

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
Tuesday, October 4, 2011

Mr. Graham called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Chair Charles Graham, Mr. Jaime Garrett, Mrs. Amy Korenyi-Both, Dr. Richard Hoback and Mr. Frank Holloway. Also present: Mr. Steve Feverston, City Planner, and Mrs. Julie Weaver, Assistant Clerk of Council.

Absent: Ms. Sharma Stone. It was noted that Ms. Stone had not contacted the Planning Department. Mr. Garrett moved to excuse Ms. Stone from the meeting. Mrs. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed with 5 ayes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No changes were noted for the minutes of the meeting on September 6, 2011.

MOTION: Dr. Hoback moved to approve the minutes of the Board of Architectural Review Regular Meeting of September 6, 2011, as distributed. Mr. Garrett seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously, 5-0.

NEW BUSINESS

Application P-2011-0116: Jeffrey and Brenda Sergent, 19-21 Weller.

Mr. Feverston gave background concerning Application P-2011-0116 by Jeffrey Sergent for approval to cover the existing historic siding of a duplex in the APD with hardie board. Mr. Feverston located the property on a map, showed photos and noted the difference in contour between the old and the proposed sidings. He noted peeling paint and layers of paint, but a relatively small amount of wood rot. Although the UDO allows the use of hardie board as an acceptable siding on a case-by-case basis, Mr. Feverston recommended scrapping and cleaning followed by two coats of primer and two coats of quality paint for this early Centerville home that was originally situated near the intersection of Main and Franklin Streets.

Mr. Jeffrey Sergent noted that the process of scraping and cleaning the old wood was very labor intensive. He said that he has been trying gradually to improve the property since he purchased it five years ago. He said that the price of wood was three times that of the hardie board, making the hardie board a better choice for this rental property that generates a limited amount of income. His intent was to cover the existing siding rather than remove it. Less than 1% of the existing wood on the 60' x 40' structure is rotted.

Dr. Hoback asked about the difference in life expectancy for the repair and repaint vs covering the siding with hardie board. Mr. Sergent did not feel that it was possible to have an adequate

job with repairing and repainting.

Mr. Garrett noted that the Dutch-lap contour of the siding was one of the significant architectural features of the home and that the shape would not be available in the hardie board material.

Mr. Sergent noted the poor quality of repairs that had been made in the past, since boards of varying thicknesses, shapes and methods of interlocking had been used.

Mr. Holloway stated his sympathy if the owners could not match the existing siding anyway.

Mr. Feverston suggested the possibility of custom-made pieces since only 1% of the area of the home would be involved. Additionally, some historians say that the layers of paint are part of the history of structures such as this one.

Mr. Sergent stated that those structures must have had more maintenance done over the years. He pleaded for permission to use the hardie board on the property.

Mr. Graham stated the alternatives for the Board of Architectural Review as recommending repair and repainting or allowing the hardie board.

Mr. Feverston said that the level of damage on the building did not rise to the level of needing to be completely refaced.

Mr. Garrett agreed. He stated that he would hate to see the loss of the historic character of the exterior of the structure. Mr. Sergent reminded the Board how labor intensive keeping the current face would be. He pointed out that complete refaces had been allowed on other properties on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Feverston explained that scraping down to the bare wood is not necessary. Scraping off loose material, cleaning, priming properly and painting are sufficient.

Mr. Sergent said that if keeping the home for future generations is the goal, then use of hardie board was his best solution for accomplishing that.

Mr. Garrett stated that the character of the home changes with the application of the hardie board siding, before Mr. Holloway pointed out the ongoing difficulty of trying to maintain paint on a rental property.

MOTION:

Mr. Holloway made a motion to approve Application P-2011-0116 and allow the use of hardie board siding on the duplex at 19-21 Weller. Dr. Hoback seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-1 with Mr. Garrett voting in the negative.

Mrs. Sergent expressed her appreciation to the Board of Architectural Review.

Application P-2011-0117, Temporary Sign in the APD

Mr. Feverston explained the request from Emil Kornfeind for a sign for the annual fundraising beer and wine fest at The Castle, 133 N. Main Street. Because an identical sign was approved by the Board last year, staff allowed the sign to be posted prior to this meeting, because the application came in too late for the September agenda and too close to the event for the October agenda. Staff will remind the applicant to apply earlier next year.

MOTION:

Mr. Holloway moved for approval of the temporary sign at 133 N. Main Street to advertise the annual fundraiser at The Castle. Mrs. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

Application P-2011-0122, Material for a Wall Sign at SuperPetz, 157 N. Main Street.

Mr. Feverston described the improvements made to the façade at the building at 157 N. Main Street. KAP signs is requesting approval of a PVC material for the wall sign on the building. The sign meets code requirements for size, color, and location. He showed a sample of the painted PVC material. The Code says the material must be opaque, solid materials such as wood or metal or others approved by the BAR. Staff recommended approval of the request.

MOTION:

Dr. Hoback moved for approval of the PVC material requested in Application P-2011-1022 for the SuperPetz sign at 157 N. Main Street. Mr. Garrett seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

Application Z-2011-0417, Color for First Financial Sign, 215 N. Main Street.

The building at 215 N. Main in the Architectural Preservation District has a new owner, First Financial Bank, which is redoing all the signage on the property. The ATM on the north side of the bank was included in the sign package submitted to the Planning Department. The majority of the ATM had been a bold blue; but the golden yellow requested for the canopy had not been used previously and is not requested for elsewhere on the property. The matter came before the BAR, because the golden yellow color of the ATM was not on the color chart for the APD. Mr. Feverston showed photos of the site, before recommending denial of the request.

Mr. Reist of Triangle Signs explained that First Financial had paid a significant fee for the new brand recognition logo and color scheme. He stated the strong desire of the bank to follow through with the recommendations of its consultant. The main color of the ATM is blue with the canopy accent of yellow. When Mr. Garrett asked if there would be a sign on the canopy, Mr. Reist shared that no sign would be permitted. When asked for what the company might accept as an alternative, Mr. Reist stated that the bank might accept solid blue, similar to what the ATM had been for the former owner.

The board passed the color samples and agreed that the colors were bright. Mr. Garrett asked about making the center panels white to match the trim on the building and using the yellow as a border, thus softening the amount and effect of the bold yellow. The board concurred that would be acceptable. Mr. Holloway pointed out the ATM was back from the main thoroughfare, not in a prominent location.

Mr. Garrett made a motion to approve Application Z-2011-0417 with the condition that the colors of the ATM canopy be modified to include white center panels. Mrs. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Feverston shared that the Planning Department is continuing to work with property owners and businesses downtown for follow up to the May hailstorm. Over thirty zoning verifications for repair and restoration of roofs, siding, and/or windows have already been issued. He mentioned a number of examples where significant upgrades are being made.

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Architectural Review is Tuesday, November 1, 2011, at 7:30 p.m. in Council Chambers.

MOTION TO ADJOURN: Mr. Holloway moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Hoback seconded the motion. The motion passed with five ayes. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



A handwritten signature in cursive script, followed by the date 11/1/11 written in a similar style.