

Design Review Board
July 22, 2020
6:30 pm Via Zoom

Call to Order: Mr. Boyer called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Members Present: John Rucker - Tim Dawson - Christine Iman - Annabelle Tuller (Not Present) - Steve Rice (Not Present) - Todd Boyer – Ron Winn

Staff Present: Nathan Cahall (Village Administrator)

Visitors: Tim Dawson; B. Adams; Bill Pizzino; Eric Medici

Communications:

- Zoning (Taylor Brill): Next DRB meeting is on Aug 5 via Zoom. Two applications will be presented.
- Recusal: Mr. Dawson acknowledged that he would be recusing himself from voting on Case # 2020-0006 because it is his application. Mr. Winn also will be recusing himself from voting for conflict of interest on Case #2020-0006.

New Business:

- **Case Number 2020-0006-** 132 N. Chillicothe Street- Request to bring back the storefront even in front of building to replace doors and windows on the 1st floor to the original design, to replace brown metal with black metal on the back of the building, and add 2 garage doors to the back of the building.
 - Ms. Brill gives a brief overview of case # 2020-0006. The applicant made it clear to staff that the building was in a severe state of disrepair as the foundation was crumbling and need to be remediated immediately to stabilize the building. As this was deemed an unsafe or dangerous condition, the applicant pursued the actions to improve the condition of the building. The applicant received fast track approval for the colors Tricorn Black and Colonial Revival Gray as they are on the approved color pallet list. As the board will recall, the subject establishment garnered the approval of new windows to be installed on the second story back in April. Staff recommends approving case number 2020-0006. Ms. Brill gives Mr. Dawson the floor to state his case for the application in question.
 - Mr. Dawson (applicant) proceeded to provide the board with an overview of his request to bring back the storefront even in front of the building, to replace doors and windows on the 1st floor to its original design, to replace brown metal with black metal on the back of the building, and add 2

garage doors to the back. Mr. Dawson provides historical pictures of the building on how it looks at its original state. Mr. Dawson states his plan on how to bring back the historic look of the building and the materials he will be using. In many of the items, he is replacing or trying to restore it will be in wood materials due to cost efficiency. Mr. Dawson hires Mr. Ivan Beachy to do all the woodwork needed for this design. Everything below the second story windows will be replaced with ash wood and glass. Everything on the second floor will remain in tin as it currently is. The second floor has the box T-1-11 on the top because the cornice detail that matched the neighboring building was removed prior and are no longer there. To have those recreated the applicant could not afford to do so. All the doors will be restored to double door with glass and wood at the bottom (drawings provided in packet). The back of the building will remain metal siding as it currently stands, but painted black to match the rest of the building.

- The chairman then opened the hearing to public comment at 7:13 pm. Mr. Eric Medici identified himself to the board and provided comments. Mr. Medici expressed his view that some of the drawings provided did not provide a design showing the ledge between the first and second floors. Mr. Medici stated he didn't see it on any of the current design views. Mr. Dawson responds that there will be a small ledge roughly about 4-8 inches. Mr. Medici shares a photo to the board showing the ledge and corner detail. The picture was taken the day the mayor's son was removing all the metal on the building. Mr. Medici expresses to Mr. Dawson if there was any way he could recreate the corner detail as shown in the picture, maybe with ash wood. Mr. Medici state on Mr. Dawson's architectural rendering pictures that Mr. Dawson provided show a chevron detail but would like to see the original design. Mr. Dawson state that the architectural rendering pictures that show the detail design is incorrect, that computer model design was done by a student. The actual drawing design that is provided to the board is what the building will look like. Mr. Medici final comments were, he is disappointed that the detailed design will not be replaced and also stated that if the applicant submits documentation to the board then that's what they are voting on because the documentation in this application is casing misleading information it can confusion on the final decision. He also disagrees with the color black for the main color.
- Mr. Rucker agrees with Mr. Medici regarding the color pallet. He stated that when the Design Review Board passed the color pallet but thinks that at a future meeting the board needs to revisit the pallet to designate base

colors and trim colors. He believes that black was more suited for a trim color, rather than a base color. Given the standards as they are written now it can be used as either.

- The chairman closed the public hearing comment at 7:25 pm opened the floor for board discussion and questions. The board then deliberated making various comments/questions.
- Mr. Rucker agreed with Mr. Medici that it would be nice to see some of the detail work preserved because that was a tremendous loss. The economics of restoring this have to be considered as well but, it would be a great thing if it could be brought back.
- Ms. Iman asks why were repairs done to building prior coming to the board, was because of environmental change? The applicant referred the question to the Village Administrator. Mr. Cahall state that before Mr. Dawson taking ownership the building/ property had major structural issues. Mr. Dawson has been working with the county/city officials to make sure the building is up to code and that is safe everyone involves as well as for the community. These repairs were done as an emergency.
- Mr. Boyer had some concerns regarding the clarification of certain items. Chairman believes that to proceed with the application the following items to need clearer to the board.
 - Garage Doors- the actual location on the backside and dimension. (clearer picture), rear elevation
 - Walk-in cooler screening
 - A clearer floorplan: dimensions, cut-sheet, single or double doors
 - Window, column, and other detail on the exterior of the building
 - Rethinking the color- may be choosing a different color other black
 - Project cost estimate
- Mr. Dawson is not prepared to turn in architectural drawing and feels like some of the request that was requested, is more of architectural drawings. Mr. Dawson believes that he was at the meeting for a Concept drawing turn in. He has provided Mr. Beachy design for the store in-front. Mr. Dawson insisted that Mr. Beachy drawing of the storefront will be the same from drawing to reality. He is concerned about the cost of the project if the board asks him to recreate some of the design it might put a financial strain that Mr. Dawson would not be able to afford.
- Several of the board members feel to approve or disapprove of the application, they need to know what exactly they are approving. They feel that the design shown tonight gives a concept of what it will look rather than what will look like. Mr. Dawson mentions the building adjacent to his, that their design is of a more modern then it is historically. The applicant's

goal is to bring back his building to its original state with a cost-effective approach, rather than give it a modern look. He feels that the owner of the building did not follow the DRB regulation.

- Mr. Dawson expresses how disappointed he feels and believes that the board is treating him unfairly regarding requesting additional information. Mr. Dawson believes he has done everything he could to provide the Design Review Board and the Village of Plain City on all the documentation needed for his application to be approved.
- The majority of the board members did not feel comfortable to make a motion. Mr. Rucker motioned to table case# 2020-0006. Ms. Inman seconds the motion. Three votes Yes, two not present (A. Tuller and S. Rice) Two are recusing (T. Dawson and R. Winn). Motion carries
- Chairman states that the motion was tabled due to needing more details regarding:
 - The locations of the garage doors to the rear
 - Drawing of the rear elevation
 - Screening for the walk-in cooler and its relationship to the façade
 - Clarification on whether the doors will be single doors or double
 - Mr. Boyer wanted to see the dental detail and the cornice detail brought back but is willing to discuss feasibility at the next meeting
 - Mr. Rucker suggest providing a cost estimate for the work
 - Cut sheets for the 1st story windows
 - Reconsider modifying the pre-approved colors
 - Ms. Iman wants drawing depicting inaccurate detail to be removed from the packet
- Mr. Rucker asked Ms. Brill to look into the certificate of appropriateness granted to the building adjacent (120-124 N Chillicothe)

Discussion:

- Masonic Lodge: Mr. Rucker gave a brief description regarding the redoing of stucco and going to repaint the Masonic Lodge. He states the Masonic Lodge would like to refreshed what is already existing, in doing repaint the mural on the side and repaint with the same base color. Mr. Rucker believes this does not need a Design Review Board to approve, as it is not a significant change, just would like to notify the board of the work. The committee has no issues regarding the updating (refreshing) of the Masonic Lodge.

ADJOURN:

- Mr. Rucker motioned to adjourn at 8:20 pm. Ms. Iman seconded. Three votes Meeting ajourned