

June 27, 2017

Chairman Lauryn Bayliff called the meeting of the Tipp City Restoration and Architectural Board of Review to order on Tuesday, June 27, 2017 at 7:29pm. Other Board members in attendance included: Ralph Brown, Heather Wendel, Josh Hartman, Vonda Alberson, and Lisa Lawson. Also in attendance were City Planner/Zoning Administrator Matthew Spring and Board Secretary Laura Tobias.

Citizens signing the register: Robert and Jennifer Davis.

Absence

Mr. Spring announced Mr. Gruber had notified him that he was in Columbus for work and would probably not be able to make it to the meeting.

Ms. Alberson **moved to excuse Joel Gruber from the meeting**, seconded by Ms. Wendel and unanimously approved. **Motion carried.**

Oath of Office

City of Tipp City staff member and notary, Dawn Gross, administered the Oath of Office to Board Members Lauryn Bayliff and Josh Hartman.

Election of Chairman

Mr. Brown **moved to nominate Ms. Bayliff as Chairman of the Restoration and Architectural Board of Review**, seconded by Ms. Lawson. **Motion carried.** Ayes: Brown, Lawson, Wendel, Hartman, Alberson. Nays: None. Ms. Bayliff abstained from the vote.

Election of Vice Chairman

Ms. Alberson **moved to nominate Mr. Brown as Vice Chairman of the Restoration and Architectural Board of Review**, seconded by Ms. Bayliff. **Motion carried.** Ayes: Alberson, Bayliff, Hartman, Lawson, Wendel. Nays: None. Mr. Brown abstained from the vote.

Minutes

Chairman Bayliff asked for discussion. Being no further discussion, Mr. Brown **moved to approve the January 24, 2017 meeting minutes as written**, seconded by Ms. Alberson. **Motion carried.** Ayes: Brown, Alberson, Wendel, Lawson. Nays: None. Ms. Bayliff and Mr. Hartman 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

Robert and Jennifer Davis - 115 E. Main St. – Lot: IL 18 – The applicant seeks an approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the following:

1. The installation of vinyl siding on the rear section of the structure
2. The placement of a new wooden accessory structure (storage shed) at the rear of the property
3. The installation of six security cameras on the structure
4. The installation of a security light on the rear of the structure

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

June 27, 2017

Zoning Code Section(s): § 154.05 (E)

Mr. Spring stated that the applicant seeks an approved Certificate of Appropriateness for several items at the property located at 115 E. Main Street, which is the Grounds for Pleasure Coffee Shop.

1. The installation of vinyl siding on the rear section of the structure
2. The placement of a new wooden accessory structure (storage shed) at the rear of the property
3. The installation of six security cameras on the structure
4. The installation of a security light on the rear of the structure

Mr. Spring continued with a little background information on the property. The structure at 115 E. Main Street consists of two sections being: 1) a front (southern) section, fronting E. Main Street, (c. 1865); and a rear (northern) section constructed of a combination of plywood and vertical siding with an unknown construction date. In addition to the *Grounds for Pleasure* commercial venture, the building also contains a residential upper floor apartment.

The applicant's first request is to seek an approved Certificate of Appropriateness to oversee the rear single-story frame section of the structure with *Polaris WeatherTech™* Vinyl Siding. The proposed siding would be 4" (Double D-4 8") Dutch Lap and would be grey "Twilight" color (see Attachment "J"). The applicant's state in their application:

"We would like to improve the look and appearance of the addition to the original structure. The addition is a single story structure, wood frame and is a mixture of plywood and other wood. This portion of the structure is not believed to be of historical significance" (see applicant's photos Attachments "C-E").

Mr. Spring continued, explaining Board decisions with regard to structural significance.

Structural Significance

Staff notes that Code allows the Restoration Board to relax or waive the standards or guidelines based on the significance of the structure as follows:

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;

June 27, 2017

- 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.

Mr. Spring also indicated he had provided an excerpt from the Design Manual on Siding and Exterior Materials for the Board's review.

Excerpt from the Design Manual on Siding and Exterior Wall Materials

The major visual element of any building is the material that makes up the body of the wall surfaces. For wood frame buildings, this is usually a form of siding, in other cases, it may be brick.

One of the reasons the

Restoration District has survived to this date relatively intact is because a significant number of buildings were constructed of brick as encouraged by John Clark. Brick and better frame buildings tended to last longer than crude log buildings. Nevertheless, brick buildings need occasional maintenance. On the other hand, there are many sturdy, long-lasting buildings that have wooden siding. It can be vertical boards and battens, as in the B & O Freight Station's original walls, or the more common horizontal siding. Because one of the goals of the Restoration District regulations is to preserve and maintain that unique character of historical Tippecanoe City, the Restoration Board strongly discourages major changes such as replacing exterior siding with other than like material or painting over brick or masonry.

Although many property owners might consider placing new siding materials over old siding to be an improvement, it is a very destructive practice from a historic preservation viewpoint. The application of new siding materials over old siding may result in physical damage to a building, increasing the potential for long-term damage and destroying important historical elements. The practice of "oversiding" is strongly discouraged in the Restoration District.

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 27, 2017

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 fishscales, sawtooth, 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. Robert Davis, 115 1/2 E. Main Street, Tipp City, Ohio approached the dais.

Mr. Davis stated that the back of the building currently contains T-111 plywood. It has uneven surfaces and they are hoping to cover it with a cost effective, low maintenance siding. There are no architectural features, which leads him to believe that it is not historically significant.

Ms. Lawson asked what size siding he was requesting. Mr. Davis replied that he was requesting approval for 4-inch siding. Mr. Spring clarified it is double lap, and the siding would show two 4-inch laps on a 10' to 12' length.

Ms. Alberson asked what their intentions were for the existing conduits, wiring, and meters. Mr. Davis said that, according to code, the boxes would need to be framed out, and the wires would need to be located in front of the siding. According to code and his contractor, it cannot be buried.

Mr. Spring confirmed for Ms. Bayliff that there was no specific reference in the historic register regarding when any additions or accessory structures on this property were incorporated into the Historic District.

Ms. Bayliff explained that the Board is trying to eliminate vinyl siding in the entire Historic District, and that is indicated in the Design Manual.

Mr. Davis pointed out the clause in the Design Manual, stating that the standards can be waived if the part of the building is not historically significant. He continued that they are just trying to solve a problem and be proactive in improving the appearance of the building. Even if they used non-vinyl siding for historic purposes, there are still all sorts of gas pipes and wires running everywhere, and they cannot be relocated.

Ms. Wendel inquired if they ever considered wood siding or cement board, since the Design Manual does state that Hardy Plank is authorized in the Historic District, and provides a wood look with less maintenance.

June 27, 2017

Mr. Davis argued that wood is very expensive and requires painting. He said it doesn't matter what material is put there, because it is going to be covered with wires, poles, meters, and gas pipes. He feels the material won't change the appearance of the building because none of those items can be relocated.

Ms. Bayliff stated that, because the building next door was torn down, the side of this particular building is visible from Main Street. When it is not visible from the main thoroughfare, the Board can be more flexible.

Jennifer Davis approached the dais and commented that the brick on the building goes about three quarters down the alley, and she does not feel like you can see the siding from Main Street.

Mrs. Lawson inquired about the building above the one being discussed. She referred to "Attachment C". Mr. Davis stated that is the Burwell building, and it has aluminum siding.

Mr. Brown announced that he would rather see Hardy Board or cement board, versus vinyl siding.

Mr. Davis was unclear about cement board.

Ms. Bayliff clarified that one of the brands of cement board is called Hardy Plank. It is designed to replicate the style of a lap siding, it looks like real wood, and it is made in widths to be consistent with historical time periods. She explained that it is individual boards created with or without a pigment, so you can choose to paint it. Ms. Alberson added that it is colorfast, and doesn't require paint for up to twenty years.

Mr. Davis pointed out that people park in the parking lot, right up against the siding, and therefore you can hardly see the siding because of the cars. He said cars have bumped into the building and graffiti has been sprayed on the siding, not to mention the rain water that gets splashed onto the siding from passing trucks. He said he got a quote for wood siding and it is significantly more money than vinyl siding.

Mr. Brown said the cement board is a lot more cost effective than wood. Mr. Hartman agreed, saying he had one of his houses sided with cement board and it is durable, it can get wet and doesn't warp, it is impact resistant, and there are a lot of great advantages to it.

Ms. Alberson voiced a concern that the Board is trying to be consistent regarding vinyl siding. She commented that determining the significance of that part of the structure is understandable, but the building as a whole is a part of the character contributing to the Historic District.

Mr. Davis stated he was reluctant to have to buy siding and then pay to have it painted as well. Ms. Bayliff and Ms. Alberson assured him that, similar to vinyl siding, it comes in a variety of colors.

Mr. Davis was concerned that the surface the siding needs to be attached to is not smooth, and Mr. Brown assured him the cement board is just like vinyl siding and is bendable.

Mr. Davis said he could just leave it as is, because he has to maintain a budget. He reiterated that while the Board is specifying a specific material, the goal of maintaining a historic look is not being met because of all of the meters and wires.

June 27, 2017

Ms. Bayliff assured him the Board does take budget into consideration, but they do follow the guidelines and consider the property's contribution to the Historic District.

The Board agreed to amend the application to approve only the use of Hardy Plank or wood siding in a similar color scheme.

Chairman Bayliff asked for further discussion. There being none, Ms. Alberson **moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with modifications**, seconded by Ms. Wendel. **Motion carried.** Ayes: Alberson, Wendel, Hartman, Lawson, Brown, Bayliff. Nays: None.

The Board moved on to the discussion of the request for a storage shed.

Mr. Spring clarified that, if the Certificate of Appropriateness is approved, a Zoning Permit would need to be obtained from Tipp City's Planning and Zoning office.

Mr. Spring stated the applicant requests an approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the placement of a pre-constructed wooden shed at the rear of the property (see Attachments H & I). The proposed shed would be built by Whispering Oak Gazebos and have dimensions of 8' x 10' (80 sq. ft.) and be approximately 8' tall. The actual shed proposed is as depicted in Attachment "H" with 2-tone beige siding and black 3-tab asphalt shingles. The shed would be located in the rear (north) of the lot, 3' from the rear (northern) property line, 3' from the side (eastern) property line, 9' from the side (western) property line, and about 44' from the rear of the primary structure (see Attachment "B").

Ms. Davis clarified that the picture makes the color appear beige, but it's actually more of a light gray.

Ms. Bayliff confirmed the roof on the shed would be similar to the roof on the building, the material for the shed is wood, which is consistent with historic materials, the color is not outrageous, and based on the way it is presented, she doesn't see anything in the Guidelines that would prohibit the structure.

Chairman Bayliff asked for further discussion. There being none, Ms. Lawson **moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness**, seconded by Mr. Brown. **Motion carried.** Ayes: Lawson, Brown, Wendel, Bayliff, Alberson, Hartman. Nays: None.

The Board moved on to the discussion of the request for six security cameras and a security light.

Mr. Spring stated the applicant requests an approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of six security cameras on the structure. The proposed cameras are Amcrest® cameras (see attachment "F") and would be located at the upper corners of the building as delineated on the site plan (attachment "B"). Cameras would be placed on the north and south of the building (at each upper corner) and also on the east side of the building (at each upper corner). Staff notes that there are no specific guidelines for "security cameras" listed in the Design manual.

The applicant also requests an approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of an exterior lighting sconce at the rear (north) of the building (see attachment "G"). The fixture would be located at the upper center on the northern façade (above the doors). The proposed lighting fixture would be a Strongway® 16" barn light. The fixture would be constructed of black aluminum and include a metal cage over the face.

Ms. Bayliff asked if the light matches the one in the front. Mr. Davis confirmed it does.

June 27, 2017

Mr. Davis discussed some problems with people parking illegally, graffiti, and flowers being damaged. He also mentioned wanting to be proactive about the security of the ladies who work at the Grounds for Pleasure Coffee Shop.

Chairman Bayliff asked for further discussion. There being none, Mr. Brown **moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness**, seconded by Ms. Lawson. **Motion carried.** Ayes: Brown, Lawson, Alberson, Hartman, Bayliff, Wendel. Nays: None.

Ms. Wendel reminded the Board of the Downtown Tipp City organization, which offers a Façade Improvement Program. She recommended Mr. Davis look into that to help with the siding costs.

Mr. Spring, who is on the committee, confirmed that the grant provided is a 50% matching grant, up to \$1000. He offered to email the application materials to Mr. Davis and mentioned that the committee would be meeting the following day.

Mr. Davis announced he will look into the cement board, but he is planning to appeal the Board's decision about the siding.

Ms. Bayliff informed Mr. Davis that he would have to file an official appeal with the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Davis said the City Manager had already informed him of the appeals process.

Mr. Spring explained that there are no forms to fill out regarding the appeal. Mr. Davis would simply need to provide a statement. If Mr. Davis wanted to put together any supporting documents, they would be included with the application. He informed Mr. Davis that the decision would need to be appealed within ten business days, but that the deadline for the July 19th meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals is July 3rd, if he wanted to be on the agenda for the July meeting.

Mr. Davis needed some clarification on what the decisions mean. Mr. Spring explained that he would be sent a Certificate of Appropriateness for all of the decisions made at the meeting. In addition, he would need to get a zoning permit from Mr. Spring for the shed. He would need no permits from Miami County. The camera and lights could be installed immediately.

Ms. Lawson clarified for Mr. Davis that vinyl siding can crack or shatter if hit by a vehicle, whereas the Hardy Plank will not do that as easily. Also, if it is spray painted with graffiti, it is easier to paint over than vinyl would be. Hardy Plank is more expensive than vinyl, but not as costly as wood, and the grant may help offset the extra cost.

Mr. Spring confirmed for Mr. Davis that the Board's modification of the siding request stated that the siding must be Hardy Plank or wood siding in a similar color scheme.

Mr. Spring added the color of the siding could be approved administratively, if Mr. Davis chooses to change it.

Old Business

There was none.

June 27, 2017

Miscellaneous Business

There was none.

Adjournment

Chairman Bayliff asked for further discussion or comments. There being none, Ms. Bayliff **moved for adjournment**, seconded by Ms. Lawson and unanimously approved. **Motion carried**. Meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

ATTEST:


Board Secretary

APPROVED:

