



**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**April 26, 2023 at 6:30 PM**  
**Council Chambers**

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

**Members:** Jim Eudaily, Jim Cron, Jamie Davis, Robert Phillips, Christine Iman

**Call to Order:**

Mr. Price called the meeting to order at 6:32pm.

**Roll Call:**

Present: R. Price, J. Eudaily, J. Cron, J. Davis, C. Iman.

Absent: T. Boyer, R. Phillips.

**Approvals:**

Mr. Price motioned to amend the agenda to correct the order of business, placing the tabled application COA-23-7 (COA-23-3) within old business, seconded by Ms. Iman. All in favor.

Design Review Board – Meeting Minutes – April 13, 2023

Mr. Eudaily motioned to approve the April 13, 2023 minutes, seconded by Mr. Price. Four yeas and one abstention from Ms. Iman.

Design Review Board – Findings of Fact – COA-23-1

Mr. Price motioned to approve the Findings of Fact for COA-23-1, seconded by Mr. Eudaily. Four yeas and one abstention from Ms. Iman.

Design Review Board – Findings of Fact – COA-23-2

Mr. Price motioned to approve the Findings of Fact for COA-23-2, seconded by Mr. Eudaily. Four yeas and one abstention from Ms. Iman.

### **Swearing in of Speakers:**

Mr. La Fayette, the Village Solicitor, swore in all speakers at once, those who wished to speak as applicants and in general public comment.

### **Communication:**

Planning & Zoning – Mr. Hutchinson: Nothing to report.

### **Public Comment:**

Mr. Eric Medici introduced himself and asked who the burden of enforcement falls upon if someone does not do what the Design Review Board has previously approved or ordered. Mr. Hutchinson said that enforcement lies with the Planning and Zoning Department of the Village. Mr. Medici reminded the Board and staff that Mr. Dawson has yet to paint the exit stairs on the east side of The Grainery, as he was directed to do two years ago. Mr. Hutchinson said he would look into the matter.

### **Old Business:**

COA-23-7 (continuation of COA-23-3): 101 S Chillicothe Street; Certificate of Appropriateness; Exterior Paint, Modifications and Site Design

Mr. Price reminded everyone in attendance that the public comment for application COA-23-7 (COA-23-3) has remained open since the previous meeting and those who wish to speak may do so now.

Mr. Anthony Scott, representative of the applicant, introduced himself and thanked the Board for their time. He stated that there has been precedent set that would permit the building to be painted since several other buildings, located within and outside the Village of Plain City, have also been painted. As he interprets the code, painting a historic building is not prohibited. He encouraged the Board to approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Steve Syfert said that, due to some personal research, he believes the staining option presented at the previous meeting would be as detrimental to the brick as

painting. As such, he believes the building should not be painted or stained and should remain as is.

Ms. Stephanie Syfert agrees with Mr. Syfert's comments and believes that painting the brick is prohibited in the code. She encouraged the Board to not approve the exterior painting.

Mr. Eric Medici reminded the Board that he is opposed to the exterior paint and roll-up doors and believes the code prohibits both modifications. He emphasized that this building possesses unique characteristics that qualify it is historic and distinctive. Additionally, he does not believe there are any previous precedents in regards to other buildings being painted since this Board did not formally approve those buildings to be painted.

Mr. Tim Dawson introduced himself and stated that he believes precedent has been set in regards to other buildings being painted. He feels that the application includes necessary updates. He cited several examples from neighboring communities in which historic buildings have been painted. He is in support of this application as proposed. Mr. Dawson also believes that the application aligns with the priorities listed in the 2018 Plain City Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Ina Medici introduced herself and stated that she strongly feels that this application should be disapproved.

Ms. Jenny Brill introduced herself and stated that as she interprets the code in section 1327.08 and 1327.09, this Board would not be able to approve the application. She encouraged the Board to follow the guidelines set forth in the code.

Mr. Scott asked if this structure is a registered historic building. The Board said that it is not on the National Register of Historic Places however it does fall within the locally designated historic district.

Mr. Price asked the applicant if they have any plans or renderings depicting what they propose to do to the rear of the building. Mr. Scott said that they are waiting to submit those plans until a later date. Mr. Price asked the same question in regards to the rear doors, Mr. Scott replied the same, they are waiting to submit plans for that as well. Mr. Scott noted that the signage depicted in the renderings are not included in the application and that all awnings would be removed from the building if the application is approved.

Mr. Eudaily asked the applicant if they have considered cleaning the brick with a detergent and not painting at all. Mr. Scott said that he and the property owner prefer to paint the building. Ms. Iman stated that she prefers the building as is.

Mr. Price closed public comment at 7:09pm.

Mr. Price began deliberations for the Findings of Fact for application COA-23-7 (COA-23-3).

As it pertains to section 1237.08(a) of the code, Ms. Iman believes that this criteria has been met. The Board agrees.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(b), Ms. Iman and Ms. Davis believe the exterior paint would permanently alter the character of the building.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(c) – 1327.08(d), the Board agrees that these criteria have been met.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(e), the Board agrees that the building is unique in its present state and that any modifications would render a change to the character. The Board agrees that these comments apply equally to section 1327.08(f).

As it pertains to section 1327.08(g), the Board agrees that this criteria has been met.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(h), the Board agrees that this criteria does not apply since no archaeological resources are present.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(i), Ms. Iman believes that the door replacement qualifies as an addition and therefore this criteria has not been met. Mr. Eudaily stated that he believes the doors do not qualify as an addition.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(j), both Ms. Iman and Mr. Eudaily believe their previous comments are applicable as previously stated.

As it pertains to section 1327.09(a), Ms. Iman stated that if the application is approved, this criteria would not be met.

As it pertains to section 1327.09(b) – 1327.09(c)(2), the Board agrees that these criteria have been met or are not applicable to the application.

As it pertains to section 1327.09(d), the Board agrees that the proposed color satisfies this criteria since it is listed on the Sherwin-Williams Historic Color Palette.

As it pertains to section 1327.09(e) – 1327.09(f), the Board agrees that these criteria are not applicable to the application.

Ms. Davis asked the applicant if any of the buildings that they have painted in Troy, Ohio have required maintenance. The applicant said that since the building was painted in 2018, no exterior maintenance has been required.

Upon hearing no additional comments or discussion from the Board, Mr. Price closed the deliberations for the Findings of Fact for application COA-23-7 (COA-23-3).

The Board elected to take a five-minute break at 7:22pm during the voting stage. Mr. La Fayette noted that no deliberations or talking about the application may take place during the break. At 7:28pm, Mr. Price called the meeting to order and had Mr. Dreier provide an overview of the votes that had been cast.

Mr. Price motioned to approve Certificate of Appropriateness application COA-23-7 (COA-23-3) with the understanding that the fence, signage, and window border are not included in the application and that the "beer garden" is still required to go through the zoning permit process, seconded by Mr. Eudaily. Three yeas from and two nays from Ms. Davis and Ms. Iman.

### **New Business:**

COA-23-4: 138 W Main Street; Certificate of Appropriateness; Sign

Mr. Hutchinson provided a brief summary of the application which consists of a sign to be installed on the east side of The Grainery that would say "The Grainery Live – Patio Entrance". The sign would be constructed of powder-coated aluminum and would be mounted to the brick exterior with a support post on the opposite side in the middle of the alley.

Mr. Price opened public comment at 7:33pm.

Mr. Medici inquired why this application is being reviewed by this Board when the proposed sign surpasses the size requirement in the sign code. Mr. Hutchinson said that this Board is required to review it first and, if approved, the application will go before the Board of Zoning Appeals for a zoning variance. Mr. Medici noted his concern that the sign wouldn't be able to be appropriately maintained given how close it would be to the adjacent property line.

Ms. Syfert and Ms. Medici said they are opposed to the application as proposed.

Mr. Robinson, the adjacent property owner, stated that he prefers an archway style sign that would connect his building and the applicant's building. He believes that style of sign would fit the area more appropriately.

Mr. Price closed public comment at 7:43pm.

Mr. Price began deliberations for the Findings of Fact for application COA-23-4.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(a) – 1327.09(b) of the code, the Board agrees that these criteria are not applicable to the application.

As it pertains to section 1327.09(c)(1) – 1327.09(c)(2), the Board agrees that these criteria do not apply to the application but a wrought iron style sign would be a better fit for area.

As it pertains to section 1327.09(d), the Board agrees that the proposed color satisfies this criteria since it is listed on the Sherwin-Williams Historic Color Palette.

As it pertains to section 1327.09(e), the Board agrees that the sign does not conform to this criteria and noted their preference for an archway sign.

As it pertains to section 1327.09(f), the Board agrees that a deviation is not required.

Mr. Price asked Mr. Dawson if he would be amenable to resubmitting the application to accommodate the Board's preference for an archway sign. Mr. Dawson said that he prefers to have the Board vote on the sign as submitted.

Upon hearing no additional comments or discussion from the Board, Mr. Price closed the deliberations for the Findings of Fact for application COA-23-4.

Ms. Iman motioned to approve Certificate of Appropriateness application COA-23-4, seconded by Ms. Davis. One yea and four nays from Mr. Price, Mr. Eudaily, Mr. Cron, and Ms. Davis.

COA-23-5: 138 W Main Street; Certificate of Appropriateness; Fence

Mr. Hutchinson provided information about the application, stating that is it to install a fence in the alleyway on the east side of The Grainery. The fence would match the existing fences on the property in both color and materials.

Mr. Price opened public comment at 7:56pm.

Mr. Medici said he is opposed to this application since the fence does not fit in to the style and design of the Uptown Historic District. He is concerned that this fence is only being proposed due to the difference in opinions between the applicant and adjacent property owner.

Ms. Syfert said she is opposed to the application since it does not fit within the environment of the Historic District and is not historically accurate.

Mr. Robinson, the adjacent property owner, said he is amenable to a temporary fence to protect Mr. Dawson's property from the construction work that will be taking place soon but believes that there are better options for all parties involved than what is being proposed with this application.

Mr. Dawson said that he is also amenable to a temporary fence similar to what Mr. Robinson has proposed but prefers that the Board deliberate and vote on the application as submitted. Mr. Dawson emphasized that he believes there have been contradictory decisions previously made by this Board that has led to the current discussion.

Ms. Iman said that she does not believe this application encompasses the open concept streetscape that the Village desires.

Ms. Davis asked how many weddings and events Mr. Dawson has scheduled for The Silo in the near future. Mr. Dawson said he is not sure of the exact number but is aware of several that have been scheduled.

Mr. Price closed public comment at 8:10pm.

Mr. Price began deliberations for the Findings of Fact for application COA-23-5.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(a) of the code, the Board agrees that this criteria is not applicable to the application.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(b), the Board agrees that this criteria has not been met.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(c), the Board agrees that this criteria has been met.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(d), the Board agrees that this criteria is not applicable to the application.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(e), Mr. Eudaily believes the fence would affect the distinctive feature of the property whereas Mr. Price does not believe it would affect those features.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(f) – 1327.08(i), the Board agrees that these criteria are not applicable to the application.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(j) – 1327.09(b), the Board agrees that these criteria have been met.

As it pertains to criteria 1327.09(c)(1) – 1327.09(c)(2), the Board agrees that these criteria are not applicable to the application.

As it pertains to section 1327.09(d), the Board agrees that this criteria has been met.

As it pertains to section 1327.09(e), the Board agrees that this criteria is not applicable to the application.

As it pertains to section 1327.09(f), the Board agrees that a deviation is not required.

Upon hearing no additional comments or discussion from the Board, Mr. Price closed the deliberations for the Findings of Fact for application COA-23-5.

Mr. Price motioned to approve Certificate of Appropriateness application COA-23-5, seconded by Mr. Cron. Five nays.

COA-23-6: 213 S Chillicothe Street; Certificate of Appropriateness; Exterior Addition and Renovations

Mr. Hutchinson provided details about the application which consists of an addition to the rear structure of 213 S Chillicothe Street. The applicant, Mr. Robinson, noted that the materials would be the same as what was used in the previous addition, which this Board approved recently. This includes the exterior lights as well. Mr. Hutchinson said the site plan will still go through the review phase by the Village Engineer. Mr. La Fayette noted that, if the application is approved, minor revisions would be permitted to be made administratively. However, if major changes are required, the project would have to be reviewed by this Board again.

Mr. Price opened public comment at 8:22pm.

Ms. Medici said that she supports this application as submitted.

Mr. Price closed public comment at 8:24pm.

Mr. Price began deliberations for the Findings of Fact for application COA-23-6.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(a) – 1327.08(e) of the code, the Board agrees that these criteria have been met.

As it pertains to section 1327.08(f) – 1327.08(h), the Board agrees that these criteria are not applicable to the application.



As it pertains to section 1327.08(i) – 1327.09(d), the Board agrees that these criteria have been met.

As it pertains to section 1327.09(e), the Board agrees that this criteria is not applicable to the application.

As it pertains to section 1327.09(f), the Board agrees that a deviation is not required.

Upon hearing no additional comments or discussion from the Board, Mr. Price closed the deliberations for the Findings of Fact for application COA-23-6.

Mr. Price motioned to approve Certificate of Appropriateness application COA-23-6, seconded by Mr. Cron. All in favor.

**Discussion Items:** None.

**Adjourn:**

Ms. Iman motioned to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Davis. Meeting adjourned at 8:30pm.