



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES

February 23, 2022 at 6:30 PM in Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Boyer called the meeting to order at 6:35pm.

ROLL CALL

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

Absent: Christine Iman

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Price motioned to approve Design Review Board-Regular Meeting- January 26, 2022, seconded by Mr. Dawson. 4 yeas, with Mr. Rucker abstaining

COMMUNICATION

Planning & Zoning- Ms. Brill

Ms. Brill informed the Board that the applicant for COA-21-26 sent her an email requesting a tabling until next meeting. Staff is working with the selected consultant for the next phase of uptown streetscape and the creation of an Uptown Master Plan. The kickoff meeting for the Uptown Master Plan is taking place early next week.

OLD BUSINESS

COA-21-26: 122 N Chillicothe St; Certificate of Appropriateness; Façade Renovations

Mr. Rucker motioned to table application COA-21-26 until next month, per the applicant's request. Seconded by Mr. Price. All yeas

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

Mr. Boyer introduced the first case and swore in Mr. and Mrs. Medici, Rayce Robinson, and Steve Stroh. Ms. Brill provided the board with some information of the case, which was tabled last month. She stated the applicant was requesting approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness for façade renovations at 213 S. Chillicothe St. Per the feedback at the previous meeting, the applicant is presenting three new options for the façade treatment. All of which were included in the packet.

Mr. Robinson introduced himself as the new property owner and gave a brief overview of why he wanted to revitalize the property. Mr. Stroh provided a presentation of the new exhibits. Option 1 shows the brick arches being reinstalled and the brick soldier course, with the canopy. Option 2 illustrates the brick arches being reinstalled and the brick soldier course, with no canopy. Option 3 shows a new projecting roof with standing seam metal and decorative brackets. The roof structure will project 4' from the building face. The brick soldier course will also be a component. The garage door shows muntin's in the windows of the overhead door.

Mr. Eric Medici provided public comment. He stated that the addition being a different material than the original, follows the guidelines for the secretary of state more closely. He was in support of the application.

Ms. Ina Medici provided public comment. She liked option 3 the most. Liked that the coach lights were going to be retained.

Mr. Boyer opened the meeting to Board comments. Mr. Cron stated after some thought the suggestion of having the addition brick would not work. He liked what has been proposed and wants to see the building in the Uptown restored. He preferred option 3. Mr. Rucker appreciated the explanation of the material choice for the addition. He was apprehensive of the design at first, but now understands how this will work while still maintain the integrity of the original buildings. Mr. Price stated that the guidelines in the Code state additions should not compromise the integrity of the original if removed. He asked the applicant to elaborate on this. Mr. Stroh stated that it was a frame construction up to the existing brick and worst-case scenario would be replacing the roof in the future if addition is removed. Mr. Price referenced 1327.08(a) and stated this was beyond minimal change, but doesn't think it looks bad. Mr. Robinson stated that the purpose and use was not a big change, but an extension of the use. Mr. Dawson asked what the space with the garage door would be used for. Mr. Robinson stated meeting space.

Mr. Dawson stated that based on the options presented that option 3 was the best in his opinion. He asked what the treatment of the exterior of the would be around the south side of the building. He asked if the same material would be wrapped around from the front façade. Mr. Robinson stated that they have discussed multiple options such as painting or extending the material around the side. He stated the most cost effective would be to paint it to match, but is open to options.

Mr. Boyer asked what the design intent for the back building bay. Mr. Robinson stated they have not yet decided. That will most likely come up in a later phase, in a separate project. Mr. Stroh pointed out on the rear elevation that there were multiple additions over time. Stated they could wrap the board and batten finish around the side, concluding where the building jogs at the back side of the original building. The treatment for the back façade would remain the same until they have decided what will happen. Mr. Robinson stated that they would like to add a bathroom and add a garage door on the west side. The only part they are not talking about is the bay the furthest to the rear.

Mr. Boyer stated that the design seems appropriate based off of the criteria listed in chapter 1327. Appreciated the change to the door suggest last month. Fiber glass seems appropriate. He prefers that the brick arches not be added, as it evokes a false sense of historic elements. He is not in favor of the modern canopy proposed in option 1. Liked that there was consideration of wrapping the board and batten around all four sides. Suggests to reconsider the door on the lean-to to make it something more consistent with the others on the same front façade. Mr. Boyer asked what the preferred option was of the applicant. Mr. Robinson stated options 1 or 3.

Mr. Rucker motioned to approve application COA-22-1 as amended per option 3, with the following conditions:

1. The board and batten siding will be wrapped around the side of the 213 S Chillicothe building to include the old jail structure;
2. The applicant is permitted to replace the rear overhead door to match the front façade;
3. The applicant will bring plans for the rear block building to the Board before any work is performed. All yeas.

NEW BUSINESS

COA-22-4: 160 W Main St; Certificate of Appropriateness; Third Story Addition

Mr. Boyer introduced the first case and 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 a third story addition to 160 W. Main St. The applicant proposes to replace the roof in the existing building and add a gabled roof with dormers. The addition will give the building a third story, adding four additional windows to the front façade and three to each side. The height of the structure is measured from the mean height level between the eaves and ridge of a gable roof and would be roughly 42' tall. The front façade will be Board and batten siding and shiplap on the dormers. The shingles will be fiberglass and asphalt. It appears based on historical photographs in the 1880s there was a third story on the building. In a 1910 photograph, the third story was no longer intact.

Mr. Dawson stated he was considering a few options for the roof. His engineer cautioned against a flat roof which is why the gabled roof is being proposed. The dormers will provide some light in the space.

Ms. Medici asked if the third floor will be habitable. Mr. Dawson stated yes. She also asked if the weathervane was included in the overall height. Ms. Brill explained how the code defines building height.

Mr. Medici stated that the original building had a third floor and it was destroyed by a cyclone that went through Plain City. He wanted to provide the board with the details. He liked the original cornices on the building and would like to see the details brought back.

Mr. Cron asked if Mr. Dawson if he had a structural engineer involved. He stated the first step was getting the design approved and then he will engage an engineer to make sure the trusses

can support the structure. Mr. Dawson stated that he wants to put an elevator on the back of the building to provide ADA access to the building.

Mr. Rucker stated the building stated the third story so it makes sense, but to add back all the original details would not be feasible. The proposed design seems to be appropriate. Mr. Boyer stated he is not opposed to adding a third story back to the building. He stated that the proposed design might not be the right approach. The current design changes the proportion of the building by putting a hat on it. He suggested an addition being pulled back from the edges and it be a lot smaller. The proposed roof is very much like a residential gabled roof, but doesn't feel appropriate on the commercial building. By stepping the roof back, it would allow for the building to have a third story without altering its street presence.

Mr. Dawson stated he liked that idea and would be interested in exploring the idea. Mr. Rucker asked the applicant if he would be amenable to tabling. Mr. Dawson agreed.

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

DISCUSSION ITEMS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 7:36pm.