

July 22, 2014

Chairman Lauryn Bayliff called the meeting of the Tipp City Restoration and Architectural Board of Review to order on Tuesday, July 22, 2014 at 7:30pm. Other Board members in attendance included: Karen Kuziinsky, Pete Berbach, Joel Gruber, and Ann Harker. Also in attendance were City Planner/Zoning Administrator Matthew Spring and Board Secretary, Kimberly Patterson.

Absence

Mr. Berbach **moved to excuse Mr. Ralph Brown and Ms. Nancy Cox from the meeting**, seconded by Ms. Kuziinsky and unanimously approved.

Citizens signing the register: Ron Re' and Mike Rousculp.

Minutes

Chairman Bayliff asked for discussion. Being no further discussion, Mr. Gruber **moved to approve the June 24, 2014 meeting minutes as written**, seconded by Ms. Harker. **Motion carried.** Ayes: Gruber, Harker, Kuziinsky, Berbach, 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

There were none.

New Business

Ron Ré, Trustee – Tippecanoe Masonic Lodge #174 - 108-110 E. Main Street - Lot: Pt. IL 22 & Pt. IL 23 - The applicant seeks an approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of 8 exterior windows and 1 exterior door on the structure at 108-110 E. Main Street.

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

Mr. Spring stated that the applicant requested Restoration Board approval for the installation of 8 exterior windows and 1 exterior door on the northern (front) façade of the structure located at 108-110 E. Main Street. The proposed project included the following:

- The removal of 8 the existing standard windows and the associated storm windows on the 2nd and 3rd floors of the northern facade
- The removal of the 3rd floor standard & storm window/door at the fire escape
- The replacement of the of 8 the existing standard windows with Gilkey® double-pane low e-glass vinyl windows
- The replacement of the 3rd floor standard & storm window/door at the fire escape with a Gilkey® double-pane low e-glass vinyl door to match the look and configuration of the other windows

July 22, 2014

Mr. Spring noted that following which was an excerpt from the Design Manual on Historic Significance for Windows:

Windows make an important contribution to the character of a building. Their shape, type, size, and placement help create building styles. Historically, windows first functioned as a means of providing light and air circulation within a building. As glass-making processes improved, windows could also be used to embellish buildings. Eliminating or changing windows may affect the balance and proportion of a building and thus why the preservation of these elements is so important to the character of the district.

Of all the parts of the building that protect from weather coming in, windows are usually the first to need attention. Beyond normal cleaning, windows may also need to have screens installed in summer and storm panels in winter. In addition, to remain in good working order, periodic adjustments need to be made and old dried-out caulk needs to be replaced. A good wooden framed window can last for hundreds of years provided it is given routine care and maintenance.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR WINDOWS

- 1) *The original windows, window components, window openings, and window patterns shall 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.*
- 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.*

July 22, 2014

- 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.*

Mr. Spring also noted the following:

- The applicant had stated that the existing windows were over 100 years old.
- The applicant had stated that the existing windows were drafty and rattle.
- The Downtown Tipp City Partnership had recently approved a grant for the painting of the exterior façade and would be expanding the grant for the window replacement as described in this staff report if approved.
- The 1st floor of the building was occupied with an attorney's office and a pipe/smoke shop. The 2nd and 3rd floors were occupied by the Masons.

Ron Re' for the Masonic Lodge #174, 108 E. Main Street, approached the dais. Mr. Re' stated that the building sat between Harrison's Restaurant and The Soap Shop and they

July 22, 2014

both have recently made improvements to their buildings which added to the downtown. Mr. Re' also stated that the Downtown Streetscape looked good and it was time that the Masons do something with their building, paint was cracking, outside storm windows never fit and have a large gap that allows wind to whistle in and through and would like to replace them. Mr. Re' also noted that not only to add beauty to the downtown area, that in 2009 they were chosen the best lodge in the State of Ohio. The following year Lodge #174 won the Mark Twain Award, which only fifty are given in the United States and Mexico which results in the lodge getting a lot of visitors from other Masonic Lodges. Mr. Re' expressed to the Board that the inside had been taken care of to include murals painted on the walls and ceilings and that it was now time to improve the outside. Mr. Re' said that the windows would be white in color to contrast with the painting that was to be done including the back side of the building.

Mr. Re' stated that a couple of years ago the Masons had installed the flag and clock out front of their building and a lot of people in the Masonic family thought that was great and now they wanted to come up with implementing improvements on the outside of the building that would look just as good. Mr. Re' expressed that the new windows would help save on fuel and air conditioning and also help the environment. The existing storm windows on the building, no one was willing to climb up to clean them, not only that but the insides cannot be cleaned and after streetscape project more dust got inside from the cracks and they are full of dirt and looks muddy; the new windows would enable them to be cleaned on the inside and outside which would give a better appearance to the building.

Mr. Re' stated that the lodge received estimates and the contractor who had completed Harrison's estimate was \$16,000. The Masonic Lodge cannot come up with that kind of money and that the lodge was obligated to give to various charities throughout the year so coming up with extra money has to come from the members. Mr. Re' noted that the Downtown Partnership said that they would donate an additional \$1,000 to their grant, Gilkey windows would be within the means they could afford.

Mr. Re' added that he did read the Guidelines and that the Gilkey window looked like wood and that the windows were on the second and third floor and no one was going to walk over and knock on it to make sure it was a clad window or a wood window. The only thing that someone on the street would see was that it was clean and neat and goes along with the building.

Chairman Bayliff asked for discussion.

Chairman Bayliff stated that the concern was how the request fit in within the Standards and Guidelines which state that the original windows attempt to be preserved to the extent feasible to help preserve the 100 year old window which makes them pretty special windows and that she understood the issue of the dirt coming in through the storm windows. Chairman Bayliff also noted that with the storm windows as they are, you

July 22, 2014

cannot see the window behind it and didn't know if that would be an option to replace storm windows that fit as an alternative to removing the actual window itself. Chairman Bayliff also noted that if the Board agreed to replace the windows that the application did not fit within the Guidelines and the replacement standards having glass similar type to 100 year old glass and then have the windows be wood or vinyl clad. Mr. Re' stated that he understood that but the windows being rotten and the wood not any good and the other problem was if went with just the storm windows, which an estimate was obtained, was almost as much as replacing the entire windows but would be in the same fix and how would the windows ever get cleaned with the storm windows on which presents the same problem all over again which was trying to avoid because the new windows would tilt in to be able to be cleaned. Mr. Re' also stated that just replacing the storm windows may help the Board but did not help the Masonic Lodge.

Mr. Gruber asked if the windows were a wood faux finish. Mr. Re' stated they were and the contractor was to be at the meeting with a sample but had not shown.

Chairman Bayliff stated that with both buildings on either side of the Masonic Lodge have maintained their original windows the proposed new windows for the Mason Lodge would be more obvious against the block that was being worked with. Chairman Bayliff also stated that she was aware that the Soap Shop did remove their storm windows and was not on the Board when Harrison replaced theirs. Chairman Bayliff noted that she understood that Mr. Re' was making the extra effort to make the building look great and fit in with the rest of the block and that was the intention of the Board to make sure that the changes did fit in and continues to be that historically significant building that it is by maintaining the standards of the windows.

Mr. Berbach stated that he somewhat agreed and that it had never been brought up before at what level was visible and knows that historical relevance while walking past the building however he was unaware that there was a vinyl window that looked wooden with the grain. Chairman Bayliff stated that the windows were proposed as white vinyl windows and that on attachment E had shown the details.

Ms. Kuziinsky inquired if Harrison's restaurant windows were wooden. Mr. Re' stated that they were Anderson wooden windows and also stated that their contractor had quoted to the Lodge a price of \$16,000.

Ms. Kuziinsky inquired Mr. Re's budget for windows. Mr. Re' stated it was nowhere close to the \$16,000, about half.

Mr. Re' stated that with Anderson and so many other companies they say that they make custom windows, the problem was that the windows were made for certain sizes so when they are installed the windows have to be shimmed and spaced and that was not the desire of the Lodge and that they want windows that are the correct size. Mr. Re' also stated that Gilkey makes the window that will fit in the opening without spacers and shims.

July 22, 2014

Mr. Re' stated that he understood that the Board had regulations that the Board did not want to go against but he was asking for consideration because he was trying to make the building look better plus save money and the environment by saving heat and air conditioning and again he brought up the fact that the windows were on the second floor and who was going to be able to tell what the windows were. Mr. Re' also stated that if he put wood windows, if he could afford them, and why anyone would want a clad window because the metal gets cold and transfers to the inside. Mr. Re' noted that the windows were going to be painted white anyway because that was the painting scheme and if the Board didn't approve, he did not know when the Lodge would ever get windows and the old dirty aluminum windows would remain up there. Mr. Re' reiterated that for the Lodge to give to the many charities they would never be able to come up with \$16,000 to get the windows done.

Ms. Kuziinsky stated that for the Historical Society, they ran into the same situation and ended up getting the wood on the outside and vinyl on the inside which was vinyl clad and were in the same situation as the Lodge with no money and the Tipp Foundation was very generous in assisting with the costs.

Chairman Bayliff stated that if item one in the guidelines was ignored vinyl windows were still deemed inappropriate replacements however if the proposed windows were vinyl clad then that would be appropriate. Mr. Re' asked why anyone would want vinyl on the inside of the building and why would someone want the vinyl on the inside. Ms. Kuziinsky stated that was just the way they were made.

Mr. Re' stated that anything over \$10,000 had to be approved by the Grand Lodge because they want to make sure that you have the money and the Masonic Lodge was not eligible to apply and obtain a loan.

Mr. Re' thanked the Board for their time.

Chairman Bayliff asked for further discussion. There being none Ms. Harker **moved to deny the request as submitted**, seconded by Ms. Kuziinsky. **Motion carried**. Ayes: Harker, Kuziinsky, Gruber, and Bayliff. Nays: Berbach.

James Rousculp & Debra Strauss - 223 W. Main Street - Lot: Inlot 141 - The applicant requested an approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of an existing shed/garage and the construction of a new detached garage, driveway, and landscaping.

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

Mr. Spring stated that the applicant requested an approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the following:

1. The demolition of an existing detached shed/garage at 223 W. Main Street

July 22, 2014

2. The construction of a new detached garage, driveway, and landscaping at 223 W. Main Street.

Mr. Spring also stated that the applicant proposed the demolition of an existing ± 336 sq. ft. detached shed/garage in order to make way for the construction of a new 2½ car ± 744 sq. ft. detached garage, driveway and associated landscaping. Staff noted that Restoration Board approval of the demolition was a prerequisite for the proposed new garage construction. If the Restoration Board denied the COA for demolition of the shed/garage, the corresponding construction portion this staff report would be moot and not applicable.

1. Demolition of existing shed/garage

Code §155.05(C)(7) requires that the Restoration Board first make a determination as to the historical significance of the structure:

Excerpt from the Design Manual on Historic Significance

DETERMINING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF A STRUCTURE

When making decisions or recommendations about changes to structures in the Restoration District, the Restoration Board shall have the authority to make a determination of the historical significance of the structure based on this section. For structures that the Restoration Board finds are not historically significant, the board may relax or waive the standards or guidelines of this document. If the Restoration Board finds that the structure is historically significant, the standards and guidelines of this manual may be fully applied.

The Restoration Board shall determine whether a structure or site is significant based on the following criteria:

- Its value as a reminder of the cultural or archaeological heritage of the city, state, or nation;
- Its location as a site of a significant local, state, or national event;
- Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the city, state, or nation;
- Its identification as the work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose individual work has influenced the city, state, or nation;
- Its value as a building that is recognized for the quality of its architecture and that it retains sufficient elements showing such architectural significance;
- Its characteristic of an architectural style or period;
- Its contribution to the historical nature of the overall site; and/or
- Its character as a contributing element in the Restoration District.

July 22, 2014

Mr. Spring noted the following:

- The property under consideration was within the Old Tippecanoe City Restoration and Historic Overlay District.
- The Ohio Historic Inventory had no information concerning the detached shed/garage.
- The Miami County auditor had no information concerning the detached shed/garage.

Not Historically Significant

If the Restoration Board finds that the structure subject to the application is not historically significant, the Restoration Board shall state the basis for such determination and shall be required to make a formal determination that the proposed demolition or movement of a structure will not harm or reduce the historical significance of the site on which it is located or on the RA District as a whole.

Historically Significant

If the Restoration Board finds that the structure is historically significant, the demolition or movement of a structure may only be considered if the applicant can clearly demonstrate that three or more of the following conditions prevail:

- A.** *That the building proposed for demolition or movement is not inherently consistent with other structures within the district;*
- B.** *That the building contains no features of special architectural and/or historic significance;*
- C.** *There is no viable economic use of the building as it exists or as it exists on the site;*
- D.** *A written report by a contractor acceptable to the Restoration Board demonstrates it is not feasible to restore the structure; or*
- E.** *A written report by a contractor acceptable to the Restoration Board demonstrates it is not feasible to move the structure to another location (applicable in demolition requests only).*

Even with a demonstration that the above conditions exist, the Restoration Board may also take into consideration the following criteria when making its decision.

- A.** *The historic, scenic, cultural, aesthetic or architectural significance of the building, structure, site, or object;*
- B.** *The importance of the historic structure, building, site, or object to the ambiance of a district;*
- C.** *The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing such a structure, building, site, or object because of its design, texture, material, detail, or unique location;*
- D.** *Whether the historic structure, building, site, or object is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the Restoration District or the city;*

July 22, 2014

- E. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what the effect of those plans on the character of the surrounding area would be;*
- F. Whether the structure would be more appropriate in the proposed new location;*
- G. Whether reasonable measures can be taken to save the historic structure, building, site, or object from collapse; and/or*
- H. Whether the historic structure, building, site, or object is capable of earning reasonable economic return on its value.*

Mr. Spring noted that the applicant had provided a narrative and photographs from Terry Kessler – Kessler Construction in support of the proposed demolition.

Per Code §154.05(C)(7)(b)(iii): *If the Restoration Board approves the COA for demolition or movement of the structure, the applicant shall be subject to additional bonds or sureties as established in §154.05(C)(7)(d).* Subsequently, the Restoration Board can proceed with review of the proposed new garage, driveway, and landscaping as delineated below. As noted previously, if the Restoration Board denies the COA for demolition of the shed/garage, the balance of this staff report is moot and not applicable, since the demolition is required for the proposed construction.

Mike Rousculp, 223 W. Main Street, approached the dais and stated that he had lived at the home for 36 years. Mr. Rousculp stated that the shed/garage may go back to the early days of the home and there was indications that horses may have been kept there but he could not get a car inside and the building was beyond help and was leaning and was not feasible to restore, was not big enough to do anything with, and did not offer historical significance except some detail on the gable which he had planned on matching on the proposed new construction. Mr. Rousculp noted that there were limestone blocks inside as the floor which would be incorporated into the landscaping scheme.

Board Members discussed whether the shed/garage was historically significant or not and found the following: Rousculps were the third owners of the property; the Davis Family were the second owners (Davis was the old postmaster in 1887) and stayed in the Davis Family until the 1950's then June Green acquired the property, Mr. Rousculp purchased from her in 1978; there was an addition to the shed which had a dirt floor; the shed did not contribute to the historical nature of the overall site; the shed's character was not a contributing element in the Restoration District; the proposed new construction fit within the zoning code requirements; the architectural features were not there; there was no viable economic use of the building as it exists on the site; a written report was supplied by a contractor that the shed was not feasible to restore or move to another location.

July 22, 2014

Board Members concurred the shed/garage was historically insignificant. Chairman Bayliff asked for further discussion. There being none, Mr. Gruber **moved that the building was found to be Historically Insignificant and approved the demolition of the shed/garage**, seconded by Ms. Kuziinsky. **Motion carried.** Ayes: Gruber, Kuziinsky, Harker, and Berbach. Nays: Bayliff.

2. Construction of New Detached Garage, Driveway, and Landscaping

Mr. Spring stated that the applicant proposed the construction of a new 2½ car detached garage. The proposed garage would have an area of ± 744 square feet and a height of ± 18 feet. The garage would be 10' from the eastern property line, 12' from the northern property line and 30' from the western property line, and include:

- (2) carriage-style single-bay 9' x 7' garage doors
- (1) 3' x 6' 8" steel man-door with ½ lite
- (1) 36" x 48" vinyl double-hung window (1st floor)
- (2) 30" x 48" vinyl double-hung windows (attic)
- Pine siding (pattern #104)
- Aluminum gutters
- Dimensional shingles – Gray (match existing porch shingle color)
- Paint colors as follows (Sherwin Williams):

○ Body of garage	Svelte Sage	SW 6164
○ Trim	Ancient Marble	SW 6162
○ Accent #1	Connected Grey	SW 6165
○ Accent #2	Reddened Earth	SW 6053
○ Accent #3	Eclipse	SW 6166
○ Accent #4	Poetry Plum	SW 6019

Mr. Spring also stated that In accordance with Code §154.10, the detached garage shall have a paved hard-surfaced driveway of asphalt or concrete. The applicant had proposed access from the alley to the east.

Mr. Spring noted that the applicant proposed the installation of landscaping in the rear of the property about the proposed garage. The proposed landscaping included various trees, perennials, & bushes, as well as a sitting wall, flagstone path, and pavers.

Mr. Spring noted that following which was an excerpt from the Design Manual on Accessory Structures and New Construction/Additions:

Excerpt from the Design Manual on Accessory Structures

Accessory structures include garages, carriage houses, springhouses, smokehouses, greenhouses, gazebos, and other structures of the like. They provide functional space while adding to the historical character of the property. Accessory buildings should complement the primary building or the site. Restoration District standards for accessory buildings are the same as those required for primary buildings. A COA shall be required for the construction of any accessory structure.

July 22, 2014

Standards and Guidelines for Accessory Structures

- 1) The accessory structure should be subordinate to the primary building. It should not "overshadow" or "outshine" the main building.
- 2) The architectural style and materials of any accessory building should generally be compatible with the principal building as should the roof type and roof slope. A flat roof should not be used, for example, on a garage behind a house with a steeply pitched gable roof.
- 3) An accessory use shall not be permitted where there is no principal building on the same lot.
- 4) Accessory structures and uses shall be required to comply with Section 154.06 of the Tipp City Zoning Code and may be subject to additional zoning or building permit requirements.

Excerpt from the Design Manual on New Construction and Additions

Even though the Restoration District is a historic district, there may be occasions where a building has to be demolished or where an applicant was to add onto an existing building. While new construction or additions are not intended to look aged, they do need to maintain a historic character to ensure compatibility with the overall district.

When reviewing new construction or additions, the Restoration Board may refer to other guidelines in this document, as appropriate. For example, if the addition includes adding a porch to the building, the Restoration Board may refer to the standards and guidelines for porches that are found earlier in this manual. The demolition of structures is addressed in the Tipp City Zoning Code.

Standards and Guidelines for New Construction and Additions

- 1) New construction and additions shall be clearly differentiated so that the addition does not appear to be an original part of the historic building.
- 2) To the maximum extent feasible, any additions to an existing building should be located in the rear or in the most inconspicuous portion of the site so as to not overwhelm the original historic 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.
- 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;
- 5) The overall height of new construction should relate to that of adjacent buildings. As a general rule, new buildings should generally be the same

July 22, 2014

height as the average height of existing buildings within the vicinity. The Restoration Board may authorize slightly taller buildings on corner sites to create a focal point for the intersection.

- 6) The width of a new building shall be designed to continue the established rhythm of the block. If the lot is wider than 50 feet, the building façade shall be broken into smaller bays with architectural details to maintain the building rhythm.
- 7) The scale of a buildings proportions and the building's massing shall be similar in character to surrounding buildings.
- 8) New buildings or additions shall maintain the same directional expression (horizontal or vertical) as surrounding buildings. Horizontal buildings can be detailed to relate to more vertical adjacent structures by breaking the façade into smaller masses and bays. Strongly horizontal or vertical façade expressions shall be avoided.
- 9) The roof shapes and forms of new buildings shall resemble, but shall not necessarily duplicate, the shape, style, and form of roofs for nearby structures. Introducing roof shapes, pitches, or materials not traditionally associated with the area or architectural style shall be prohibited.
- 10) Principal buildings shall be set to the back of the sidewalk or the front right-of-way. Buildings may set back from the front lot line an amount equal to the average setback of buildings within 250 of the subject building.
- 11) Exceptions to the setback requirement above may be made to allow room for outdoor dining areas, landscaped entries, pedestrian plazas, enhanced customer entrances, and similar pedestrian amenities.
- 12) Open spaces between buildings that create courtyards or walkways to the rear of the property are encouraged.

Mr. Spring noted the following:

- If approved by the Restoration Board, the applicant would be required to obtain an approved Demolition Permit, prior to commencement of the proposed demolition.
- If approved by the Restoration Board, the applicant would be required to provide surety in accordance with Code §154.05(C)(7)(d) for the project.
- If approved by the Restoration Board, the applicant would be required to furnish and keep in full force and effect, at all times during the period of demolition or moving, a policy of insurance written by a solvent insurance company authorized to do business in Ohio.

July 22, 2014

- If approved by the Restoration Board, the applicant would be required to obtain an approved Zoning Permit and ROW Permit prior to construction.
- If approved by the Restoration Board, the applicant will be required to obtain an approved Building Permit from Miami County.

Mr. Rousculp proposed the following: that the siding would match the siding on the home which was Queen Ann stick style and to be the same color scheme; will be able to see the front gable from the street; pitch of roof would be wider to allow for the two car garage without going higher; a carriage style overhead door; vinyl clad windows; current parking area to be grass; walkway to be extended to garage; not removing any trees; bricks from downtown street to be implemented into landscape;

Chairman Bayliff suggested amending the Certificate of Appropriateness to specify vinyl clad windows, Board Members agreed.

Chairman Bayliff asked for further discussion. Being no further discussion, Ms. Kuziinsky **moved to approve the request with modification to specifically note to use vinyl clad windows**, seconded by Mr. Gruber. **Motion carried.** Ayes: Kuziinsky, Gruber, Harker, and Bayliff. Nays: None.

Mr. Spring presented Mr. Rousculp with the demolition permit and would contact him regarding specifications on surety and miscellaneous fees.

Mr. Spring stated that the Board would need to determine how they would like to proceed with deeming the amount of the surety bond required for the demolition. Mr. Spring noted that the current zoning code stated that the financial guarantee should be in such an amount as the Restoration Board or its duly authorized representative determines to be reasonably necessary to complete the demolition of the structure, ensure protection of surrounding properties and ensure cleanup of the site. Mr. Spring also stated that the duly authorized representative would mean Staff, but if the Board would like to designate a figure or designate staff would be up to the Board. Board Members unanimously concurred to have Staff as the representative of the Board to deem the surety bond.

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 Mr. Gruber and unanimously approved. **Motion carried.** Meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

TIPP CITY, MIAMI COUNTY, OHIO

RESTORATION AND ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW

July 22, 2014

APPROVED:


Board Chairman Lauryn Bayliff

ATTEST:


Kimberly Patterson, Board Secretary