

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**Tuesday, September 17, 2002**

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

Attendance: Mr. James Treffinger, Chairman; Mr. Charles Graham; Mrs. Laverne Stebbins; Ms. Heidi Miller; Mrs. Martha Sheley; Mr. Jack Gramann. Absent: Mr. John Carr. Also present: Mr. Ryan Shrimplin, Planner.

Approval of minutes:

MOTION: Mrs. Sheley moved to approve the minutes of August 6, 2002, Board of Architectural Review meeting, as written. Ms. Miller seconded the motion. The motion was approved 3-0-3 with Mr. Graham, Ms. Miller, and Mr. Gramann abstaining.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Shrimplin informed the members that under Other Business, Mr. Loren Gannon will be presenting the second of a three part series on preservation.

Mr. Shrimplin stated that Las Piramides Mexican Restaurant has not submitted a complete application at this time. The architect for the project has been contacted and will be providing the additional information shortly.

Mr. Shrimplin stated that in response to a question posed by Mrs. Stebbins at the last meeting, he researched the history of the fluorescent lights under the awning of Craig's Barber Shop at 288 North Main Street. Apparently the lights appeared under the awning several years ago when the building was occupied by Fox Cleaners and is most likely a legal non-conforming use.

Mr. Shrimplin gave the BAR members an update on the progress of the BAR Sign Color Chart. Staff is in the process of revising the draft prepared by Heidi Miller and will meet with her to begin working on a final copy for review by the BAR.

Mr. Shrimplin stated that the proposed APD Sign Lighting and Landscaping Ordinance will be incorporated in a larger ordinance amending other sections of the sign code. Staff is in the process of preparing the larger ordinance.

Ms. Miller stated that she has a business meeting later in the evening and asked to be excused early from the BAR meeting so she can meet with her clients. The BAR excused Ms. Miller.

NEW BUSINESS

Joli Boutique - Board of Architectural Review Special Approval

Mr. Shrimplin reviewed the Special Approval application submitted for Joli Boutique located at 47 East Franklin Street which is the northeast corner of Franklin and Maple Streets. The zoning on the property is A-P, Architectural Preservation. The request is for new ground and directional

signs. He explained the ordinance allows a sign to have a single background color plus two (2) copy colors for text and graphics. A third (3<sup>rd</sup>) copy color may be used for outlining text.

The applicant is requesting approval of a sign showing one (1) background color and three (3) copy colors. The proposed colors include buff or ivory as the background color; blue for the words "Joli Boutique"; red for the rose petal graphic; and dark green for the stem.

Staff believes the proposed sign colors are compatible with each other and would be appropriate in the APD keeping with the spirit and intent of the color chart. The Planning Department recommended approval of the signs for Joli Boutique subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed signs shall conform to the location, material, and size requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the ground sign shall not exceed sixteen (16) square feet in size per sign face and each directional sign shall not exceed each two (2) square feet in size per sign face.
2. A sign lighting plan shall be subject to approval by the Planning Department.
3. A sign landscaping plan shall be approved by the Planning Department.

Mrs. Debbie Teeters, the applicant, stated that she intends to keep the existing lighting on the property. Her business is an upscale women's clothing boutique that will feature a number of high-style items including items worn by celebrities.

MOTION: Mr. Graham moved to approve the Special Approval application submitted for Joli Boutique requesting a ground sign and directional signs as submitted. Mr. Gramann seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 6-0.

Ms. Miller excused herself from the meeting at this time.

#### OTHER BUSINESS

Loren Gannon, an architectural history professor at the University of Dayton and a former preservation officer for the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, gave the second installment of his series entitled "Preservation 101".

Mr. Gannon stated that success in preservation is in the details. His presentation tonight will examine the components of a historic building and show how the details can tell you something about the age of the building.

Doors tend to be the one feature of a historic building that stands out the most. Like the buildings themselves, certain door styles are tied to particular periods in history. One of the most popular door styles in the history of America has been the Colonial six-panel door (also referred to as the "cross and bible" door). Colonial design in general has been very popular in America, even today. Historic doors should not be replaced if they can be repaired. The profile of the paneling on a door dates it period of origin.

Windows are another defining feature on a historic building. They are analogous to eyes on a face. The number and style of the glass panes indicate the history of the window. The most common window pane pattern in Centerville is the 6-over-6 window. Like door paneling, the profile of the muntins used to hold the panes in place date the window's period of origin.

In America's early days, glass panes were small due to the method used to produce them, called crown glass blowing. Later, another method was developed, called cylinder glass, that allowed the glass to lay flat and could be cut into larger panes.

The traditional sash window is very energy efficient in its design. Storm windows help insulate a building and protect historic windows from cold weather. Only metal frame storm windows should be used, and the frames should be painted to blend in with the building.

One rule in preservation is that deteriorated materials should be replaced with new materials of the same type and style. This is especially true of porches.

Bricks were originally "soft", consisting of a mud-and-straw "pug" that was hand fashioned into bricks and left to dry in the sun a la adobe style. Later bricks were categorized as either "common" brick or "finished" brick. The finished brick contained a hard outer coating that protected the brick from the weather. Common brick has about 80% moisture absorption while finished brick only has about 10%. This is why brick buildings should never be blasted or powerwashed: the protective outer coating of the brick is removed, exposing the interior of the brick to moisture and freeze-thaw.

There are several types of brick course bonds. The three main bonds are Flemish, English, and American. Flemish bond alternates headers and stretchers within each coursing. English bond alternates courses of headers and stretchers. American bond consists of five or seven courses of stretchers and then a course of headers.

Lime mortar was historically used on masonry buildings. Lime has the same rate of expansion and contraction as brick. Portland cement, introduced to America in the late nineteenth century, is a much harder substance and should not be used as a mortar.

Like brick, stone and wood should never be blasted or powerwashed.

Walls need to breathe, that is, they need to be able to allow humidity to pass through them. If the exterior of a building is covered with aluminum or vinyl siding, the humidity gets trapped in the wall cavity and leads to dry rot. Wood siding allows humidity to pass through and does not create dry rot.

Mr. Gannon ended his presentation there for the evening and will pick up where he left off at a later meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

*James L. Treppinger, Chairman*

