



**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
December 21, 2022 at 6:30 PM
Council Chambers**

Chair: Todd Boyer **Vice-Chair:** Ronald Price

Members: John Rucker, Jim Cron, Jamie Davis, Tim Dawson, Christine Iman

Call to Order:

Mr. Boyer called the meeting to order at 6:37pm.

Roll Call:

Present: T. Boyer, R. Price, J. Cron, J. Davis.

Absent: J. Rucker, T. Dawson, C. Iman.

Approvals:

Design Review Board Minutes – November 30, 2022

Mr. Price motioned to approve the November 30, 2022 minutes, seconded by Mr. Cron.
All in favor.

Design Review Board Findings of Fact – COA-22-16

Mr. Price motioned to approve the Findings of Fact for COA-22-16, seconded by Mr. Cron. All in favor.

Communication

Planning & Zoning – Mr. Hutchinson

Mr. Hutchinson provided information to the Board on the zoning code update and stated that Council has allowed him more time to revise and make minor modifications to the code draft. The Planning & Zoning Commission meets in January to discuss these potential revisions. Mr. Hutchinson stated that he plans to bring a draft before this Board to hear their opinions as well.

Public Comment:

None.

Old Business:

None.

New Business:

COA-22-18: 213 S Chillicothe Street; Certificate of Appropriateness; Sign

Mr. Boyer swore in Rayce Robinson and Brady Monroe.

Mr. Dreier briefed the Board on the application details and summarized the application background. The application is for two signs at 213 S Chillicothe Street. As proposed, both signs would say “Brick House Blue”. The front sign would be interior illuminated and the rear would have exterior gooseneck style illumination.

Mr. Cron asked if both of these signs meet the zoning criteria for size and placement. Mr. Dreier responded that they do meet the zoning requirements.

Mr. Boyer stated that he believes, although they meet the size requirement, he feels that the front sign is too large given that it is twenty-feet long. He asked if Brick House Blue is the owner. Mr. Robinson said that they are not, rather they are the anchor tenant.

Mr. Boyer noted his concern with the interior illumination and the residential units across the street. He asked if the sign would be on a timer or similar device to prevent the sign from being on too late at night. Mr. Monroe said that it would have a timer and

given the design of this sign, it should not be bright enough to affect neighboring residences.

Mr. Boyer commented on the rear sign and stated that the exterior, gooseneck-style, lighting is more historically accurate than what is proposed for the front sign and inquired if that had been considered as an option for the front sign. Mr. Monroe said that the engineering requirements for the anchors are more extensive given the size of the front sign and that it could be more destructive to the brick exterior to place gooseneck-style lighting on the front. Additionally, Mr. Robinson stated that the proposed front sign style is the least intrusive and prevents any unnecessary exterior, standalone, lighting being left behind in the event the proposed sign is removed. He added that the electrical wiring for the front sign will be run through the attic of the building, which will minimize the work being done to the historic brick exterior. They plan to place the joints for the proposed sign through the mortar and not the brick.

Mr. Robinson stated to the Board that, in the future, he plans to bring an application before them for a freestanding monument sign which will function as a multi-tenant sign. He noted that he understands it is unusual for an uptown business to have this style sign but stated that it is important to potential tenants to have that type of signage and believes it would fit in appropriately. Mr. Hutchinson added that as the code stands currently, all freestanding signs are prohibited in the B3 zoning district but that the zoning code update may change that regulation. He added that wall signs are currently allowed in the B3 zoning district.

Ms. Davis asked if, in regards to the neighbor notice that was sent to all residents within 250 feet of the applicant's property, any comment or feedback was received from those residents about the proposed signs and lighting. Mr. Dreier answered that staff has not received any comment, either negative or positive, in regards to this application. Mr. Dreier asked Mr. Robinson if he has received any comment or feedback and Mr. Robinson affirmed that he had not. Mr. Robinson added that he believes if residents did have a concern with the proposed sign, he would have been contacted. Mr. Monroe stated that given the design of the front sign, the illumination would be a halo style around the letters which would not expel as much light as other styles.

Ms. Davis commented that she is trying to look at this application from the perspective of planning for future signs and how to prevent signs from being piecemealed together on this structure. Mr. Hutchinson said he understands and that the zoning code update will address several of these concerns. Ms. Davis asked if a projecting sign for multi-tenant signage would work on this building. Mr. Hutchinson said that projecting signs are allowed. Ms. Davis said she would like that style and believes it would look appropriate on this building. Mr. Monroe stated that his company designs and constructs those types of signs often in true downtown style environments but that this building sits back far enough from the street that it would

minimize the benefits of building a projecting sign. Mr. Boyer said he understands both sides of the discussion but believes that most people will know where Brick House Blue will be and a large sign, as proposed, may not be needed.

Mr. Cron asked about the addresses for the parcel and if there are still two addresses. Mr. Robinson answered that there are currently two addresses for the parcel but that he is working toward having one address for the property. Mr. Cron stated that if there is only one address for the property, he believes a monument sign in the front of the building may not be needed and interior wayfinding would suffice. Mr. Robinson acknowledged Mr. Cron's comments and said that more discussion on that topic could take place when that application goes before this Board.

Mr. Boyer began deliberations for the Findings of Fact for application COA-22-18.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(b) of the code, Mr. Price stated that he believes the proposed application meets this standard. The Board agrees.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(c) of the code, Mr. Boyer stated that he believes the proposed application meets this standard. The Board agrees.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(e) of the code, Mr. Boyer stated that the installation of the proposed sign should not damage the distinctive features of the building or the craftsmanship of the property since the installation will take place on the mortar as much as possible and not on the historic brick. The Board agrees.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(j) of the code, Mr. Boyer made the same comment as he did for section 1327.08(e).

As it pertains to section 1327.09(d) of the code, Mr. Price inquired if the sign is subject to this part of the code. Mr. Hutchinson stated that it is and asked Mr. Monroe if the color is historically accurate. Mr. Monroe answered that it is part of the Sherwin-Williams historic color palette. Mr. Hutchinson stated that he encourages the applicant to review all colors involved to make sure the final color is as close as possible to be historically accurate.

As it pertains to section 1327.09(e) of the code, Mr. Boyer stated that interior illumination would not necessarily reflect the era in which the structure was built but that the wall sign style would be consistent with the era. He added that all other aspects of the sign are consistent with the era. Mr. Monroe stated that internally lit neon signs began in the 1930's and therefore could be considered to be part of that era. He also stated that this is a tough criteria to meet since most historically accurate signs would not properly encompass the professional nature and standards that signs are designed to now.

The Board took a brief break to give legal counsel adequate time to finalize the Findings of Fact. Once finished, the Board began their review of the Findings of Fact. The Board found that no modifications were required.

Mr. Price motioned to adopt the Findings of Fact for application COA-22-18, seconded by Ms. Davis. All in favor.

Mr. Price stated that he would like to apply, as a condition to the applicant, that they use historically accurate colors and make every effort possible to mount the sign through the mortar and not the historic brick.

Mr. Boyer added that, in the future, he would like to see less front facing signs be interior illuminated and more use of automatic timers to prevent signs from being on at unnecessary times.

Mr. Price motioned to approve Certificate of Appropriateness application COA-22-18, seconded by Mr. Cron. All in favor.

Discussion Items:

None.

Adjourn:

Mr. Boyer motioned to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Cron. Meeting adjourned at 7:33pm.