

**MINUTES
DESIGN & REVIEW BOARD**

July 15, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Keith Speirs, Louise Keating, John Campbell, Sandra Hull and Susan Bates

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dick Kinder and Dick Deffenbaugh

STAFF PRESENT: Andrew Dutton

I. MINUTES

Susan Bates moved to approve the June 9, 2015 meeting minutes. Sandra Hull seconded the motion. Motion carried.

II. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION

DR-545. Tim Bogner of Bogner Construction Company, representing the College of Wooster, requesting Certificate of Appropriateness approval for the demolition of the Holden Hall Annex building at 1101 Beall Avenue (rear).
(College of Wooster Landmark District)

Tim Bogner, Bogner Construction, stated Holden Hall Annex was constructed in 1922. Mr. Bogner stated there was an effort to try and save Holden Hall Annex, but indicated there were no ADA entrances, ramps or elevators; the foundation system would be very difficult to bring up to the current code; the exterior stucco system needed to be replaced; there was no basement to accommodate modern mechanical and electrical systems; the roof needed to be resheathed (slate roof); there was extreme dryrot around the building; building insulation and window entrance system "R" values were inadequate and would need to be completely replaced; and the plumbing, HVAC and sprinkler systems were not up to Code. For those reasons, the College decided to raze the structure and it would be replaced at a later date with a more modern, 40-bed structure. Mr. Bogner stated that included in the Board's packets were schematics of the proposed "Brush Hall". Mr. Bogner indicated that additional photographs of the building would be taken of both the interior and exterior of the building should the razing of the building be approved by the Board.

Louise Keating moved to recommend the Certificate of Appropriateness. Sandra Hull seconded the motion. Motion carried.

III. SIGN APPROVAL

DR-546. Angela Steiner of Bespoke Hair Salon requesting sign approval for a wall sign at 228 South Market Street. (C-4 District)

Angela Steiner, Bespoke Hair Salon, stated she was asking for approval to paint the brick on the building along with a sign.

Mr. Campbell questioned if the letters would be painted on the building. Ms. Steiner stated yes.

Ms. Hull moved to accept the proposal as submitted. Ms. Hull stated it was a “great graphic”. Susan Bates seconded the motion. Motion carried.

IV. DESIGN GUIDELINES UPDATE

Wendy Naylor and Diane Wellman of Naylor Wellman, LLC. Outline and discussion of the Design Guidelines update project.

Wendy Naylor and Diane Wellman of Naylor Wellman were present. Ms. Wellman outlined the areas which they would be addressing which included: The Purpose of Design Guidelines; Design & Review Board criteria currently being used; and feedback from Board members. Ms. Wellman stated there were two “audiences” that would be addressed with the design guidelines—not just the Design & Review Board but also the applicant. Ms. Wellman stated the guidelines were a basis of consistency and fair decisions and would strengthen the Board’s position when making a decision. The Board would not only have CLG status and a recognized ordinance, but would also have design guidelines that it would use which were approved through a CLG process. Ms. Wellman stated the design guidelines would support all of the objectives that were set forth in the ordinance to safeguard the heritage of the City, to stabilize and improve property values, to enhance the character, the use of historic preservation and archeological sites in the community, and to take necessary measures to protect and safeguard the landmarks. With design guidelines and CLG status, it encouraged investment in the community because it was predictable what would happen within the district so people felt more confident reinvesting in their properties and in the downtown. Ms. Wellman stated part of the Design Guidelines would include sections that discussed styles and types of houses and buildings in Wooster, and specific buildings and houses would be used to demonstrate that.

Ms. Naylor questioned Board members as to what type of issues they repeatedly saw. Mr. Campbell and Ms. Hull stated archeology was something that never came up. Ms. Naylor questioned the Certificate of Appropriateness process and whether the Commission was obtaining the type of materials they needed in order to review requests. Mr. Campbell stated the Board did struggle with not having adequate information and lacked architectural substance. Mr. Campbell stated presentations were oftentimes “sketches on pieces of paper” and colors that were copied on a copier, so it became difficult to figure out exactly what they were doing. Ms. Hull stated she felt there needed to be consistent, required information provided to the Board. Mr. Campbell stated he did not think the Board would want to have an “exhaustive list” of requirements that an applicant would have to provide to them. Ms. Naylor questioned if the Board encouraged preliminary review. Mr. Campbell stated it had occurred but was not something which happened a lot. Ms. Hull stated if the Board was unclear on a proposal, they asked the applicant to clarify it and return to the Board. Mr. Campbell stated he felt that providing a drawing, to scale, was important and actual samples as opposed to photocopies would be helpful to the Board.

Ms. Naylor questioned Board members as to what had been the most contentious issues. Mr. Campbell stated as for signage, internally illuminated, white background signs was an issue the Board had to deal with. Mr. Campbell stated the majority of the requests which came before the Board related to signage. Ms. Bates also noted that the Board also had difficulty with signs already being erected before the Board had reviewed them. Ms. Hull agreed and indicated that was a “huge issue”.

(Louise Keating left the meeting at approximately 6:00 p.m.)

Mr. Campbell stated he felt the Board could benefit from having a sign guideline that had a defined essence to it. Mr. Campbell stated it was difficult for the Board to reject a sign without having a document that it could refer to. Ms. Hull and Mr. Campbell stated it would be beneficial to an applicant to be given an idea as to what was acceptable—sign types, scale in relationship to the structure. Currently, the only guideline an applicant had was size of sign.

Mr. Speirs also indicated that secondary signage was an issue—signage in the windows. Mr. Campbell stated the Board currently reviewed those types of signs as a “subjective evaluation” and was based on square footage.

Ms. Hull stated she felt alternatives should be included in the guidelines addressing internally illuminated signs. Ms. Hull stated overhead lights or backlit letters should be alternatives that are suggested.

Ms. Naylor stated the Board would need to address what needed to be in the ordinance and what could be in the guidelines.

Mr. Campbell stated another area which could be addressed was for face changes to existing lexon signs. Mr. Campbell stated if the applicant only wished to change the front, there was not much the Board could currently do. Mr. Campbell indicated that language could be added to indicate that when a change was made to that type of sign, it had to then be removed and replaced.

Ms. Hull also indicated that tall, pole signs were issues. Mr. Campbell stated tall signs in the downtown were not necessary because the “field of vision” was lower.

Ms. Naylor questioned issues with ADA accessibility. Mr. Campbell stated the Board really did not advise or approve ADA issues.

Ms. Naylor submitted copies of the timeline to the Board (March, 2016). Ms. Naylor stated the next step would be the creation of an outline which would be drafted for discussion.

Meeting adjourned at 6:26 p.m.

Andrew Dutton, Staff Liaison