 ft. in height on Church St. (none currently there) to make it more visible for people driving east. Because they're reducing the marquee sign from 57 linear feet to 24 feet it won't be as visible while driving past.

They are proposing a six-foot letter height for the marquee sign that is internally luminated with a red acrylic face . The illumination factor is not as bright as the previous white lights in the Criterion marquee. Ron showed the spec drawing for the marquee - 6 foot letter height, 24' by 3" wide with red LED lighting with red acrylic face. He also showed a slide of the white, blank panels proposed below the marquee sign. They are proposing that they use the existing mounting brackets so the sign will sit the same as the previous sign. They will not be making any changes to the mounting configuration.

Ron said they are **proposing a rear sign , next to where Price Chopper was located.** The overall size will be a little bit smaller than what was there. They are proposing 3' letters (previously 18" stacked and totaling about 36"). The new sign should just about mirror the same footprint. It will be the same construction and illumination and acrylic faces.

Ron summarized that they are proposing four signs:

1. Where the BTX was.
2. The front fascia sign
3. Church Street
4. The back elevation where Price Chopper was

Tamie Ehinger, Chair clarified for review:

D = Marquee sign

C = Church Street Sign

F = BTX sign on Railroad

G = Rear sign by Price Chopper

Tamie said she has no concern about the removal of the blade signs, although, she noted they're not considered signage.

D. **The Marquee sign** - 6' letters are much too large and inappropriate for the space and City requirements. At the most they should be 32" as they are with Criterion. **Tamie** said she would possibly consider 36" but beyond that the 6' is inappropriate. **Tamie** said the white, translucent panels under the marquee sign should be removed if they are not going to serve a purpose.

F. **BTX on railroad** - **Tamie** had no concerns. Just a replacement in kind. **Tad Roemer** noted that there's nothing that says movie theatre. He agrees with Tamie on the white, blank signs - looks like the movie theatre shut down. **Tad** said an overall no to the giant logo.

C. **Church Street Sign** - signs not typically allowed on the second floor, but **Tamie** said she understands why they put it there. The applicant will have to take that up with the Zoning Board of Appeals. Tamie feels the letters are much too large - City code is that those letters should be no more than 18". **Tamie** asked the Board to comment on the internally lit lighting. A halo effect against the wall has been encouraged for the downtown.

G. **Rear sign by Price Chopper** - **Tamie** said the font size of the old letters met code at 18". These letters are larger, but the sign would take up the same amount of space as the previous sign. **Tamie** feels the lettering should be the same size as what was discussed for Church Street with the halo lighting. **Tad Roemer** feels the light is too bright. He suggested not lighting it at all. He is opposed to an internally lit sign in this spot.

Amanda noted to the Board that the UDO prohibits channel lighting. Criterion received variances with their sign package to allow channel lighting on select signage. She said it's up to the DRB to determine if this change in the lighting/signage package to continue the use of that channel lighting or if it's more appropriate to do something that's more allowed by code, which would be the halo effect.

Leslie DiCarlo said the Criterion had a much more elegant look the way it wrapped around the marquee and worked better architecturally. She said people go to a theatre to see a movie not because of the name of the theatre. They want to know what's playing and the times. The signage helps to define what the building is on a very prominent corner. She agreed with Tad that AMC could

be anything. She feels they will lose the identity of what the building is. The letters are too tall and the white banding under the marquee needs to either be painted black or the stone color.

Jeff Gritsavage said he's confused with the objective. The sign says nothing about what's in the building. The huge lettering is not necessary. The building needs more of a theatre identity.

Rob DuBoff - agrees with most of what has been said. The AMC sign is much too large. Rob said if the applicant is not going to advertise the movies and times on the white panels, they need to be removed. Rob said he would give the theatre some leeway on the channel lighting because historically theatres had glitzy signage to attract people to the shows.

Chris Bennett - agreed with everything previously stated. He thinks changing the white panels to another color won't work. Chris said the panels should state the movies and times. He believes the panels should not be removed; they should be utilized for the purpose of stating it as a movie theatre. Chris agrees that the AMC is way too large, but he likes the red color. Chris said he doesn't mind the sign on Church Street if it's in context. He mentioned that removing the blade signs may cause them to have to make repairs to the masonry. Chris wants to make sure that issue is addressed and taken care of.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if anyone in the audience had any comments on the application. There were none.

Tamie said this is an advisory opinion to the Zoning Board of Appeals about the size and location of each of the signs.

Tad Roemer mentioned that AMC could give the signs something of a local flavor. Perhaps spell out what AMC means and add something about theatres.

A motion was made by Tamie Ehinger, Chair and seconded by Leslie DiCarlo in consideration of the request for an advisory opinion by the Zoning Board of Appeals regarding the AMC movie signage at 19 Railroad Place .

The Design Review Board provide d the following feedback:

Sign #1 - Marquee sign - the location is appropriate. The channel lighting is appropriate. The size of the sign is inappropriate, it is too large. What is being recommended would be a sign 32 to 36 inches tall. Notation regarding that - the DRB is recommending that the applicant keep and use the marquee for the purpose in which it is meant for, specifically to identify the use of the building. If the marquee space is not going to be used for its intended purposes, we are recommending that it either be removed or incorporated in some other manner into the design of the building.

Sign #2 - the proposed Church Street sign - we are recommending that the location is appropriate. The size as presented is too large and we are recommending an appropriate size would be 18 to 24 inches. In this location the lighting as presented as channel lighting is not appropriate and a halo lit sign would be more appropriate.

Sign #3 - Railroad Place - the location, size and lighting are appropriate.

Sign #4 - Rear sign - the location is appropriate. The size is too large. An appropriate size would be 18 to 24 inches. Based on the location of this sign, halo lit would be more appropriate.

The DRB provided feedback about the lack of the use of the word "theatre". Our recommendation would be that if the applicant is able to include some reference as to the use of the building whether that be the term "theatre" or another.

Record of vote: motion for an advisory opinion to the Zoning Board of Appeals was made by T. Ehinger, seconded by L. DiCarlo: passed 6-0

In favor: T. Ehinger, R. DuBoff, L. DiCarlo, C. Bennett, Tad Roemer, J. Gritsavage.

#20230752, 17 West/Station Lane New 5-Story, Mixed-Use Development. Architectural review of a new 5-story mixed-use development within the Neighborhood Center / T-5 District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair said the DRB has seen this application before and they provided general feedback to the applicant. DRB will be providing the applicant with further detailed feedback to put them in a better position and to help everyone move forward as efficiently as possible.

Amanda said when the applicant was before the DRB in the past, they deferred SEQR lead agency to the Planning Board. The Planning Board has since requested additional information related to traffic, so they now have uncoordinated review to allow the applicant to move forward with some of the other processes including the variances that will be required for the buildout along Station Lane, and to move forward with discussions with the DRB. No decisions can be made until the variances are granted, but the DRB can give feedback as to whether the applicant is headed in the right direction. When the time comes the DRB will be seeking its own review as well as the Planning Board.

James Tripp, MRB Group displayed inspiration boards for a mixed-use building with a contemporary feel. They are proposing to have retail, commercial, restaurant spaces and residential units on the first floor. The upper three floors will be residential with balconies. At the corner of Station Lane and West Ave. there's a slope where the grade increases up West Ave. that they are addressing. There is below level parking under the building with access off Station Lane as well as surface parking. There are wetlands in the gray shaded area that will remain undisturbed. James showed a slide of the basement parking layout with elevator, trash, stairwells, access, etc. The first-floor plan shows purple and blue areas that are designated retail spaces. The dark purple is a proposed restaurant. There's a fitness center and residential lobby with controlled access from both sides of the building. The west wing has residential units on the first floor. The second and third floor are a mix of residential units with 1 and 2 bedrooms, and a few studio apartments. Many of the units have balconies overlooking Station Lane and West Ave. The 4th floor plan is like the 2nd and 3rd floor plan with patio space included for the resident's use. James showed the south and east elevations of the building where they are proposing fiber cement panels, exposed aggregate thin veneer on the residential tower pieces (grey shaded area), and Trespa panels (sample). There will be similar treatment around all sides of the building. The dark Trespa panels would be used on the lower elevation along with the wood look Trespa as accent panels. The windows systems are aluminum storefronts with aluminum black operable sashes. The copings and metals in the residential units would be black. There are cast stone products for the signage bands and such at the retail elevations. James said they are looking to make the corner elevation more engaging, a plaza with landscaping and signage, and restaurant and storefront space. They are proposing concrete retaining walls there with form liner to give the walls some texture. James mentioned that Russell Fadden from The Ownership Group and Scott Lansing from Lansing Engineering are with him to answer any questions.

Tamie said the 3-D renderings were very helpful. The DRB is looking at mass and scale (height and proportions), contextual appropriateness, how it fits in with the neighborhood and adjacent buildings. They are looking street orientation, step backs, visual interests, main entrances, facades, rhythm and materials. Tamie said the building is massive and the applicant is doing their best to break it up with shadow lines. Tamie asked the Board to consider if it's too broken up, too busy. She said renderings from different perspectives would be helpful for the Board to make that determination. Tamie feels the 4-story building is appropriate. She would not support sliding glass doors on the building because they're too suburban looking. Tamie said what looks like a wheelchair ramp on West Ave. It would be inappropriate for that access to be at the front of the building or on Station Lane. James said the main accessible parking and entrance is in the rear of the building, inside the "L". Scott Lansing said the West Ave area, from the northern most part as you go down towards the intersection is a six-foot difference in grade. They're trying to work with that grade. The building is a long and level building with the ground sloping. They need to have ADA accessibility to the front of all the structures. Scott

said the dip that's shown in the architectural rendering is not accurate to what is on the site plan. The grade follows more continuous along the front of the building and then the pitch on the road follows opposite to that. It's more of a smooth transition from one to the other. The wall that is shown will retain the accessible ramp and access to the front structures. It will start from zero and go to about 5.5 feet. It will be continuous, there won't be any dips. Tamie's concern was the lack of identification of main entrances because this is a major part of the DRB's purview. She said the applicant has addressed this very well with the 3-D rendering. Pedestrian engagement is key, so she was happy to hear the applicant say that that's what they were looking to accomplish. The City's Comprehensive Plan envisions a lot of pedestrian traffic in the future on West Ave. It's important that any new structures really engage with those pedestrians. Tamie said it's challenging working with the grade they have and it's apparent that the applicant is aware of that, and they are looking to gain solutions for that issue. She said the canopies around the main entrance on the 3-D drawing are very helpful and they add a lot of visual interest as does the open-air pergola on the top story.

Chris Bennett 3-D rendering very helpful. He agrees that there should be no sliding glass doors. Chris suggested a heavier cornice to protect the building from the elements. He likes the building and the interesting use of materials but he's not a fan of cement board. Tamie asked Chris to look at the thin brick, the grey color on the grade. James said it is applied by mortaring it in. Chris would like to know the permeability rate of the product.

Rob DuBoff said he thinks the applicant did a really nice job breaking up the mass and that it's an attractive looking building. Some material concerns he has are the cement panels and HPL panels. How long will it last and how's it going to look in ten years? The exposed aggregate looks like a great product.

Leslie DiCarlo finds the building interesting to look at and she likes how the applicant has broken it up with the different materials. Tamie interjected that she likes the wood look, but an actual wood product might be a better solution there.

Jeff Gritsavage said this building is a nice anchor for other buildings in the area to work off from. Jeff said the sliding glass doors in this area of town might be appropriate. Jeff said 55 Railroad Place and 116 West, a condo building complex, have sliders that look fine. In this application, in this location, sliders might be acceptable.

Tad Roemer likes the overall composition of the building. The 3-D rendering was very helpful. Tad asked if the thin brick came in corner pieces. James said you can miter the brick. Tad agreed with Tamie about the fake wood versus real wood. He said he objects to the wood appearance at the bottom of the brick bays. James thanked Tad for pointing that out and he agrees that it shouldn't be wood. Tad said the concrete and treatment and finish of the steps and retaining wall at the bottom will be important because it's right at eye level. Tad said he would like more details on railings, lighting, mortar/grout. Tad asked what was behind the dark panel at the bottom of the windows. James said it would be an insulated panel. Tad said the applicant should consider the drainage on the balconies, where it drains into and where it slopes. Tad agrees with Tamie about not using sliding doors, or at least not facing the main streets. The green and grey are less subtle than it shows on the rendering. Would like to see specs on the glass.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair said the Board will want to see the following details when the applicant returns: Venting, Mechanical equipment on the roof, whether it's screened-where it appears, visibility. Stair and elevator towers and how they relate from a pedestrian perspective. Exterior penetrations - lighting. Look at larger cornices and drainage on balconies. Applicant is heading in the right direction.

Amanda said the applicant still needs to work on getting some variances. After that they will come back.

There will be a caravan for the meeting on November 1st.

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

Design Review Board Caravan, Wednesday, October 25, 2023, at 4:00 P.M. will be followed by Board training with Miller Mannix and Mark Schachner.

Design Review Board Meeting, Wednesday, November 1, 2023, at 6:00 P.M.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

The motion to Adjourn was made by Rob DuBoff and seconded by Chris Bennett.

ALL IN FAVOR

There being no further business to discuss the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Gizzi
Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved November 1, 2023