

June 24, 2014

Chairman Lauryn Bayliff called the meeting of the Tipp City Restoration and Architectural Board of Review to order on Tuesday, June 24, 2014 at 7:30pm. Other Board members in attendance included: Ralph Brown, Karen Kuziinsky, Nancy Cox, Pete Berbach, Joel Gruber, and Ann Harker. Also in attendance were City Planner/Zoning Administrator Matthew Spring and Board Secretary, Kimberly Patterson.

Citizens signing the register: Bill Hibner, Michael Boyde, Darby Mahan, and Michael Mahan. Tony Heintl was present but did not sign the register.

Minutes

Chairman Bayliff asked for discussion. Being no further discussion, Ms. Cox **moved to approve the May 27, 2014 meeting minutes as written**, seconded by Mr. Brown. **Motion carried.** Ayes: Cox, Brown Kuziinsky, Harker, Berbach, Gruber, and Bayliff. Nays: None.

Chairman's Introduction

Chairman Bayliff explained Board procedure to all present to include the order of business; the appeal process and ten day waiting period; citizens wishing to speak for or against a request; and the acquisition of all required permits upon any approval.

Citizens Comments Not on the Agenda

Mike Mahan. 620 Redwood Square, Tipp City approached the dais. Mr. Mahan stated that he had just purchased a property located at 214 E. Walnut Street and inquired about the process would be to find out historical information regarding the property prior to filling out an application to come before the Restoration Board.

Chairman Bayliff the library had information about the specific property and could reach out to the Historical Society. Chairman Bayliff stated that if Mr. Mahan was interested in having an informal conversation with the Board, it was recommended to complete an application with ideas, the sooner the better.

Mr. Spring stated that the Ohio Historic Inventory was available for most historical properties in the district and would also provide the most current Guidelines Manual and application material.

New Business

Steve & Sarah Gustavson - 439 W. Main Street - Lot: Inlot 201 – The applicants requested an approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of the existing 3-tab gray color shingles and replacement with dimensional charcoal color shingles, for the home and detached garage at 439 W. Main Street.

Zoning district: R-2/RA – Two-Family Residential/Old Tippecanoe City Restoration and Historic District

Mr. Spring stated that the applicants requested an approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of the existing 3-tab gray color shingles and

June 24, 2014

replacement with dimensional charcoal color shingles, for the home and detached garage at 439 W. Main Street.

Mr. Spring also stated that the proposed siding was Mastic Ovation and provided a 3" lap. The proposed color was Quiet Willow (gray) to "match" the paint color on the primary structure.

Mr. Spring noted that following which was an excerpt from the Design Manual on Historic Significance for Roofs, Gutters, and Downspouts:

- 1) The original roofing materials, shape, overhang style, roof structure, gutters, and downspouts shall be maintained and preserved to the maximum extent feasible.
- 2) If the roof or roof material is to be replaced, restoration to the original roof style, material, shape, and color is preferred. Metal roofs, if replaced, should be replaced with standing-seam metal roofing.
- 3) Changing the original roof shape or adding features inappropriate to the essential character of the roof, such as oversized dormer windows or connected dormers, is discouraged.
- 4) The replacement of an asphalt shingle roof with asphalt shingles is acceptable. Generally, light colored shingles are not appropriate because they are a more modern development.
- 5) The use of asphalt shingles as valley flashing is strongly discouraged. Copper, galvanized metal, and rolled aluminum with a baked-enamel finish are more appropriate choices for valley flashing than today's woven shingle technique.
- 6) Removing elements such as chimneys, skylights, light wells, dormers and cupolas that are part of the architectural style or era of the building's roof is not appropriate.
- 7) Low-profile ridge vents are not appropriate if they detract from the original design and destroy historic roofing materials or design.
- 8) Skylights, roof decks, and roof gardens may be permitted if they do not detract from the architectural character of the building. Generally, the use of skylights, roof decks, or roof gardens on a façade facing a public right-of-way is discouraged because of increased visibility and incompatibility with most architectural styles.
- 9) To the maximum extent feasible, the original roof materials should be retained. In cases where new roofing is required, the materials should match the old in composition, size, shape, color, and texture. Preserve or replace, where necessary, all architectural features that give the roof its essential character such as dormer windows, cupolas, cornices, brackets, chimneys, cresting, and weather vanes.
- 10) Adding antennae, satellite dishes, skylights, solar collectors and the like on the front of a building or street elevation. These items should be installed on

June 24, 2014

- non-historic accessory buildings or on non-character-defining areas of the roof that are not prominently visible from the streets.
- 11) Modern hanging gutters shall only be permitted on the side and rear of the building and shall not be located on the façade facing a public right-of-way. Hanging gutters should be half-round.
 - 12) Exposed gutters and downspouts that are not made of copper should be of a color similar to the color of the structure or other trim.
 - 13) Baked enamel finishes are preferred for gutters, downspouts, and flashings, rather than bare aluminum, zinc, or galvanized steel. Copper flashings and gutters should be kept unpainted.
 - 14) New downspouts shall be round in shape.
 - 15) Cast iron boots, scuppers, and other ornamental roof accessories shall be cleaned, repaired, and painted.

Mr. Spring also noted the following:

- The applicant had stated the following:
 - The existing roof was damaged and in need of repair.
 - Dark dimensional shingles are consistent with many other homes on Main Street, west of the tracks.
 - The appearance was also consistent with roofing materials used in Ohio in the early 1900's.
 - The height of the roof and being the first house east of Hyatt, the roof and front of the house are very susceptible to high winds.
 - Dimensional shingles far out perform 3-tab shingles in high winds.

Sarah Gustavson, 439 W. Main Street, approached the dais. Mrs. Gustavson stated that there was not anything to add to the staff report.

Board Members reviewed the request and found the following: The roof was a simple tear off and replace.

Mr. Berbach **moved to approve the request as submitted**, seconded by Ms. Harker. **Motion carried.** Ayes: Berbach, Harker, Brown, Gruber, Bayliff, Cox, and Kuziensky. Nays: None.

Pamela Holsapple, Vice-President – Monroe Federal - 24 E. Main Street - Lot: Pt. Inlot 39 – The applicant requested Restoration Board approval for the removal of an existing window and a ± 13" x 28.5" section of marble trim for the installation of a drive-thru Automatic Teller Machine (ATM) at the Monroe Federal Savings & Loan located at 24 E. Main Street.

Zoning: CC/RA- Community Center/Old Tippecanoe City Restoration and Historic District

Mr. Spring stated that the applicant requested Restoration Board approval for the removal of an existing window and a ± 13" x 28.5" section of marble trim for the installation

June 24, 2014

of a drive-thru Automatic Teller Machine (ATM) at the Monroe Federal Savings & Loan located at 24 E. Main Street. The proposed exterior facing ATM would be installed internal to the existing building, current position of the existing window, on the west side of the building, south of the existing drive-thru banking window and include a matching surround.

Mr. Spring also stated that the existing window (48" x 62") to be removed was the southern-most of three existing windows on the western façade of the primary building. The $\pm 13"$ x $28.5"$ (± 2.57 sq. ft.) section of marble trim was below the window at ground level. The proposed ATM installation was 60" x 72", and included a surround, and associated signage.

The ATM was black in color, the aluminum surround was blue to match the existing "ATM" sign on the northern façade of the building, and the ATM signage (12" x 50") was constructed of Lexan and includes the Monroe Federal logo and associated 24-Hour ATM copy.

Mr. Spring stated that the applicant would also install bollards on both side of the ATM as a protective element and three wall-pack lighting fixtures for illumination of the ATM area. Two of the lighting fixtures would be installed on either side of the ATM at a height of 9'. The third lighting fixture would be installed on the southern inset of the building proximate to the ATM.

Mr. Spring noted that following which was an excerpt from the Design Manual and Standards for Windows, and Wood or Other Siding:

Standards and Guidelines for Windows

- 1) The original windows, window components, window openings, and window patterns be maintained and preserved to the maximum extent feasible.
- 2) Replacement windows may be permitted when the new or refurbished windows match the original window in size, shape, design, and material. Matching the size and thickness of muntins and mullions is especially important to keep from losing the style of the building.
- 3) Replacement windows clad in materials other than wood or vinyl (See # 8 below.) may be permitted if the Restoration Board finds that the proposed material or design maintains the architectural character of the building.
- 4) Old "wavy" glass should be replaced with glass similar in appearance.
- 5) In multi-pane windows, the replacement of one pane with dissimilar glass can adversely affect the overall appearance of the window and as such, this type of glass replacement is prohibited.
- 6) The addition of snap-in grids or grids placed between full panes of glass to give the appearance of a multi-pane sash is prohibited.
- 7) Windows of an architectural style or era different than the original building shall not be used.

June 24, 2014

- 8) New or replacement storm windows (exterior) should be of wood or metal with a painted finish. The use of interior storm windows shall not require a COA.
- 9) Window openings should not be reduced or enlarged in size, especially on street facades.
- 10) If new windows are to be installed where there previously was no window opening, the new windows should match the existing windows in the building in shape, size, design, material, and spacing between windows. New opening shall be of the same size and height as other window openings.
- 11) The closing or filling of window openings on the side or rear façade shall be discouraged unless the Restoration Board finds that such windows do not contribute to the historic nature of the building and can be closed without loss of a unique architectural element. In doing so, the Restoration Board may require that the opening be filled in a manner that retains the original sills and lintels.
- 12) The closing or shuttering of a window opening on a side or rear façade if it is closed through the installation of operable shutters that are closed and latched into position to maintain the appearance of a window.
- 13) The replacement of wood windows with vinyl windows shall be prohibited. The replacement of wood windows with vinyl clad windows may be permitted if the applicant demonstrates that the replacement windows will not detract from the historic character and style of the building, as determined by the Restoration Board.
- 14) The installation of vinyl storm windows shall be prohibited. The installation of vinyl clad storm windows may be permitted if the applicant demonstrates that the storm windows will not detract from the historic character and style of the building, as determined by the Restoration Board.
- 15) The closing or filling of window openings on the primary façade of a building or on any façade that faces Main Street shall be prohibited.

Standards and Guidelines for Wood and Other Siding

- 1) Existing siding material shall be maintained and preserved to the maximum extent feasible with the exception of artificial siding, which should be removed and replaced with original siding materials.
- 2) Wood clapboard siding should be used as the repair and replacement material on wood frame buildings. The repair or replacement of wood siding with cementitious board (e.g., Hardiplank) may be permitted if the applicant demonstrates that the replacement materials will not detract from the historic character and style of the building, as determined by the Restoration Board.
- 3) Artificial stone, asbestos, asphalt shingles, and other similar resurfacing materials are prohibited except where needed to repair buildings already using such materials.
- 4) Siding of any kind shall not be used to cover or replace brick walls.
- 5) Siding should be applied horizontally unless the architectural style or era of the building typically used vertical siding such as board and battens.

June 24, 2014

- 6) Replacing a horizontal lap siding with a vertical panel-type plywood siding is prohibited.
- 7) All wood siding should be painted.
- 8) Wood shingles were often used as a siding element. Decorative patterns such as fish scales, saw tooth, diamond, square, scalloped and diagonal boards were used in Victorian homes. Every effort should be made to preserve and protect these original boards.
- 9) The removal of previously installed modern siding materials and restoration of original materials is strongly encouraged.
- 10) The use of aluminum or vinyl siding, asbestos, and formed stone are not appropriate. These sidings can drastically change the appearance, scale and texture of the structure and often require the removal of ornamentation and trim, therefore altering the historical character of the house. In addition, the relationship of the trim to the body of the wall is changed when the new thickness of material is applied. If artificial siding is allowed, the original scale (height and width) of the siding, the trim, fascia, sills and other elements should all be maintained to the maximum extent possible to reflect the historic form of the building

Mr. Spring also noted the following:

- On 1/28/14, an identical application was reviewed and denied by the Restoration Board.
- On 2/19/14, the decision of the Restoration Board was upheld by the Board of Zoning Appeals.
- On 3/17/14, City Council affirmed the decisions of the BZA and Restoration Board.

Bill Hipner, Board Member of Monroe Federal, 24 E. Main Street, approached the dais. Mr. Hipner stated the Monroe Federal Board recognized that they had been through this process once but attempting to find some common ground so that they could satisfy their customers and their needs. Mr. Hipner also stated that he had completed some research and that he had been involved with Historical District for a number of years, such as the Oregon district and St. Ann's; he had looked through the history of this property and when the original historical designation was determined the Monroe Federal building was identified as an intrusion of the Old Tippecanoe Historic District. The building was built in 1962 and the copper façade was added in 2005 to repair and replace the deteriorated marble. Mr. Hipner noted that even though the building was in the district and the guidelines apply this building does not really qualify as a historic building.

Mr. Hipner also noted that under the Standards and Guidelines for New Construction adopted in April of 2014 suggested that the project not be considered as a removal of a window but rather a small addition on the building and presented the Board with a photo rendition of his proposal. Mr. Hipner recited from the Standards and Guidelines for New Construction and Additions:

June 24, 2014

2) To the maximum extent feasible, any additions to an existing building should be located in the rear of in the most inconspicuous portion of the site so as to not overwhelm the original historical structure.

3) Additions such as balconies, decks, exterior stairs, and greenhouses may be permitted but shall be placed on non-character defining elevations such as the rear or side façade. Mr. Hipner noted that the ATM was at the rear back corner of the building.

4) New additions should look new but should be compatible with the surrounding structures as outlined in this manual. Do not try to making the building look older.

Mr. Hipner also noted that this statement states to not to try and make the building look older and suggested that they work from this point forward as an addition and proposed a copper color metal finish that matched front of the building and also proposed the project as a small addition to the back corner.

Mr. Berbach inquired if the ATM bumped out from the structure. Mr. Hipner stated yes it would and would cover the window completely and could remove the marble that was behind and store piece in the basement along with the window.

Chairman Bayliff inquired if the proposed design required the altering of the window opening and the removal of the marble. Mr. Hipner stated yes.

Chairman Bayliff also inquired that the request presented would be in addition to what was already requested in the original application. Mr. Hipner stated that was correct and that the façade was in addition to. Chairman Bayliff clarified that none of the proposed details were worked into the application. Mr. Spring stated they were not presented.

Chairman Bayliff stated that per her interpretation of the Guidelines she could not see how the proposed request would be considered an addition and asked Mr. Spring for his understanding. Mr. Spring stated that the application that was originally presented was essentially an issue of window and or siding that was being altered and what Mr. Hipner had proposed was something that Mr. Spring had not had the opportunity to review, but would be a gray area which was a small addition with issues regarding windows and siding as well.

Chairman Bayliff stated that in the new Standards and Guidelines under Windows states:
9) Window openings should not be reduced or enlarged in size, especially on street facades.

15) The closing or filling of window openings on the primary façade of a building or on any façade that faces Main Street shall be prohibited.

Chairman Bayliff noted line item 15 that stated any façade that faces Main Street shall be prohibited, she understood this project was on the side but was very visible from Main Street which was evident by choice to cover the side in the same material as the front façade.

June 24, 2014

Chairman Bayliff called to the Board's attention section one of Guidelines for Wood and other Siding: 1) Existing siding material shall be maintained and preserved to the maximum extent feasible with the exception of artificial siding, which should be removed and replaced with original siding materials.

Mr. Hipner inquired if an addition was proposed how it could be done without removing some siding or window. Chairman Bayliff stated that would be determined on individual case as to what was being removed, what was being changed, how that would affect architectural significance of the building and how each request fit within the Standards and Guidelines.

Mr. Brown stated that the application as presented he would have to deny due to the fact that the request was still a modification to the window and could not consider a new construction.

Mr. Hipner stated that it was his understanding that the Board did issue a Certificate of Appropriateness the removal of the window as long as the marble was not cut. Chairman Bayliff said that was correct but changing the window opening alters the window opening not just the removal of the siding and window and the structure was being cut to modify the building to fit the ATM structure. Mr. Hipner reiterated that Monroe Federal received a Certificate of Appropriateness to install an ATM in the existing window opening without cutting the marble or damaging any of the surrounding materials. Mr. Hipner stated that the window would be modified obviously due to the removal of the window. Chairman Bayliff noted but not changing the window opening.

Mr. Brown stated that the Board authorized just removing the glass and putting the ATM in that place. Chairman Bayliff noted that was the Board's middle ground so that Monroe Federal could still offer the service to their customers but the long term protection of the historical character of the building would not be in jeopardy from cutting the building and removing the siding. Proposing to keep and store the removed pieces was understood, but the possibility of being misplaced or lost was a concern and it was the intent of the Board to stay within the Standards and Guidelines per code. Mr. Hipner stated that was a strict interpretation.

Mr. Berbach inquired if the proposed orange unit would cover the window. Chairman Bayliff stated that machine would be inset and the window would still have to be removed and all the structural changes would remain the same as originally proposed just that the blue pieces would be orange to match the front of the building.

Mr. Hipner stated that the ATM machine has to be installed that confirms with the American Disability Act which was 24"; cannot be installed up at the sill of the window.

June 24, 2014

Mr. Berbach suggested adding on to the end of the building if the project was an actual addition and build five feet from the building and the window would remain untouched.

Mr. Hipner said that would be a possibility.

Mr. Hipner asked about cutting into the brick. Chairman Bayliff noted that the brick was on the back side of the façade and would have to be addressed at another Board meeting.

Mr. Berbach asked the Board how they would receive an application to propose an addition on the back side of the building to house the ATM. Mr. Gruber stated that he would consider it and Chairman Bayliff mentioned that proposal would have to go through the same process with another request for the Certificate of Appropriateness and Mr. Spring would review and present the Board with the appropriate code sections to review.

Chairman Bayliff asked for further discussion. Being no further discussion, Mr. Brown **moved to deny the request as submitted**, seconded by Ms. Cox. **Motion carried**. Ayes: Brown, Cox, Kuziinsky, Harker, Bayliff, Gruber, and Berbach. Nays: None.

Old Business

There was none.

Miscellaneous

There was none.

Adjournment

Chairman Bayliff asked for further discussion or comments. There being none, Ms. Kuziinsky **moved for adjournment**, seconded by Ms. Cox and unanimously approved. **Motion carried**. Meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

APPROVED: _____


Board Chairman Lauryn Bayliff

ATTEST: _____


Kimberly Patterson, Board Secretary

