City of Rochester
City Hall Room 125B, 30 Church Street
Rochester, New York 14614-1290
www.cityofrochester.gov

Rochester Preservation Board

September 14, 2016

Ms. Carmen Zatreanu
12 Vick Park A
Rochester, NY 14607

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish a garage shared with 16 Vick Park A, and construct a new 25'x 30' garage.

On the premises at:	12 Vick Park A
Zoning District:	R-2 Medium-Density Residential District East Avenue Preservation District
Application Number:	A-045-15-16
Record of Vote(s):	J. Dobbs — Approve on condition (motion) E. Cain — Aye (second) B. Mayer — Aye C. Carretta — Aye G. Gamm — Aye D. Beardslee — Aye D. Matthews — Aye

Please take notice that at its hearing of September 7, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED your application ON THE CONDTION that the man door on the garage is a flush or 2-panel style rather than a 6-panel style, and that the existing hedge along the driveway remain rather than be replaced by a fence.

In addition to this approval, a demolition permit is required (separate from that for #16), and a building permit is needed to construct the new garage. Both can be obtained in City Hall room 121B. A copy of the approved plan will be on file there.

Please contact Peter Siegrist at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov with any questions.

Rochester Preservation Board

By: Marguerite Ramos for
Zina Lagonegro, AICP, EIT
Director of Planning & Zoning

Filing Date

RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE
2016 SEP 14 AM 9:13

I. FINDINGS OF FACT:

A. In reviewing applications for certificates of appropriateness in a preservation district, the Preservation Board considers quality of design and site development in terms of the relationships to the street, building facades and overall neighborhood character.

B. This application was presented jointly with application A-016-16-17 for 16 Vick Park A, because the garage spans across the shared property line.

C. Architect Stu Chait testified that the existing garage is unstable, is torqued and warped and is missing framing pieces. He stated that the rear sits in a depression that collects rainwater, causing structural pieces to have rotted away. He found that the southern half is most at risk, with portions two feet out of plumb. He stated that he is a preservationist at heart, but believes the building is beyond repair.

D. Mr. Chait presented a design of a new garage that would replace the existing one, but only on 12 Vick Park A since the owner of #16 is not interested in constructing a new garage. He described the design, stating that it is meant not to compete with the high-style house. The garage would be painted to match the house, with the doors painted white. It would have no windows because of a concern for security. Its south wall would be built 3 feet off the south property line to provide a fire separation to any future building on #16. Gutters on the north side would direct rainwater onto #12, and not allow water onto the property to the west.

E. John Lembach, speaking for the Board of the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association, stated that his organization regrets the need to demolish such an old structure, but is generally in support. He questioned the need for an 11-foot-tall rear wall of the garage, feeling that it would appear too massive against the property to the west. He asked that the hedges alongside the driveway remain rather than be replaced by a fence, and that the man door on the garage be simplified.

F. Board members expressed regret for losing such an old structure, but agreed that it is structurally unsafe. Members expressed support for the understated design of the garage, feeling that it would not compete with the house.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board found that the replacement of the garage is appropriate to the historic visual character of the property and the preservation district on the condition that the man door is a flush or 2-panel style rather than a 6-panel style, and that the existing hedge along the driveway remain rather than be replaced by a fence.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Site survey map
C - Site plan showing new garage and expanded driveway
D - Floor plan and elevations of proposed garage
E - Details of proposed fence
F - Catalog sheets of garage and man doors
G - Photographs of existing conditions
H - Letter from the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association
I - Appearances by Stu Chait and John Lembach
J - Site visits by Board members

City of Rochester

City Hall Room 125B, 30 Church Street
Rochester, New York 14614-1290
www.cityofrochester.gov

one city ROCHESTER

Rochester
Preservation Board

September 14, 2016

Mr. Frank Murano
212 Harwood Circle
Rochester, NY 14625

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish a garage shared with 12 Vick Park A, and replace with surface parking.

On the premises at:	16 Vick Park A
Zoning District:	R-2 Medium-Density Residential District East Avenue Preservation District
Application Number:	A-016-16-17

Record of Vote(s):

J. Dobbs	Approve on condition (motion)
E. Cain	Aye (second)
B. Mayer	Aye
C. Carretta	Aye
G. Gamm	Aye
D. Beardslee	Aye
D. Matthews	Aye

Please take notice that at its hearing of September 7, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED your application ON THE CONDTION that the new parking area is 18 feet deep rather than the 22.4 feet shown, that the new rear fence connect to the new garage to deter trespassing, and that a hedge matching that at 12 Vick Park A and consisting of mature shrubs is installed in place of the proposed fence alongside the driveway.

In addition to this approval, a demolition permit is required (separate from that for #12) and a building and fence permit is required for the pavement and fencing. Both can be obtained in City Hall room 121B. A copy of the approved plan will be on file there.

Please contact Peter Siegrist at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov with any questions.

Rochester Preservation Board

By: Margaret Allen for
Zina Lagonegro, AICP, EIT
Director of Planning & Zoning

Filing Date: 2016 SEP 14 AM 9:13
RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE

I. FINDINGS OF FACT:

A. In reviewing applications for certificates of appropriateness in a preservation district, the Preservation Board considers quality of design and site development in terms of the relationships to the street, building facades and overall neighborhood character.

B. This application was presented jointly with application A-045-15-16 for 12 Vick Park A, because the garage spans across the shared property line.

C. Architect Stu Chait testified that the existing garage is unstable, is torqued and warped and is missing framing pieces. He stated that the rear sits in a depression that collects rainwater, causing structural pieces to have rotted away. He found that the southern half is most at risk, with portions two feet out of plumb. He stated that he is a preservationist at heart, but believes the building is beyond repair.

D. Mr. Chait presented a plan to demolish the garage and replace it with a new garage on 12 Vick Park A and a surface parking lot on 16 Vick Park A. He stated that the owner of #16 is not interested in rebuilding, unlike the owner of #12. In place of the garage on #16, he would install a paved parking area for three vehicles, which would be 18 feet deep rather than the 22.4 feet shown on his drawing. The remaining 4.4 feet would be established as lawn along the west property line, and would be used for snow storage. The existing stockade fence along the west property line would be extended northerly to enclose the rear yard, and would be painted dark brown. Mr. Chait would locate this fence about one foot west of the current fence line, in order to increase the lawn to about 5.5 feet.

E. In the side yard alongside the driveway, Mr. Chait would install a 6 foot tall fence to screen the new parking area from street view.

F. John Lembach, speaking for the Board of the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association, expressed general support for the application. He requested that the fence in the side yard match that on #12, and that the rear fence extend to the new garage on #12 to deter trespassers.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board found that the application is appropriate to the historic visual character of the property and preservation district on the condition that the new parking area is 18 feet deep rather than the 22.4 feet shown, that the new rear fence connect to the new garage to deter trespassing, and that a hedge matching that at 12 Vick Park A and consisting of mature shrubs is installed in place of the proposed fence alongside the driveway.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Site survey map
C - Photographs of existing conditions
D - Site plan showing new parking area
E - Details of proposed fence
F - Letter from the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association
G - Appearances by Stu Chait and John Lembach
H - Site visits by Board members

City of Rochester
City Hall Room 125B, 30 Church Street
Rochester, New York 14614-1290
www.cityofrochester.gov

Rochester
Preservation Board

September 14, 2016

Mr. Mitchell Rowe
City of Rochester
2650 Lake Avenue
Rochester, NY 14612

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a Visitor Center sign relocated from 60 Brown's Race, to install 6 LED lights on the north side, and remove vines on the north wall.

On the premises at:	74 Brown's Race
Zoning District:	CCD-R Center City Design District - River Brown's Race Preservation District
Application Number:	A-017-16-17
Record of Vote(s):	D. Beardslee Approve on condition (motion) J. Dobbs Aye (second) B. Mayer Aye C. Carretta Aye G. Gamm Aye E. Cain Aye D. Matthews Aye

Please take notice that at its hearing of September 7, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED your application ON THE CONDITION that the lower bracket of the sign is to be moved to the bottom of the sign, rather than between the words 'museum' and 'gallery' where it is currently placed.

Please contact Peter Siegrist at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov with any questions.

Rochester Preservation Board

By: Margaret Bellows for
Zina Lagonegro, AICP, EIT
Director of Planning & Zoning

Filing Date: 2016 SEP 14 AM 9:14
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE
CITY OF ROCHESTER
RECEIVED

I. FINDINGS OF FACT:

A. In reviewing applications for certificates of appropriateness in a preservation district, the Preservation Board considers quality of design and site development in terms of the relationships to the street, building facades and overall neighborhood character.

B. Mitch Rowe, Director of the City's Bureau of Buildings and Parks, described the proposal. He stated that the Visitor Center had been accessed through neighboring 60 Browns Race, but that property has been sold. Visitors will now enter through the doors on the front of #74, and the existing sign will be moved over.

C. Mr. Rowe stated that 6 ground-based light fixtures would be installed on the north side of the building, to illuminate the wall. These would be like those used on the Rundel Library and City Hall. He stated that the electrical panel would be inside the building.

D. Mr. Rowe stated that the windows, doors and trim would be sanded and repainted, and the vines on the north wall removed.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board found that the application is appropriate to the historic visual character of the building and preservation district on the condition that the lower bracket of the sign is to be moved to the bottom of the sign, rather than between the words 'museum' and 'gallery' where it is currently placed.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Photographs of existing conditions with narrative descriptions of work
C - Catalog sheets of light fixtures
D - Appearance by Mitch Rowe
E - Site visits by Board members

g:\planning&zoning\bldgzng\zoning\rpb\2017 rpb\decisions\september 7, 2016\a-017-16-17.docx

City of Rochester
City Hall Room 125B, 30 Church Street
Rochester, New York 14614-1290
www.cityofrochester.gov

one city

Rochester
Preservation Board

September 14, 2016

Mr. Allan Chapman
875 East Avenue
Rochester, NY 14607

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a metal picket fence 3'H x 120LF along the east property line and two matching gates at the west entrance.

On the premises at:	875 East Avenue
Zoning District:	R-3 High-Density Residential District East Avenue Preservation District
Application Number:	A-018-16-17
Record of Vote(s):	D. Beardslee Approve (motion) G. Gamm Aye (second) B. Mayer Aye C. Carretta Aye J. Dobbs Aye E. Cain Aye D. Matthews Aye

Please take notice that at its hearing of September 7, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED your application as submitted.

In addition to this approval, a fence permit is required. This may be obtained in the Planning & Zoning office, City Hall room 121B. A copy of the approved plan will be on file there.

Please contact Peter Siegrist at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov with any questions.

Rochester Preservation Board

By: Marguerite Parrino for
Zina Lagonegro, AICP, EIT
Director of Planning & Zoning

2016 SEP 14 AM 9:14
RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE

Filing Date

Phone: 585.428.7238 Fax: 585.428.6137 TTY: 585.428.6054 EEO/ADA Employer

I. FINDINGS OF FACT:

A. In reviewing applications for certificates of appropriateness in a preservation district, the Preservation Board considers quality of design and site development in terms of the relationships to the street, building facades and overall neighborhood character.

B. Applicant Allan Chapman described his proposal to extend the existing fence. He stated that there are several styles of fence on the property, and that he would match the one at the rear. He stated that this would be a real iron fence.

C. In response to Board questions, Mr. Chapman stated that the fence may need to jog around trees along the east property line. He stated that he would not remove trees, and that he ordered a survey to confirm the tree locations.

D. John Lembach, speaking for the Board of the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association, stated that he appreciates the efforts to find and install a period-correct fence to match the others. He stated that the fence would be a tasteful addition to the neighborhood.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board found that the fence, as proposed and described, is appropriate to the historic visual character of the property and the preservation district.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Site survey map showing fence locations
C - Photographs of existing conditions
D - Catalog sheets of proposed fence
E - Letters of support from Mark Chaplin and the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Assoc.
F - Appearances by Allan Chapman and John Lembach
G - Site visits by Board members

City of Rochester
City Hall Room 125B, 30 Church Street
Rochester, New York 14614-1290
www.cityofrochester.gov

one city

Rochester
Preservation Board

September 14, 2016

Mr. Robert Keck
16 Selden Street
Rochester, NY 14605

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a chain link fence on the north and east property line with a 6'H wood fence, and to remove a cluster of maple trees at the northwest corner.

On the premises at:	16 Selden Street
Zoning District:	R-3 High-Density Residential District East Avenue Preservation District
Application Number:	A-019-16-17
Record of Vote(s):	G. Gamm Approve (motion) D. Beardslee Aye (second) B. Mayer Aye C. Carretta Aye J. Dobbs Aye E. Cain Aye D. Matthews Aye

Please take notice that at its hearing of September 7, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED your application as submitted.

In addition to this approval, a fence permit is required. This may be obtained in the Planning & Zoning office, City Hall room 121B. A copy of the approved plan will be on file there.

Please contact Peter Siegrist at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov with any questions.

Rochester Preservation Board

By: Margaret Allen for
Zina Lagonegro, AICP, EIT
Director of Planning & Zoning

Filing Date: 2016 SEP 14 AM 9:14
RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE

I. FINDINGS OF FACT:

A. In reviewing applications for certificates of appropriateness in a preservation district, the Preservation Board considers quality of design and site development in terms of the relationships to the street, building facades and overall neighborhood character.

B. Applicant Robert Keck testified that the previous owner had simply leaned sections of stockade fencing against a chain link fence to block the view of the property to the north, which had been a derelict site before the townhouses were built a few years ago. He stated that he would remove the panels and the chain link fence and install a new wood stockade fence to match that of his neighbors at #14 (which the Board approved in 2012).

C. Mr. Keck also proposes to remove a clump of Norway maples in the rear corner of his property. He stated that nothing grows beneath the trees due to the shallow roots. He stated that he expects the large trees on either side of his property to partly fill in the empty space. He stated that he might consider adding one to two new trees in the future.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board found that the application is appropriate to the historic visual character of the property and the district, as submitted.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Site survey map showing fence and tree locations
C - Photographs of existing conditions
D - Appearance by Robert Keck
E - Site visits by Board members

g:\planning&zoning\bldgzng\zoning\rpb\2017 rpb\decisions\september 7, 2016\a-019-16-17.docx

City of Rochester
City Hall Room 125B, 30 Church Street
Rochester, New York 14614-1290
www.cityofrochester.gov

one city

Rochester
Preservation Board

September 14, 2016

Mr. Tasos Kolokouris
962 East Avenue
Rochester, NY 14607

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace all windows in the two buildings, and remove 5 trees along the east side of the church and replace with low plantings.

On the premises at:	962 East Avenue
Zoning District:	R-3 High-Density Residential District East Avenue Preservation District
Application Number:	A-020-16-17
Record of Vote(s):	D. Matthews Approve (motion) B. Mayer Aye (second) D. Beardslee Aye C. Carretta Aye G. Gamm Aye E. Cain Aye J. Dobbs Aye

Please take notice that at its hearing of September 7, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED your application as submitted.

In addition to this approval, a building permit is needed to install the windows. This may be obtained at the Planning & Zoning office, City Hall room 121B. A copy of the approved plans will be on file there.

Please contact Peter Siegrist at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov with any questions.

Rochester Preservation Board

By: Margaret Allen for
Zina Lagonegro, AICP, EIT
Director of Planning & Zoning

Filing Date:

RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE
2016 SEP 14 AM 9:14

I. FINDINGS OF FACT:

A. In reviewing applications for certificates of appropriateness in a preservation district, the Preservation Board considers quality of design and site development in terms of the relationships to the street, building facades and overall neighborhood character.

B. Architect Robert Wolfe presented the application, beginning with a proposal to remove five evergreen trees along the east side. He testified that these are dead or dying, and that he would replace them with six pear trees. The new trees would be about 8-10 feet tall at installation, and would grow to about 30-40 feet at maturity. They would be planted about 15-20 feet on center, midway between the walkway along the building and the neighboring driveway, slightly nearer the church than the current trees.

C. Mr. Wolfe testified that all windows in the church, community center and connecting link would be replaced for better energy efficiency. He explained that his choice of a dark bronze finish--rather than clear anodized more typical of the building style—is to match the brown frame of the church's stained glass windows. These windows, he said, are inside the dark bronze aluminum windows seen from the outside that are about 25 years old. He stated that a darker color would be more compatible with the dark stair railings at the church entrances, and with the bell tower between the two buildings. To unify the campus, he would use the same dark finish on all windows and on the framing and cladding of the connecting link.

D. In response to Board questions about whether mullions on the new church windows would obscure the stained glass imagery, facilities manager Tasos Kolokouris stated that mullions are needed due to the window height and to transition to the arched top. He stated that the mullions would be positioned to align with mullions in the stained glass windows.

E. John Lembach, speaking for the Board of the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association, thanked the applicant for proposing high-quality replacement windows.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board found that the application, as submitted, is appropriate to the historic visual character of the property and the preservation district.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Site survey map showing tree locations
C - Photographs of existing conditions
D - Catalog sheets of proposed windows
E - Drawings of elevations and floor plans
F - Architect's statement on choice of window finish
G - Letter from the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association
H - Appearances by Robert Wolfe, Tasos Kolokouris and John Lembach
I - Site visits by Board members

City of Rochester
City Hall Room 125B, 30 Church Street
Rochester, New York 14614-1290
www.cityofrochester.gov

Rochester Preservation Board

September 14, 2016

Mr. Ira Srole
24 Prince Street, Apt. 2A
Rochester, NY 14607

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to legalize replacement of railings on the porch stairs.

On the premises at:	114 Troup Street
Zoning District:	R-3 High-Density Residential District Corn Hill Preservation District
Application Number:	A-021-16-17
Record of Vote(s):	J. Dobbs Deny (motion) D. Beardslee Deny (second) B. Mayer Deny C. Carretta Deny G. Gamm Deny E. Cain Deny D. Matthews Deny

Please take notice that at its hearing of September 7, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board DENIED your application. Your case will remain in enforcement until an approval is obtained. Your options are to return the railings to their original appearance, or submit a new application to the Preservation Board. If you choose the first option, you must submit a drawing of your proposal to our office for review under the NYS Residential Code. If you choose the second option, you must follow section 120-188(O) of the Rochester Zoning Code (copied below) for the procedures for a successive application.

Please contact Peter Siegrist at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov with any questions.

Rochester Preservation Board

By: _____
Zina Lagonegro, AICP, EIT
Director of Planning & Zoning

2016 SEP 14 AM 9:14
RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE

Filing Date

I. FINDINGS OF FACT:

A. In reviewing applications for certificates of appropriateness in a preservation district, the Preservation Board considers quality of design and site development in terms of the relationships to the street, building facades and overall neighborhood character.

B. Applicant Ira Srole testified that the stairs suffer weather damage due to their exposure and that he has had to replace the railings before. He stated that he tried to achieve railings that are consistent with the original ones, but acknowledges that they are not exact duplicates.

C. Board members noted that, when they visited the site, the new railings were gone. The members stated that they had received photographs of the latest railings, but were unable to see them in person. Members noted that the photographs show railings that differ from the railing on the stair landing, which is thought to be original.

D. Member Mayer stated that the light fixtures on the stair newel posts are very bright and inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board found that the railings are inappropriate to the historic visual character of the property and the preservation district, and denied the application.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Photographs of existing conditions and replacement railings
C - Appearance by Ira Srole
D - Site visits by Board members

120-188(O) Successive applications

(1) Whenever any application, appeal or other request filed pursuant to this chapter has been finally denied on its merits ..., a second application, appeal or other request seeking essentially the same relief or a modification of such conditions shall not be brought within two years unless, in the opinion of the review authority, or, in the case of decisions of the ...Preservation Board ..., in the unanimous opinion of all members present on the Board ..., one of the following standards has been met:

(a) There is a substantial change in circumstances relevant to the issues and/or facts considered during review of the application that might reasonably affect the [Board's] application of the relevant review standards to the development proposed in the application;

(b) New or additional information is available that was not available at the time of the review that might reasonably affect the decisionmaking body's application of the relevant review standards to the development proposed;

(c) A new application is proposed to be submitted that is materially different (e.g., proposes new uses, or a substantial decrease in proposed densities and intensities) from the prior application; or

(d) The final decision on the application was based on a material mistake of fact or law.

(2) Any such second application shall include a detailed statement of grounds justifying consideration of such application.

City of Rochester
City Hall Room 125B, 30 Church Street
Rochester, New York 14614-1290
www.cityofrochester.gov

one city ROCHESTER

Rochester Preservation Board

September 14, 2016

Mr. Aaron Costa
Krudco Skateboards & Footwear
371 Park Avenue
Rochester, NY 14607

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a hanging sign and window sign for 'Krudco Skateboards & Footwear'.

On the premises at:	367-371 Park Avenue
Zoning District:	C-1 Neighborhood Commercial District East Avenue Preservation District
Application Number:	A-022-16-17
Record of Vote(s):	G. Gamm Approve (motion) B. Mayer Aye (second) D. Beardslee Aye C. Carretta Aye J. Dobbs Aye E. Cain Aye D. Matthews Aye

Please take notice that at its hearing of September 7, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED your application as submitted. Board members suggested, but did not require, that you change the font of the property address in the window to match the font of the other lettering.

In addition to this approval, a sign permit is required. This may be obtained in the Planning & Zoning office, City Hall room 121B. A copy of your approved plan will be on file there.

Please contact Peter Siegrist at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov with any questions.

Rochester Preservation Board

By: Margaret Allen for
Zina Lagonegro, AICP, EIT
Director of Planning & Zoning

Filing Date:

RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE
2016 SEP 14 AM 9:14

I. FINDINGS OF FACT:

A. In reviewing applications for certificates of appropriateness in a preservation district, the Preservation Board considers quality of design and site development in terms of the relationships to the street, building facades and overall neighborhood character.

B. Owner and applicant Aaron Costa testified that he has had a temporary banner sign on the building for several months, as he considered options for permanent signage. He described his proposal to hang a two-sided sign off an existing light post in the front yard, where the previous tenant, a hair salon, had a similar sign. He stated that he is assessing means to hold the sign securely, since a hanging sign at the adjacent business, MansaWear, was recently stolen. He stated that he plans to repair existing ground lights that would illuminate the sign.

C. Mr. Costa described the window signage, which would consist of the word 'Krudco', a logo, and the text 'Established 1994'. He stated that he would retain the property address at the bottom of the window, left over from the previous tenant.

D. Board members noted that the font style of the new window lettering differs from that of the property address, and suggested that the address lettering be changed to match 'Established'. The Board did not require this, however.

E. John Lembach, speaking for the Board of the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association, expressed strong support for the signage, stating that this is one of the two best sign proposals his group has recently seen.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board found that the ground sign and window sign are appropriate to the historic visual character of the property and preservation district, as submitted.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Images of proposed signs
C - Photograph of existing conditions
D - Letter from the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association
E - Appearances by Aaron Costa and John Lembach
F - Site visits by Board members