

October 28, 2014

Chairman Lauryn Bayliff called the meeting of the Tipp City Restoration and Architectural Board of Review to order on Tuesday, August 26, 2014 at 7:30pm. Other Board members in attendance included: Pete Berbach, Ralph Brown, Karen Kuziinsky, Joel Gruber, Nancy Cox, and Ann Harker. Also in attendance were City Planner/Zoning Administrator Matthew Spring and Board Secretary, Kimberly Patterson.

Citizens signing the register: Ken Brightman, Keith Lavy, and Dan Glover.

Minutes

Chairman Bayliff asked for discussion. Being no further discussion, Ms. Cox **moved to approve the August 26, 2014 meeting minutes as written**, seconded by Ms. Harker. **Motion carried.** Ayes: Cox, Harker, Berbach, Brown, and Bayliff. Nays: None. Mr. Gruber and Ms. Kuziinsky abstained from the vote.

Chairman's Introduction

Chairman Bayliff explained Board procedure to all present to include the order of business; the appeal process; 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

Keith Lavy for Tipp City United Methodist Church, 8 W. Main Street, Tipp City, - Lots 35, 36, 115, 116 & 117 and portions of vacated alleys. The applicant requested Restoration Board approval for the following:

1. Removal and replacement of existing asphalt shingles on primary sanctuary building and parapets.
2. Removal and replacement of the flat roof membrane on the existing centrally located flat-roofed portion of building.

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

Mr. Spring stated that the applicant requested an approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the following items at the Tipp City United Methodist Church at 8 W. Main Street:

- Removal and replacement of the existing asphalt shingles on the primary sanctuary building and parapets. The proposed new shingles would be *CertainTeed Grand Manor* "two full-size, one-piece fiberglass base shingles with randomly applied tabs"; Colonial Slate or Stonegate Gray color.
- Removal and replacement of the flat roof membrane on the existing centrally located flat-roofed portion of the building.

October 28, 2014

The project will also include the rebuilding and replacement of box gutters as necessary (like for like), and the reinstallation or replacement of fascia, molding and frieze trim as necessary (like for like). Staff notes that a like for like replacement does not require Restoration Board approval.

Excerpt from the Design Manual on Roofs, Gutters and Downspouts

Standards and Guidelines 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 non-historic accessory buildings or on non-character-defining areas of the roof that are not prominently visible from the streets.

October 28, 2014

- 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 stated that if the Restoration Board approved the request a Certificate of Appropriateness would be issued in accordance with code.

Mr. Ken Brightman, 35 Southmoor Circle, Kettering Ohio, approached the dais. Mr. Brightman stated that the existing roof of the church was failing and buckets were being used in many places. Mr. Brightman provided the Board with mini prints of what was prepared to be submitted to the contractors. Mr. Brightman stated that the intention was to improve the area of connection between the addition and the original structure; the side walls of that particular area had drive-it and with the amount of snow build up and drifting with expansion and contraction was causing damage. Mr. Brightman also stated that the intent was to take the gutter down to existing pre-engineered building and reface with an appropriate sheaving material and then roofing all the way up to that gutter line from lower on up; then taking the new roof through the lower area on up to the 1950's addition a minimum of 3' to make all of that area dry. Mr. Brightman noted that all duct work that runs across the roof was to be removed to ensure a good installation. Mr. Brightman noted another chronic area was a cricket that was installed which was done as a standing seam metal rood as well that matched the pre-engineered building that had been very problematic in years past; a new membrane roof over this area by installing rigid insulation to the same height and width as each standing seam on the roof to build up; then a new sub-straight board on that then a membrane roof that water would not get through. Mr. Brightman noted that there were light maintenance areas in the 1950's addition; contractor was to do inspection and controls to be reported back to the architect and owner as to what conditions were found under the installation and if anything found wet would be replaced as well.

Mr. Brightman stated that all of the work proposed does not show anywhere from the ground anywhere in the downtown area but what did show was the original building. Mr. Brightman continued to say that on the original building an ice and water shield would be installed so that when ice conditions come ice dams with water running down inside the wall area would cease which was what was presently occurring. Mr. Brightman noted that on top of the wall there was a built in cornice and gutter system that had been on the building since originally built and had been repaired many many times and each a

October 28, 2014

new material added; whether it be felt, tar, tar and gravel, and more recently a membrane roof and so many different layers of the boxed gutter that was originally 7" at the back 5" wide and 3.5" at the face and had been completely filled and now have a very low compression which ends up being a ski slope for the water as it comes down. Mr. Brightman presented the Board with a collection of pictures to include in the Board's files of the findings of the conditions that were found.

Mr. Brightman stated that what the drawings called for was to remove all of the existing shingles on the main roof; remove built in gutters which was original turned metal that was thin and 90% had been rusted through which was to be removed back to the original structure and replace what had to be replaced in order to rebuild the trough area which was the built in gutter and cornice work; lining with a new 60 mil membrane roof that would run through the roof are and then capped over the top. The cornice work would then be reinstalled after the new framing was done to keep the same look from the ground; intent was to reuse what they have and as they get into the project and find out that would not be possible they would work the best they can with the contractor to get the same profile.

Mr. Brightman noted that the proposed shingles were an asphalt type shingle made by CertainTeed Grand Manor series that from a half a block away from the parking lot would look more like a slate roof than the existing asphalt shingles; also advocating that the two small towers to remove the existing slate material and re-clad with ice and water shield on 100% of that area and install same proposed shingles to match with texture and coloration; currently the two towers did not match the roof.

Mr. Brightman stated that there had been over eight months of research for this project and that the church had been very kind as a self-help project take some of the areas a part so that they could see how the church was built and put together to enable them to see what the original architect and contractors had in mind as they built it to align themselves with today's materials.

Chairman Bayliff inquired what type of shingles were on the towers currently. Mr. Brightman stated that slate was currently on the towers that was failing and have found shards of the slate falling near a children's play area that had to be roped off; some of the slate that was found on the ground that appeared to not have breakage at the hole but probably had used a ferrous nail that had rusted through which was allowing the slate shingles to fall to the ground. Mr. Brightman stated that he wanted to ensure to improve the safety and the condition of the roofs on the towers with the cladding with ice and water shield and putting on a new shingle. Mr. Brightman also stated that all of the sheet metal work on the corners of each tower as well as the cap would be taken down, wrapping the entire roof and then reinstalled but an additional drip metal may be needed at the bottom.

October 28, 2014

Mr. Brightman asked the Board if they were familiar with the type of shingle proposed. Chairman Bayliff stated photos and information was provided in the Board packets.

Mr. Berbach inquired as to what was currently slate. Mr. Brightman stated that the top of the towers were the only thing that was currently slate and everything else was an asphalt shingle that was at least two or maybe three layers.

Chairman Bayliff inquired if the current asphalt shingles would have been layered over the original slate roofing material. Mr. Brightman stated that they would have been removed because the new shingles would not have been able to be nailed down into the slate material. Mr. Brightman stated that this project would include complete removal to the original 1 by boards which was there long before plywood was invented.

Chairman Bayliff stated that in the current Guidelines the Board strives for the original material to be maintained as much as possible and realizes that the original gutter was rusted through could not be used but sounded like the applicants were willing to adjust to keeping the same aesthetic and materials which was the most important thing in perpetuating that so that the building continues to be maintained; she would like to see as much original maintained as possible with also protecting the building by repairing the issues that were there and based on the Board's Guidelines it was important that the Board tell the applicant how important it is that maintain of downspouts flashings the roofs as much original as possible. Chairman Bayliff also stated that the existing asphalt shingles were not but assumed that the existing slate was original or made to repair the original.

Mr. Brown stated that his concern was the wood that was damaged that the applicant proposed to reuse as much as possible the terminology the applicant presented in the request was to use the latest and greatest material and was the applicant referring to using wood or what material. Mr. Brightman stated that the corners work as shown in the photos was all metal which all the cladding would be taken down; the frame work that was on the inside which had allowed all of the gutter to fall off of the building was rotted away so new material would be put back lining then with a new membrane roof then the original sheet metal corners would go back in place then the same round gutters were to be reinstalled at the current location and would then be adding new round gutters as well because the downspouts were not adequate to be able to carry that type of roof with that kind of area. Mr. Brightman noted that everything from the ground will be reused if they can now as you were on the roof looking down would be all of the best of our technologies today. Mr. Brown asked if all of the wood under the gutters would be put back. Mr. Brightman stated that was all metal; large sections had been removed to see what the profile was and was also shown in the photos.

Ms. Kuziinsky asked what color of shingle would be used. Mr. Brightman stated that once the sheet metal was removed and were able to do some scraping to the bottom coat of paint to find out what color that was that it appeared to him as the first piece was

October 28, 2014

removed the sheet metal that the scrapings proved the color to be a tone of white. Ms. Kuziinsky said she meant the shingles. Mr. Brightman said the shingles would be two different types of gray and when the slate was down off the upper tower the color would match.

Chairman Bayliff noted that it was mentioned that some of the slate was falling off and inquired if there was leakage within the towers or if it was secure as where it stands right now. Mr. Brightman stated that it was hard to tell because one of them was a bell tower with arches on the side of it with bird screen so if there was a leak it was probably falling into the inside roof area then finally being gathered but they know there's water inside they probably have damaged wood and want to keep as dry as they can.

Mr. Brightman pointed out the picture of the Gatehouse Slate colored shingle in the Board's packet and noted that the manufacture was able to give that range of colors because there were three different layers of shingle in one particular shingle and reviewed how that shingle was layered to add dimension and resembled a foe painting.

Chairman Bayliff stated that based on the Board's Guidelines and the Board's goals it would be her suggestion that the project commence as planned but to maintain or replacing the slate on the two towers and understood that it would be a massive job to do a total restoration of the entire project but on the smaller areas of the two towers where the slate was present and were such a big symbols of the historic nature of the building she would like to see to maintain the slate and either removing it and replacing the inside and putting the slate back up or replacing with brand new slate but to stick with the slate roof on the two signifying beacons of what the church is especially since the other roof that was proposed would match better. Chairman Bayliff stated that was her assessment based on what was presented to her and what the Board tries to stick with the Guidelines and maintaining all of the original materials or replacing like for like as much as possible.

Mr. Brightman stated that he read in the Guidelines as well and it states as long as it was not cost prohibitive and he could certainly run the numbers on it and see if it fits within but already knows that keeping the slate would be so much more expensive and even if they had authentic slate in one area and another slate that looks like slate he wasn't sure that there would be a dead on match unless you use the same material in both and from an aesthetic standpoint from the street if asphalt shingles were placed on both there would be a better look rather than trying to match the colors.

Chairman Bayliff stated that aesthetics was important but it was also about maintaining the historical fabric per the Guidelines and cost prohibitive things were not part of the equation for the Board and that the Board was taking care of maintaining those historic buildings and they hoped that one hundred years from now one could see that there was a slate roof here; even though it was not on the whole roof building but it was on the towers so it must have been like that a hundred years ago. Chairman Bayliff also noted

October 28, 2014

that the changes implemented in the 1950's would be historical and interesting and hopefully that could be maintained as well.

Ms. Harker stated that she would like to keep the slate on the two towers and that was keeping with the history of the church.

Mr. Berbach stated he would agree that this was a massive project and there was a lot of roof and just getting up there to do the work was expensive and the up cost of the square footage from shingle to slate he thought was worth the extra expense. With the square footage and the look he liked the idea of keeping the slate on the two towers and the rest of the request was a go with him.

Mr. Brown stated that his neighbor to his right of his current home had a slate roof and knows that it was expensive to repair but the integrity wouldn't have it any other way. Ms. Kuziinsky stated hers was decorative and was different that the proposed and noted that slate was very long lasting when it is put on correctly. Mr. Brown stated there was sympathy that the job would not be easy to do but he really thought and it was his perspective to this everything else makes complete sense but the slate roof had been there for a long long time and his personal position was for it to stay if it was at all possible.

Chairman Bayliff inquired if the Board was open to making an amendment to the application of the approval or denial. Mr. Berbach asked if could approve the application as presented but the towers.

Mr. Brightman stated that he would be more than happy to amend the drawings for the two towers and to get a price for slate and see where they were at from a dollar stand point and may have to come back to revisit.

Mr. Brown stated that it was the general consensus of the Board that the majority of the slate should probably stay and only repairs be made to it not a slate rip off and replace.

Ms. Cox inquired the probability of finding matching slate somewhere where it had been removed from another building which would not be as expensive. Mr. Brightman stated that was part of the investigation that he would have to start now with the direction of this group may have to give him to take a look at.

Mr. Brown asked Ms. Kuziinsky if she had an issue finding slate after a tree damage. Ms. Kuziinsky stated that there was no problem finding the same color of slate and that there were supplies and was a company out of Columbus, Ohio; Dura-slate. Ms. Cox stated there was also a company located in Toledo that had reclaimed slate from older buildings.

Chairman Bayliff stated that she would like to amend the Certificate to state that he slate was to be maintained/repaired/replaced like for like which would allow the applicant to

October 28, 2014

move forward with the project and would not have to come back to the Board unless there was a problem with maintaining the slate. Board Members found that the bell towers were not included in the original Certificate of Appropriateness request.

Chairman Bayliff explained the appeal process to the applicant.

Chairman Bayliff asked for further discussion. There being none Mr. Brown **moved to approve the request as amended to include the modification stating that the slate to be maintained/repared/replaced like for like on the two bell towers**, seconded by Ms. Cox. **Motion carried.** Ayes: Brown, Cox, Kuziensky, Bayliff, Berbach, Gruber, and Harker. Nays: None.

Chairman Bayliff expressed to the applicant that the Board appreciated the willingness to keep in mind during the project to maintain that historical significance.

Old Business

There was none.

Miscellaneous

There was none.

Adjournment

Chairman Bayliff asked for further discussion or comments. There being none, Ms. Kuziensky **moved for adjournment**, seconded by Ms. Harker and unanimously approved. **Motion carried.** Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

APPROVED:


Board Chairman Lauren Bayliff

ATTEST:


Kimberly Patterson, Board Secretary