



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES

January 26, 2022 at 6:30 PM in Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Boyer called the meeting to order at 6:30pm.

ROLL CALL

Present: Todd Boyer (Chair), John Rucker, Tim Dawson, Jim Cron, Ronald Price

Absent: Christine Iman

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE -CHAIR

Mr. Rucker motioned to nominate Mr. Boyer as Chairman, seconded by Mr. Dawson. All yeas

Mr. Boyer motioned to nominate Mr. Price as Vice-chair, seconded by Mr. Cron. All yeas.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Dawson motioned to approve Design Review Board-Regular Meeting- September 29, 2021, seconded by Mr. Price. All yeas.

COMMUNICATION

Planning & Zoning- Ms. Brill

Mr. Byrum's term expired and they Mayor is looking for a new member to fill the realtor spot on the board. Staff is working with the selected consultant for the next phase of uptown streetscape and the creation of an Uptown Master Plan. More details to come.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

The commission agreed to move COA-22-2 and COA-22-3 as the first and second item on the agenda so Mr. Rucker could leave the meeting early.

COA-22-2: 156 W Main St; Certificate of Appropriateness; Façade Renovations: Mr. Boyer introduced the first case and Mr. Lafayette swore in Mr. Dawson, the applicant. Ms. Brill

provided the board with some information of the case. She stated the applicant was requesting approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow for façade renovations to 156 W Main St. The proposal was to remove the green panel above the existing windows and door, to expose the glass tiles behind it. The existing door leading to the upstairs unit will be replaced, with a window/glass above the door to be added. The new door will be wood with a black steel trim.

Mr. Dawson further explained the proposal and talked through the exhibits briefly. The goal was to restore the storefront to be more historically accurate. The existing door will be replaced with new door, mainly of wood and glass. The stucco will be removed to reveal some LUXAR glass behind. Has enlisted local craftsman, Ivan Beechy to help restore to façade.

Mr. Cron and Mr. Price both liked the idea of exposing the LUXAR glass. Mr. Boyer concurred.

Mr. Rucker motioned to approve the application as submitted, seconded by Mr. Price. All yeas with Mr. Dawson abstaining.

COA-22-3: 160 W Main St; Certificate of Appropriateness; Façade Renovations; Mr. Boyer introduced the first case. Ms. Brill provided the board with some information of the case. She stated the applicant was requesting approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow for façade renovations to 160 W Main St. The proposal was to remove the existing white storefront material, to replace it with a primarily glass storefront. The existing doors will be removed and relocated on the storefront. The new double hung doors will be stained birch wood, with a black trim. The new columns on the storefront will be wood and painted black, as well.

Mr. Dawson further explained the proposal and talked through the exhibits briefly. There used to be existing double doors in the middle of the store front. The stone was added somewhere along the line. What exists now is not what was historically there. The plan is the reproduce the glass above the doors and wooden storefront at the bottom. Back to 13ft storefronts and remove the stone.

Mr. Cron asked about the grids in the windows. Mr. Dawson stated that it was just tape. The existing windows are not that old. He would like to restore them. He is in contact with some roofers to replace the roof on the building because it is bowed. Considering a flat or gable roof, the building used to be three stories. Wanted the Boards feedback on style of roof. The Board wanted to see a rendering to get a better idea. Plans to come back next month with this proposal. Mr. Cron asked about the mural planned for the side of the building. Mr. Dawson stated yes, but not the one approved last year. Its still in the works

Mr. Boyer liked the proposal. He stated it would be great to bring the brick look back on the columns. Mr. Dawson stated it may be difficult to get the paint off of the limestone.

Mr. Rucker motioned to approve the application, as submitted, seconded by Mr. Price. All yeas with Mr. Dawson abstaining.

COA-21-26: 122 N Chillicothe St; Certificate of Appropriateness; Façade Renovations; Mr. Boyer introduced the first case and Mr. Lafayette swore in Mr. James, the applicant. Ms. Brill provided the board with some information of the case. She stated the applicant was requesting approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow for façade renovations to 122 N.

Chillicothe St. She provided some background information and in 2013 and 2014 the applicant for façade renovations. The revised submittal from 2014, closely matches the one before the board tonight. Certificates of Appropriateness are only valid one year provided no work is done. Due to the timeline of events, staff has been deemed a new Certificate of Appropriateness for the work is required. The applicant proposed to install a black awning on the side of the building to provide a cover for the exterior stairs. The façade renovations will include replacing the storefront on one side to match the other. The applicant will also be painting the first-floor retail front and second floor window trim SW 6119 Antique White. The roof cornice, soffit, fascia & exterior doors will be painted SW2819 Downing Slate.

Mr. Lafayette swore in Mr. James. Mr. James displayed material samples. Mr. Dawson asked Mr. James if he could correct the elevations and materials to match what was actually installed on the buildings. Mr. Dawson asked why the façade was not inset like originally proposed. Mr. James stated structurally it was not possible, so he had to adjust. The signs are also not wall mounted any longer, but on mast arms. This could be corrected in the exhibits, as well.

The Board asked a clarification question about the approval of the paint color and the renovation. Staff stated the code only allows approval admiratively if no alterations are being made and the paint color is on the approved palette. In this case the color was on the approved list but alterations were being made, so this is why it was in front of the Board.

Mr. Dawson recommended Mr. James have his architect update the plans to match what is already constructed. Also requested to have a sideview of the trim to better see the details. Mr. Dawson stated he didn't mind the storefront the way Mr. James had it, just the drawing did not match. Mr. Lafayette asked the applicant if he agreed to table the application. Mr. James agreed.

Mr. Dawson motioned to table the application, seconded by Mr. Price. 4 yeas.

COA-22-1: 213 S Chillicothe St; Certificate of Appropriateness; Exterior Building Renovations;

Mr. Boyer introduced the first case and Mr. Lafayette swore in Mr. Stroh, the applicant. Ms. Brill provided the board with some information of the case. She stated the applicant was requesting approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow for renovations to 213 S. Chillicothe St. The proposal included to repair and clean the masonry on both structures. On 205 S. Chillicothe all windows will be removed and replaced with new windows in black finish. The existing frame of the south wall addition. All trim, doors, and finishes will be painted SW 6258-Tricorn Black. On the 213 S. Chillicothe structure, the applicant proposed removing the block add on structure and the chimney on the north wall. The existing store front will be removed and replaced. All windows will be replaced, and all trim and finishes will be painted in the Tricorn Black. The pavement between the front of the building and the sidewalk, where parking exists currently will be removed. A new patio, walkway and landscaping will be added in its place.

Mr. Lafayette swore in Mr. Stroh. Mr. Stroh stated he was the architect on the project. He provided some additional information about the project and presented the exhibits and proposed materials. They are looking to do some masonry repair. Try to clean up the porch on

the old water off and replace the front door with the existing door, currently in the basement. Remove the lean-to frame addition on the side of the building to add a connector. The connector will adjoin both the buildings on the property. Board and batten siding and hardy plank material painted black. Plans have changed slightly to replace the shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof. Repair and paint the trim and gutters black. Replace windows with double hung window. All of the painting will be tricorn black. They are replacing the garage door with a new glass garage door. The connector and house will be a co-working space. The old fire bay space will be white-boxed for future retail space. The block addition on the back of the main building will be removed. Replacing the sidewalk in front of the building and removing the inset parking. The village is looking to do a public parking lot in the rear and they are trying to coordinate their layout with that.

Mr. Cron asked if the existing brick will be tuckpointed and fixed. Mr. Stroh stated they are looking repurposing some of the brick to help replace those that have fallen into disrepair. Mr. Stroh stated they are not removing the porch just the windows. There will be a porch instead of an enclosed space. The frame addition on the south side will be removed.

Mr. Dawson asked if the roof of the water office will be replaced with true standing seam roof. Mr. Stroh stated yes. Mr. Dawson did not like that all the windows were not gridded. Mr. Stroh stated they are matching the gridding on the existing structures, but have elected to not have this gridding on the connector piece. The idea was to have the connector fade into the background and highlight the historic structures. Mr. Dawson stated that adding the breezeway changes everything and if they are going to add anything it needs to match the brick of the existing building. Mr. Stroh stated that the buildings are two different bricks and colors. Mr. Dawson stated if the goal is to make it one building it need to look as close to historic as possible. What was proposed was too modern. He also stated that he preferred the glass garage door to have the gridding.

Mr. Dawson asked where the patio fence was going. Mr. Stroh displayed where in front of the building it would be located. Mr. Dawson stated he wanted to see a drawing of the fence in front of the building from a street level. Mr. Cron agreed that he would like to see brick on the connector piece, but acknowledged it would be hard to match the bricks if they are different colors. Mr. Price asked if the connector was to get between the building. He stated it was going to look much different than what was existing. He stated brick would look better.

Mr. Stroh stated the connector has some function because plumbing and utilities will be located there instead of in the old water office. The connector also provides ADA accessibility to the building.

Mr. Boyer stated he liked that the new connector portion was setback from the façade on all sides of the building. Appreciated that the new roof was below the eave on the school building. The material choices and color choices differentiate it from the existing buildings. The secretary of state guidelines state for renovating historic building talk about clearly differentiating the new from the historic. In favor for removing all the ramps and asphalt in front of the building. Appreciated the use of wood windows and the restoration being done to the existing buildings. Stated it was a missed opportunity, in his opinion, to just replace the entry on the old school

building. Some care should be taken into putting a nice front door on the building. The overhead door felt strange, as proposed, because it is a very modern piece in the old building. Also did not feel the canopy was appropriate and it felt stuck on. Take cues from coach light details on the new canopy piece, but cautioned against adding artificial history. Mr. Stroh stated the coach lights will be restored and put back on the building.

Mr. Stroh stated by making the connector match the existing buildings, it would not allow for the existing buildings to retain their existing character. They wanted to make the connector look different to not make a third building and for the building to retain their character. Mr. Lafayette asked the applicant if he would be amenable to tabling. Mr. Stroh agreed.

Mr. Price motioned to table the application, seconded by Mr. Dawson. 4 yeas.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 7:52pm.