CITY of MEDINA
Historic Preservation Board Meeting

Historic Preservation Board

Meeting Date: October 8, 2020

Meeting Time: 5:00pm

Present: Leslie Traves, Don Geitz, Paula Banks, Elizabeth Biggins-Ramer (arrived at 5:06pm), Jonathan Mendel (Community Development Director), Sandy Davis (Administrative Assistant)

Absent: Patty Stahl

Paula Banks made a motion to approve the minutes from the September 10, 2020 meeting as submitted. The motion was seconded by Don Geitz.

Vote:	
Banks	Y
Traves	Y
Geitz	Y
Approved	3-0

Announcements: No Announcements

Old Business: None

New Business:

Mrs. Traves announced the board will hear case H20-10 first on the agenda.

H20-10 243 S. Jefferson Damir Simic COA

Mr. Mendel gave a brief overview of the case. Mr. Mendel stated this is a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for façade painting at 108 W. Washington. Mr. Mendel stated the property is zoned C-2 Central Business District. Mr. Mendel stated the applicant proposes painting the exterior with "Uncertain Gray" by Sherwin Williams. Mr. Mendel stated the applicant has provided a paint chip.

Mr. Mendel stated this would be an alteration to the building so it requires review.

Mr. Mendel stated the proposed paint scheme will provide update to the existing building. Mr. Mendel stated this paint scheme design is appropriate to the subject

building and complimentary to the immediate vicinity and the District. Mr. Mendel stated the paint scheme would continue the updating of the building.

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed painting scheme for 243 S. Jefferson St.

Present for the case was owner, Damir Simic. Mrs. Traves asked the color of the trim. Mr. Simic stated his name and address. Mr. Simic stated he is trying to improve the appearance on the inside and the outside. Mr. Simic stated the inside of the house is almost complete. Mr. Simic stated the only thing left is the painting of the siding and the trim. Mr. Simic stated once the siding is painted, it may be one shade darker per the salesperson at Sherwin Williams. Mr. Simic stated the trim would stay as it is right now until they decide what color to use. Mr. Simic stated once they decide on a color, they will come back to the board. Mr. Geitz suggested painting the trim a darker shade of gray as a nice contract. Mr. Simic stated he needs to speak to his wife about the color as well as the board.

Mr. Mendel suggested the board approve the request subject to the staff approving the trim color in an appropriate shade of gray or white.

Mrs. Banks stated she is ok having staff approve the color of the trim.

Mr. Geitz made a motion to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for façade painting at 243 S. Jefferson Street in the color "SW 6234, Uncertain Gray" and a condition that the trim and porch color be subject to administrative review and approval.

The motion was seconded by Biggens-Ramer.

There was a brief discussion regarding painting the block.

Vote:	
Traves	Y
Banks	Y
Biggens-Ramer	Y
Geitz	Y
Approved	4-0

2. H20-06 133 N. Court Street Loren A. Raymond COA

Mr. Mendel gave a brief overview of the case. Mr. Mendel stated this is for 133 N. Court Street and the applicant is Twin Pines LLC for a Certificate of Appropriateness request for complete demolition of the existing building.

Mr. Mendel stated the property is zoned C-1, Central Business District and is located on the west side of 100 block of N. Court Street. Mr. Mendel stated the subject building was constructed between 1902 and 1911 as a single dwelling residence.

Mr. Mendel stated the subject property is a converted house that has been commercially used for decades. Mr. Mendel stated at one time, this property was the location of the

Waite and Sons Funeral Home. Mr. Mendel stated at some point in the first half of the 20th century, a two story garage addition was attached to the west side of the original portion of the building, which was demolished by the current owner in 2018. Mr. Mendel stated now the current owner (who acquired the property in 2017) believes the condition of the remaining primary building is poor, not suitable for occupancy and not economically feasible for rehabilitation.

Mr. Mendel stated the applicant requests complete demolition of the existing building without a specific imminent redevelopment plan. Mr. Mendel stated the applicant intends to retain ownership of the land while they determine whether to develop it with a new building consistent with the Historic District and state building code or combine it with adjacent properties (not currently under the applicant's control) for a larger redevelopment project.

Mr. Mendel cited City of Medina Historic District Design Guidelines, Section 145.07(c): Demolition.

Mr. Mendel stated with respect to demolition, it is the interest of the Board that Landmark Buildings and buildings within Historic Districts be preserved and renovated for economically productive uses.

Mr. Mendel stated the Board encourages the saving and adaptive re-use of buildings significant to the character of the Historic Districts and the history of the City. Mr. Mendel stated consistent with this intent, the Board also realizes the Historic District is not a static environment, but an ever changing and developing entity. Applications for demolition shall be reviewed based on the overall impact the demolition will have on adjacent Historic Landmarks, Historic Districts, and the community.

Mr. Mendel stated in reviewing an application, the Board will also consider the impact of the proposed use of the site on the Historic District. Demolition of existing buildings which are not a significant loss to the Historic District to allow for the construction of new development which enhances the Historic District may be acceptable.

Mr. Mendel stated the applicant has provided the necessary data for this request as outlined in Appendix A, Chapter II, Section D of Chapter 145 of the City of Medina Codified Ordinances.

Mr. Mendel stated the subject building and property are not part of Medina's National Historic Landmark District or a National Historic Landmark, but is simply part of the local Historic District as legislated under Chapter 145 of the City of Medina Codified Ordinances.

Mr. Mendel stated Dan Gladish, Chief Building Official and Jonathan Mendel toured the subject building regarding the subject property's existing conditions in relation to consistency and/or compliance with the Ohio Building Code. Mr. Mendel stated Mr. Gladish's comments are provided with the staff report included in the packet.

Mr. Mendel stated the property has been a visible part of the streetscape for the 100 block of N. Court for more than 100 years and in that time has changed ownership, use and exterior materials.

Mr. Mendel stated given the objective investigation of the building in relation to the Ohio Building Code by Chief Building Official Dan Gladish, the building has extensive substandard conditions that constitute sanitary deficiency and/or violation of the minimum building standards.

Mr. Mendel stated if a motion to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of 133 N. Court Street is made, the following condition is recommended:

1. Subject to review and approval of a demolition permit from the Medina Building Department.

Mr. Mendel stated for the record that he received a letter from the Community Design Committee (CDC) by e-mail which he printed and provided to each board member prior to the start of the meeting as well as a copy for the file and the applicant.

Mr. Mendel stated he will not read the letter into detail as it is labeled under the President of the CDC, Michelle Nichols and will become an exhibit as part of the record.

Mrs. Traves asked if the Board can hear from Chief Building Official, Dan Gladish, first before hearing from the applicant. Mr. Mendel stated they may.

Dan Gladish, City of Medina Chief Building Official, 132 N. Elmwood Avenue, Medina, Ohio addressed the board. Mr. Gladish stated he was asked to evaluate the overall condition of the property at 133 N. Court Street, and after a thorough walk through of the interior and the exterior he noted the mechanical systems, electric, HVAC, plumbing are all outdated and in a state of major disrepair. Mr. Gladish stated there are unsanitary conditions and there has been no hot water probably for close to twenty years. Mr. Gladish stated the tank is in the basement and is basically just a pile of rust. Mr. Gladish stated and to know that was the last tank used. Mr. Gladish stated the electrical wiring is a mix of knob and tube to Romex cable and is a disaster. Mr. Gladish stated even the chimney has issues and there is a lot of exposed wiring. Mr. Gladish stated the plumbing system is the same with a mix of galvanized copper, PVC and ABS which are all tied together improperly. Mr. Gladish stated the HVAC system, part of the house is air conditioned which is in a state of disrepair. Mr. Gladish stated the boiler is inoperable. Mr. Gladish stated the heating system was set up for an old steam system, with the old cast iron radiator. Mr. Gladish stated it was converted to hot water at some point. Mr. Gladish stated you typically would not reuse the old cast iron radiators, but the heating system is very inefficient and a mix of steam with a hot water system and some forced air duct work for the air conditioning system.

Mr. Gladish stated one of the biggest concerns he has is trying to make the place acceptable for any future use. Mr. Gladish stated the front porch sets up approximately 54" from the ground and trying to make it accessible would require ramps approximately 40 to 50 feet in length. Mr. Gladish stated the exterior walls and the rock foundation fell into the front porch which is all concrete including the columns.

Mr. Gladish stated none of the chimneys have liners and one of the chimneys can be replaced with new high efficiency stuff would vent down the sidewalk and could be a major issue.

Mr. Gladish stated part of the house still has the original wiring and some of the switches are switches that date back probably 20's and 30's. Mr. Gladish stated the electric are the old two wire switches.

Mr. Gladish continued to review the report submitted to the board.

Mrs. Banks asked if there is any asbestos. Mr. Gladish stated it would need to be tested but it is clearly evident that some of the steam piping has the old asbestos insulation which is in the basement and on each floor.

Mrs. Traves asked how long the house has been vacant. Mr. Gladish stated possibly 2 years. Mr. Mendel stated the applicant would be more able to answer that questions.

Mr. Mendel stated Chief Building Official Gladish is just doing this evaluation in terms of compliance or consistency with the existing Ohio Building Code. Mr. Mendel stated he is not in his position as City Staff to be making judgement calls. Mr. Mendel stated the question that is in front of the board or as the applicant has expressed, whether there are substandard conditions in relation to the current building code and whether those substandard conditions are safe or unsafe. Mr. Mendel stated that is what is analysis in the packet is intended to be.

Mrs. Biggens-Ramer asked if there are other homes in the City of Medina with knob and tube wiring that are habited. Mr. Gladish stated he can't say for sure but most likely there are. Mr. Gladish stated knob and tube wiring is just an old system but there is nothing in the code that states it needs to be removed. Mrs. Banks asked if the house is remodeled, does it need to be replaced. Mr. Gladish stated you can leave everything existing as is.

Mr. Geitz stated if this building were to be remodeled, it would be at tremendous cost because you would have to put up a handicap right and they may decide to add a garage for residential, it would need a ramp. Mr. Geitz stated the building used to be a funeral home. Mr. Geitz stated it is a beautiful house and we hate to lose a house that old. Mr. Geitz stated the applicant would like to purchase the houses in the back. Mr. Geitz stated the building the applicant built on the corner is really nice and this is our only part of history left with this building.

Mr. Mendel stated he did not include all of the photos taken by Mr. Gladish into the packet because it is three times larger than the packet that was sent out.

Mr. Geitz asked if it is worth the effort to ask a few professional contractors to give an estimate of cost to bring the building up to code for reuse.

Mr. Mendel stated that is a question for the applicant and not the Building Official.

Mrs. Traves stated there is a general estimate in the packet.

Present for the case was Loren Raymond, owner. Mr. Raymond stated his architect is present to speak to the condition.

Mrs. Biggens-Ramer asked if the building was occupied when Mr. Raymond purchased it. Mr. Raymond stated there was one tenant. Biggens-Ramer asked if the tenant was conducting business at the time or was it residential. Mr. Raymond stated she was a therapist and she was conducting business.

Mr. Raymond introduced his architect, Ian Jones, MPG Architects, 3660 Embassy Parkway, Fairlawn, Ohio 44333.

Mr. Jones stated Mr. Raymond asked him to walk through the building. Mr. Jones stated he has been through the building multiple times since he purchased it and assessed the condition of the building. Mr. Jones stated the state of repair has been similar from when he first purchased the building to today. Mr. Jones stated it is just some things progressed and some things he made improvements on it. Mr. Jones stated Mr. Raymond did make investments in the building when he purchased it to improve it but it is just out running the capability to really maintain it.

Mrs. Biggens-Ramer asked Mr. Jones to elaborate what the improvements were. Mr. Jones stated there was some electrical, some lighting, flooring and painting done. Mr. Jones stated he thinks the intent at that time was to maintain the building as reasonable but now it has crossed the threshold where it is just not reasonable. Mr. Jones stated after his walk-through he observed much of what Mr. Gladish observed. Mr. Jones stated one of the most substantial items was the foundation is deteriorating in a few spots and appears it is mostly due to moisture issues in the basement where the walls are crumbling. Mrs. Biggens-Ramer asked the composition of the foundation walls. Mr. Jones stated they are some type of cast concrete, at least where he saw it. Mr. Jones stated he is sure there is some concrete, some stone/block foundation as well. Mr. Jones states sometimes they would plaster over the block. Mrs. Biggens-Ramer asked if the deterioration is over the entire foundation or just the section of the original wall. Mr. Jones stated he would say it is prevalent in areas throughout the whole basement and also from recently walking through it, they have removed all paper that has exposed building cracks everywhere from moving. Mr. Jones stated he thinks this building has settled in a lot of different directions just because of the nature of how it was built.

Mrs. Biggens-Ramer asked if the cracks are in the foundation or are they in the plaster. Mr. Jones stated they are in the plaster and he thinks those are a combination of water infiltration from leaks either in the roof or somewhere else or from just movement due to the foundation deteriorating.

Mr. Jones stated as Mr. Gladish stated, there is a lot of electrical issues, there is a lot of mechanical issues. Mr. Jones stated as far as the architectural integrity of the building, there has been a lot of changes that occurred probably decades earlier such as it has aluminum siding that is in poor condition. Mr. Jones stated there are some original windows and there are some areas where the original windows have been completely removed and the framed opening has changed in size so there would have to be a lot of work to bring the building back up to its historic look by expanding those openings again if the headers are still there and in good shape.

Mrs. Biggens-Ramer asked if there is any millwork or doors or anything that is salvageable. Mr. Jones stated he thinks there are parts of the interior that could be salvaged. Mr. Jones stated the non-structural items such as nice doors, maybe some wood floor, the built in woodwork. Mr. Jones stated it is not large when compared to the whole structure but he thinks it would be something that could be taken out and repurposed somewhere.

Mr. Jones stated also his assessment looked at accessibility and life safety. Mr. Jones stated it is really tricky to try and bring this building up to code with any type of improvement just because right now it has been a business use for the last, well, he didn't know when it wasn't a business use since it was the funeral home since the 1940's or so. Mr. Jones stated it did have apartments on the upper floors but with today's code, because those were used as offices as well at last we know, then bringing those up to standards for fire separation and bringing them up to standards for exit and access requirements for the stairs, with single exits and residents on the second floor, you would be required to have a suppression system installed unless you added additional means of egress. Mr. Jones stated the current means of egress are not to code so he would have a hard time, or he would think it would be unwise as an architect to even seal a drawing that would allow the building remain in fundamental elements such as the stairs.

Mrs. Traves asked if there is enough room in the back for a ramp and accessibility into the structure since they had a garage there and tore it down. Mr. Jones states yes, they could add, he thinks there is room for a ramp on the back or the front but as Dan Gladish stated, if you have a 40" rise you have to have a 40' run for a ramp and you are not permitted to have a continuous run that long. Mr. Jones stated you would have to have switch backs so it would probably be at least two directions, maybe three, each with a lift that would probably result or probably project eight to twelve feet from the building.

Mrs. Traves asked if that is because the building stays commercial so if you wanted to go back to a single family home, you would not have to meet those standards. Mr. Jones stated yes, a single family home standards are a lot different than commercial standards. Mr. Jones stated if it was commercial, it would be a huge investment in updating the

restrooms for accessibility because they would probably have to get twice or four times as large for wheelchair turning radius.

Mrs. Biggins-Ramer asked if that would be the case if it was to be turned back into a residential property. Mr. Jones stated with a single family home, yes, you would not have to do that and you would likely not have to have a ramp. Mr. Jones stated you would mostly have to bring it up to, a single family home would be the cheapest way to renovate it but he also thinks it would be the least beneficial as far as maximizing its use.

Mrs. Biggins-Ramer asked if where it is located on the block, surrounded by commercial, would it be that easy to sell if it was a house. Mr. Jones stated he would think it would be worth less than the cost to buy it and improve it.

Mrs. Biggins-Ramer asked the zoning of the buildings down the corridor. Mr. Mendel stated they are the same zoning, C-2, Central Business and then just for the record, single family dwelling is not a permitted or conditionally permitted use in the C-2 zoning district. Mr. Mendel stated this is all commercial building use and it wouldn't be able to be converted back to a single family. Mrs. Biggins-Ramer asked if a single family use is off the table. Mr. Mendel stated yes, the C-2 district allows multi-family developed which is defined as a building with at least 3 units and ground floor, first floor residential is a conditionally permitted use in the multi-family building in the C-2 District.

Mrs. Biggins-Ramer asked about the homes down the alley behind the subject property. Mr. Mendel stated they are existing non-conforming residential uses and he thinks some of them are duplexes and some are single family. Mr. Mendel stated they are not businesses, they are all residential occupancy.

Mrs. Biggins-Ramer stated the contiguous property use is all residential. Mr. Mendel stated except for the dance studio building immediately to the south. Mr. Mendel stated behind to the west, to the rear, all of those houses are residentially occupied.

Mr. Jones stated one last thing to consider is there is a lot of opportunity for the parcel and he thinks the City of Medina has a very good set of standards for development in the Historic District. Mr. Jones stated they have a thorough review process and they also have zoning that compliments the type of development that would complement the Square such as a zero setback where it can be a building similar to the development north of this where it is on the North Court Street, right next to the sidewalk. Mr. Jones stated he thinks because their system is so robust, he would think there wouldn't be any concerns about a future development being unsightly or being not the best fit for the area.

Mrs. Traves stated for her, if it is taken down, what is going to go up there so she would eventually like to get to the point where they would talk about what would actually be there. Mrs. Traves stated they also have a letter from D & D Builders, LLC which talks about the cost of renovations. Mrs. Traves asked if anybody has any questions.

Mr. Geitz asked if the building is commercial. Mr. Mendel stated it is, it would be considered under the building code it's been commercial use and that would be the vast majority of the use of the building, use group. Mr. Geitz stated it is easy for the board to say to tear something down because it is for safety, health and everything you described and showed in the pictures is horrible, there's no question. Mr. Geitz stated it is one of the oldest buildings in the area but if the applicant took it down, would he be able to conform to the historical value of the Square. Mr. Geitz stated the building on the corner did. Mr. Raymond responded to Mr. Geitz's question. Mr. Raymond stated he did the building on the corner and he has a track record in the town and this is what he wants to do. Mr. Raymond stated he loves the Historic District and he wants to maintain what you've got here but the building that he has there now, he cannot do anything with it. Mr. Raymond stated he would very much like to kind of duplicate what he did on the corner. Mr. Raymond stated he has not done any drawings because it is costly and until he gets the approval to remove the building, he did not want to spend the money. Mr. Raymond stated he has two daughters who would also be working on the project. Mr. Geitz stated it is possible this is the same firm that did the corner building. Mr. Jones stated he did all the drawings for the building on the corner.

Mr. Geitz asked if he can design something that is similar to the corner building. Mr. Raymond stated that is his intention. Mr. Raymond stated he is 80 years old and he is feeling every year of it but his two daughters will ultimately be taking over the company and their intentions are exactly as his.

Mrs. Traves asked if D&D Builders is present this evening. Mrs. Traves stated they submitted a letter on September 14, 2020. Mrs. Traves asked if they could talk about the cost of the improvements if he actually tried to save the building.

Present for D&D Builders, Inc. was Dan Kendel, 799 Bower Avenue, Akron, Ohio. Mr. Kendel stated he works for Dr. Raymond and he built his building on the corner. Mr. Kendel stated it was just a brief walk-thru and estimate of what he saw visually without getting into walls or flooring or ceilings or anything else. Mr. Kendel stated the estimate is what he feels would be a minimum cost of renovations and he is sure it would be a lot more once they got into a design phase of the renovations.

Mrs. Traves stated he has an estimate of $287,400.00. Mr. Kendel stated that is correct. Mrs. Traves asked if that was to address the foundation repairs, demo and hauling, re-plumb entire building, re-wire, new HVAC system, new windows, new exterior doors, make handicap accessible, siding, site work and parking, rough and finish carpentry, all materials rough and finish, porch renovations, flooring, etc.

Mrs. Biggins-Ramer asked if the estimate of $287,400 is to what capacity, is it a renovation to single family home renovation, commercial units. Mr. Kendel stated it is for what is was used for previously such as separate small offices, minimal structural changes which would be needed. Mr. Kendel stated it was a brief estimate of the cost. Mrs. Biggins-Ramer asked if the structure would be for one business with several offices. Mr. Kendel stated probably yes. Mr. Kendel stated once they got into what is behind the

wall, flooring and ceiling, it probably would be substantially more. Mr. Kendel stated he did not get that far into an estimate at this time. Mr. Kendel stated Mr. Raymond asked for a rough estimate.

Mr. Mendel paused the meeting to let the Planning Commission members know that this meeting will be a little longer.

Mrs. Traves resumed the meeting. Mr. Geitz stated it is his professional opinion that if he remodeled this entire building, it would be difficult to bring it up because in this day and age, people are looking for something that is up to date like the building on the corner, the new courthouse. Mr. Geitz stated they are not going to be looking for a house to rent. Mr. Kendel stated that is correct. Mr. Kendel stated it could include leasehold improvements where they would have to build it to the standards of who leased it to be what they wanted. Mr. Geitz stated he thinks they are moving in the right direction and this is an old house.

Mrs. Traves asked the total square footage of the house. Mr. Kendel stated with the attic space, probably about 3,000 sq. ft. maybe. Mrs. Traves stated with 3,000 sq. ft. and you paid $217,000 for the house and you are going to need to invest $287,400 to remodel it, you will be at almost $500,000. Mrs. Traves asked what the price per sq. ft. would then be to rent it at. Mrs. Traves asked if the Medina Market will even support it.

Present for the case was Michael Marquard, MC Real Estate in Medina. Mr. Marquard stated he has been involved with Dr. Raymond handling the leasing of all the properties. Mr. Marquard stated they did have someone to lease the building but it became prohibitive for them to lease it. Mr. Marquard stated there was more than one person in the building when Dr. Raymond bought it. Mr. Marquard stated he believes there was a lawyer in there and another business. Mr. Marquard stated the building did not have hot water for about 20 years. Mr. Marquard stated the one girl wanted to stay in the building and that is the one who remained after Dr. Raymond purchased the building. Mr. Marquard stated the tough thing about leasing the building was the way it sits and the parking situation. Mr. Marquard stated now we have the parking deck to help with that. Mr. Marquard stated he did have it at $14.00 gross modified square foot if someone is interested in the building. Mr. Marquard stated it was a vacant cash flow at that point to renovate it with leasehold improvements, cost of the building and cost of the renovations. Mr. Marquard stated Mr. Raymond would have been paying about $2,000 per month to put one tenant in the downstairs so it was a negative.

Mr. Marquard stated the building was bought at that time from Hetrick. Mr. Marquard stated he told Mr. Raymond at that time that he would not have bought the building. Mr. Marquard stated Mr. Raymond needed the building because, the building next to it, he didn't want any problems with the adjacent owner. Mr. Marquard stated to remodel the building for a commercial use, the numbers do not make sense. Mr. Marquard stated that is why building something new and fresh that fits the Historic District is what Dr. Raymond wants to do. Mr. Marquard stated that is the intent of the building. Mr. Marquard stated they do have extra parking. Mr. Marquard stated the best use for that

land is to add on and make it a "Raymond II" building just like the Raymond I building on the corner with a good architect and a zero lot line so they can utilize it. Mr. Marquard stated people aren't going to lease those things anymore. Mr. Marquard stated he has a building at 403 E. Washington Street, I'm a single user so the building is perfect for me. Mr. Marquard stated this building you cannot have a single user in there, it just doesn't make sense.

Mrs. Traves asked for comments from the audience.

Bill Lamb, 721 S. Court, Medina, Ohio stated he is here speaking as Councilman At Large for the City of Medina. Mr. Lamb stated there are a number of issues with this to be addressed. Mr. Lamb stated first of all, one thing they are absolutely opposed to is demolition through neglect. Mr. Lamb stated the discussion so far has been a great deal to do with compliance. Mr. Lamb stated compliance belongs to the person that owns the building and if somebody was in the building and it was being rented and it was a viable use, it needed to be brought into compliance. Mr. Lamb stated how the building got like it was when it was purchased, he does not know but if you buy a building, you take responsibility for the condition of the building. Mr. Lamb state4d how we got here, was by not demolishing buildings which is how the city got the restoration of the Historic District that we now have. Mr. Lamb stated it is important to consider that the purpose of the restoration is both historical and economic but the intention was never to create Disneyland. Mr. Lamb stated tearing down the building that is historic when there are other vacancies in the Historic District, particularly is not something that should be allowed. Mr. Lamb stated he owns a house that was built in 1881. Mr. Lamb stated when his wife purchased the house in 1975, the house had four apartments in it. Mr. Lamb stated there was a family that lived in the attic and it was all knob and tube wiring. Mr. Lamb stated the whole house had to be re-wired, re-plumbed, all the plaster had to be redone with drywall, and all of those things had to be done in order to make that house livable. Mr. Lamb stated it was a great expense and is an ongoing expense. Mr. Lamb stated in 1990 he bought a house ten houses from him and restored it to something for living in. Mr. Lamb stated in that house, the kitchen sink and the upstairs bathroom sink had hoses that ran downstairs into a sewer line while someone was living there. Mr. Lamb stated the sewer line was plugged up. Mr. Lamb stated it had a crumbling foundation and they simply restored those things and brought the house back to where it should be and it is now occupied as a house. Mr. Lamb stated Councilman Heffinger and he have a proposal they are working on that they hope to have ready prior to the Council meeting after Columbus Day on Tuesday. Mr. Lamb state it specifically addresses this situation and it states if you have an application for demolition in the Historic District, you have to show what will be built in its place, if that is approved, it will go to City Council and anything in the Historic District would require a super majority of Council in order to pass favorably on demolition.

Mrs. Banks asked if this is a proposed legislation. Mr. Lamb stated it is not in effect right now but the reason they are proposing it.

Mrs. Banks stated if someone owns a property before that legislation, they would not be bound by the legislation. Mr. Lamb stated that is correct. Mr. Lamb stated if this were to pass tonight, it would not be affected by any future legislation. Mr. Lamb stated his point is without knowing, number one, it shouldn't be torn down because it is in the Historic District. Mr. Lamb stated if a person buys a property in the Historic District, no matter where you are, you should think demolition might be something you are not going to do. Mr. Lamb stated secondly, if you have to tear something down, it is important to know what goes in its place and we don't really know what is going in its place. Mr. Lamb stated the idea isn't just the buildings that would look like the square. Mr. Lamb stated that was never the intent of the restoration. Mr. Lamb stated it was to preserve what is historic and anything else that gets built could blend but not just to imitate the Square. Mr. Lamb stated since 1981, over 100 buildings in the Historic District and around the District have been demolished. Mr. Lamb stated the reason the City created the Historic District and this Preservation Board was to deal with the issue of restoration and the issue of demolition because so many buildings had been lost. Mr. Lamb stated when we try and judge a building today, we don't know the significance of the loss of the building. Further, Mr. Lamb stated he is not really sure if we are supposed to consider the cost. Mr. Lamb stated all of the buildings that were restored on the Square were done at extraordinary cost. Mr. Lamb stated it wasn't a consideration of making a profit on it or will it be too expensive. Mr. Lamb stated it was done because it was the right thing to do. Mr. Lamb stated his message to the Board is this should be discouraged as a commercial building, if it stays commercial, it doesn't need a handicap ramp because it is in the Historic District and the use does not change. Mr. Lamb stated the city is in the process of building condominiums and apartments on E. Liberty Rd. because we want downtown housing. Mr. Lamb stated here we are with a structure that possibly could be housing and we are going to turn that down. Mr. Lamb stated to him it just doesn't make sense. Mr. Lamb stated the Board was created so that these issues wouldn't continue to happen so he is hopeful the Board will not approve this.

Mrs. Traves thanked Mr. Lamb for his comments.

Mr. Geitz stated if we had an image for you to view today, would this nice gentleman investing in our area, building and showing compliance with a beautiful building on the corner and a good architectural firm, then he doesn't know what to tell you. Mr. Geitz stated we have been fighting over a courthouse for ages. Mr. Geitz stated a sketch was put in your hand a year and a half ago that shows exactly where we are at now. Mr. Lamb stated he doesn't really know. Mr. Geitz stated if we haven't indicated to your group that we have a gentleman with a good heart. Mr. Lamb stated his group is him on City Council, he does not speak for a group, he is here as a Councilman. Mr. Geitz stated he does not feel Mr. Lamb's argument is valid for this building. Mr. Lamb stated he totally disagrees with Mr. Geitz and his analysis. Mr. Lamb stated he created this board to protect the City Historic District from these kinds of issues and that is what matters. Mr. Lamb stated with regard to the Courthouse, he worked for 2 years with the Commissioners and other people and they have agreed to keep the 1969 Courthouse, even though they were going to tear it down. Mr. Lamb stated they agreed to keep the old Courthouse and to keep all the additions to the old Courthouse, even though those were

going to be torn down, and they are agreeing to keep the Prosecutor's Office. Mr. Lamb stated that was because they realized it was the right thing to do. Mr. Lamb stated if it takes a long time to do that, that's ok.

Mrs. Traves stated we are not here to talk about the Courthouse.

Kimberly Marshall, Economic Development Director, stated as a point of clarification to Councilman Lamb's statements, the city wrote down a Downtown Strategic Redevelopment Plan focused on underutilized and underdeveloped properties within the Historic District in the downtown. Mrs. Marshall stated a lot of the goal for that is downtown housing however the W. Liberty project is looking at being a mixed use project with similar to what Dr. Raymond has already created in his first project that we are referring to as the Raymond Building which is retail on the first floor and housing above it. Mrs. Marshall stated she did a walk through the subject building a few years ago and she knows that Dr. Raymond looked at trying to renovate and redevelop it but as it was stated, it is cost prohibitive. Mrs. Marshall stated obviously, there are some valid points on trying to maintain the buildings but it sounds like it hasn't been maintained even prior to this ownership and she thinks to Mr. Raymond's defense, that the renovations just far out weight the benefits or cost or whatever. Mrs. Marshall stated a couple of points of clarification, the Downtown Strategic Redevelopment Plan was also adopted by Council in 2014 via resolution so they are on board with redevelopment in the Historic District.

Mr. Lamb stated we do have the downtown plan for underused areas but the development on Washington Street or Liberty Street requires no demolition. Mr. Lamb stated the development on Liberty Street that Mrs. Marshall talked about does not require any demolition. Mr. Lamb stated the demolition there occurred in the 1980's when the historic Baptist Church got torn down but the new development in its place is a vacant use of property that is being developed.

Mrs. Banks stated that is not what is before us right now. Mr. Lamb stated he thinks that is what Kimberly is talking about is the Economic Development Plan that we have bought into, we want to develop underused areas but a building with a structure on it is not necessarily underused and further, if you buy a building knowing the condition it is in, and you don't upgrade it so that today it meet the proper condition for that use, that is demolition by neglect. Mr. Lamb stated that is the absolute meaning of that term.

Skip Baron, 536 N. Broadway Street, Medina, Ohio commented. Mr. Baron stated he is speaking as an individual and as a member of the Board of the Community Design Committee that submitted the letter to the board. Mr. Baron stated he would like to find out if this is the final vote this evening on what happens or are we just getting started on this. Mr. Mendel stated the Historic Preservation Board is a final say on it and issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Baron asked if that will be tonight. Mr. Mendel stated typically, the Historic Preservation Board, 99% of the time, rule on the same evening. Mr. Baron stated he had a whole bunch of things to say but he is not sure now after hearing, Dr. Raymond I give you great credit for the building on the corner, one

thing he remembers is the previous building on the corner was a modern building and not a historic building that is going down like the one being considered this evening. Mr. Baron stated he agrees with Mr. Lamb and others that he and his wife have worked on a lot of houses over the years, renovating an 1832 federal style home, and an 1853 gothic revival in Hudson, Ohio. Mr. Baron stated they built a copy of an 1830 Hale Farm house and now he lives in an 1834 house that was built on the Square where the new Courthouse is now and moves to where it is now. Mr. Baron stated they are heavily invested in this community and the concept of Historic Preservation and they got involved in this a little late so he is not able to give a definitive statement from his personal thought process so he was wondering if it is going to be decided today.

Mrs. Traves stated because Mr. Raymond's actual thought for the property would actually include other structures behind this structure, and they are not talking about just necessarily just taking down one building, we might be talking about taking down two or three buildings or four buildings. Mrs. Traves stated in order for him to accomplish what he is trying to do, what he is asking right now is just quite vague.

Mrs. Biggins-Ramer stated she feels that the board really does need to know what is going to happen on this site and if the CDC wants to weigh in on the whole concept of the property and not just this one structure.

Mr. Baron stated he knows he needs more information before he can make a definitive judgement, from his experience. Mr. Baron stated they are spending a lot more money on his current house just like Mr. Lamb did. Mr. Baron stated they will spend more than they will get out of it. Mr. Baron stated they just bought new windows that are simulated divided lights that, as his Realtor said, nobody is going to care that you are spending all of this money on simulated divided light windows but they felt the house deserved it so they went for it. Mr. Baron stated they have already bought actual wooden shutters with hinges, locks and latches that are the same as what would have been on them when it was built in 1834. Mr. Baron stated they could have bought shutters for a whole lot less than they spent. Mr. Baron stated he thinks it is important to maintain the history the best we can and to duplicate it if necessary.

Mrs. Banks stated she thinks what you do with your own residential property and the upgrades and such are commendable but we are talking about a commercial property. Mrs. Banks stated her parents and grandparents lived in a town in Indiana and the commercial district died and is basically a ghost town that railroads go through. Mrs. Banks stated she thinks there can be a combination of new businesses that do this to make a profit, and not to improve their interiors or whatever of the time. Mrs. Banks stated we are not talking about taking this to a new home and she is not sure we can say, we want to know all of your intentions. Mrs. Banks stated if you are going to invest in a business that is going to have commercial in the downstairs and apartments up above and that is going well, then maybe that is all you want to do. Mrs. Banks stated she doesn't know that you can say, yes I want to tear down this whole block.

Mrs. Biggins-Ramer stated if they try to do in phase II like the building down the road, she does not think they have enough square footage to just tear this one house down to do what they have done already. Mrs. Banks stated she thinks it's appropriate that they let us know what they want to do at this point but she doesn't think the board can ask them to tell if they have intentions of the block. Mrs. Banks stated she thinks we need to talk one building at a time because that is what she would like to know at this point.

Mr. Geitz stated if a stranger walked in here and he had bought this building, and he didn't know these people on the corner, you would tell him just what you said, we want to see what you are going to do. Mr. Geitz stated we already know approximately what Mr. Raymond is going to blend the façade of the street to conform what the board is going to approve. Mr. Geitz stated we have that in front of us and that is why this building has got to go because it is just beyond repair. Mr. Geitz stated on this site for this applicant, this is where he stands because we have everything in place.

Mrs. Biggins-Ramer stated in the Doctor's submission for demolition, one of the things he says in #5 is Short-term –remove house & grass the property and #6 stated Longer term - purchases houses behind and construct retail stores with apartments above. Mrs. Biggins-Ramer stated the applicant does not currently own those properties and she agrees with Leslie that the footprint of this existing house at 3,000 sq. ft., if you plan to do a similar construction, is not going to be on just that one piece of property which is before us this evening. Mrs. Biggins-Ramer stated in looking at just that, this will sit vacant for who knows how long as a piece of grass or worse, could become a parking lot where we just had a parking deck constructed a block away. Mrs. Biggins-Ramer stated the other thing she has of concern is whether you are a business or a resident purchasing a home, you go into the building and assess it and what the costs may be to continue either utilizing it as a commercial space or as a home and then you negotiate those points. Mrs. Biggins-Ramer stated making some purchasing a home with the intent of demolishing it in the future is a slippery slope for our historical district.

Mrs. Banks replied that this was a commercial building. Mrs. Biggins-Ramer stated that is understood but in three years it has been vacant and he had done, according to testimony given, minimal upkeep to it so it is, unfortunately, lead to what we see before us now which is a building in poor repair and we are looking at basically, demolition through neglect. Mrs. Biggins-Ramer stated this would be a precedence for any building on the square if an owner chooses not to maintain it, we have no point of sale inspections to prevent that, so how about the Old Phoenix Bank not being kept up and eventually that just erodes into decay and we can take that down or maybe the old Zeigler building. Mrs. Biggins-Ramer stated she feels that is a dangerous precedent. Mrs. Biggins-Ramer stated she does agree that, when someone comes before the board, they state their current situation and this is what I hope to do to the property and so the board understands the progression of that.

Mrs. Banks stated the man who was here before still hasn't decided what he wants to do with the property, and granted it was just paint but when he was here before the board asked what he was going to do with the building and he said he didn't know. Mrs.

Biggins-Ramer stated that is correct but he doesn't want to tear it down. Mrs. Biggins-Ramer stated she feels it is comparing apples to oranges but she thinks it is reasonable, if you are going to remove a historical structure, and especially one that may have been left or purchased for the sole purpose of letting it go and neglect it for demolition purposes, to understand what is going to go there. Mrs. Biggins-Ramer stated if it is really the Dr.'s plan is to purchase the other homes, and, no disrespect to the Dr. and the family, but if it takes you 10 years to purchase the other homes in order to create another retail establishment with a building on the bottom and homes above, what is the community's guarantee that will actually occur. Mrs. Biggins-Ramer asked Mr. Raymond if he will be here in 10 years.

Mrs. Traves asked Mr. Jones if the applicant was to do a Phase II, how many square feet and what part of the current property would that take up. Mr. Jones stated he wants to clarify that Mr. Raymond would not need additional parcels to develop the current parcel that is up for consideration. Mr. Jones stated the development would vary in size, large or smaller, depending on which parcels he owns. Mr. Jones stated a building that would be better utilizing the space and better utilizing the location in proximity to the square could be put in place where the current building is in now. Mr. Jones states it would be a different design as far as how the layout works, it wouldn't have the stairs in the same location and it would not have the same footprint just because that is a narrower lot in general however, the development is possible partly due to there is no parking requirements in the Historic District and so you can maximize the building footprint and not have a concern about taking up land just for parking.

Mrs. Biggins-Ramer asked if that is the case, why not bring that plan to the board so they can better understand the utilization. Mr. Jones stated his service is would be a cost to create that plan and he feels for this board it is not a requirement to provide, is it? Mr. Mendel stated the code does not require a plan for a demolition request. Mr. Mendel stated it does talk about if there is one, it could help mitigate an issue with the existing building as was read from the staff report. Mr. Mendel stated it is not required at this time under the Certificate of Appropriateness review process.

Mr. Jones stated he feels the important thing is that there is a track record established as far as intentions and goals. Mr. Jones stated it is not Disneyland to create a mixed use development but it is also adherent to the requirements for building in the Historic District. Mr. Lamb asked Mr. Jones if he would like to argue that. Mr. Jones stated that he does not want to argue it here, he understands that the National Park Service, in its definition of historic, how they regard additions to the buildings and things like that. Mr. Jones stated there is a fine line in the definition by the National Parks Service.

Mr. Mendel reminded everybody it is best to remember that anybody speaking is addressing the board as opposed to anybody else in the room.

Mr. Jones stated to Mr. Lamb's point, a lot of times when there is a historic structure and an addition to it or a new building built on the same property or adjacent to it, often times they don't want a building that imitates so they don't want the brick work detail or they

don't want the same cornice details that an existing building would have. Mr. Jones stated they would want something that would have that gesture. Mr. Jones stated to him he feels we are in this century and just as capable of creating the same details that we were a century or two centuries ago. Mr. Jones stated a lot of times he thinks it is a disservice to some of those properties. Mr. Jones stated the intent is because they don't want you to be confused about what is old and what isn't. Mr. Jones stated he thinks when you have a building that is going to be here such as the Raymond building, it could be here another 100 years and when you look back from that point, he doesn't think there is going to be someone that says that building was built in 2017 and it should have been more like a Chipotle. Mr. Jones stated just because it is not the current favor of architecture because things are a little more modern doesn't mean that it shouldn't exist as new building. Mr. Jones stated he does have a little issue with that definition. Mr. Jones stated he would say if he were to do an addition on a historic structure or nearby he would not imitate it in any sense but would do something completely abstract and opposite as a counterpoint. Mr. Jones stated that is not something that we would do within a block of the square because it wouldn't be appropriate and it wouldn't be approved through the board that we would go through. Mr. Jones stated he understands the concern with a confusion for the time being as far as the origin of the building but he does not think it is a concern that has merit when we look in the future and reflect back. Mr. Jones stated he does not think it is a concern when we are just as capable now to design something that can be detailed with a craftsmanship that buildings were in the past.

Mr. Geitz stated he thinks the board might give permission to tear down the building contingent on seeing the future use of the property. Mr. Jones stated his first question would be, would that mean that with that approval they would go through the architectural review board and the Planning Commission as any building would do. Mr. Jones asked about the logistics of that because if what they submit to this board might be something different after it goes through the architectural review board, so would the HPB review be before that or after that or if it is just with the approval of the HPB plan.

Mr. Geitz stated right now you are trying to get to first base and the board just wants to see what will be on first base.

Mrs. Banks asked if Jonathan can verify the question. Mrs. Traves stated she does not think they have to provide super detailed drawings if they already know they are going to match the building next door, and the Historic Preservation Board approves facades, we have already approved that façade. Mrs. Traves stated the Historic Preservation Board is looking for how big the footprint is and how many stories tall is it. Mrs. Traves asked Mr. Jones if he can provide that.

Mr. Raymond stated he wants to defend himself a little bit. Mr. Raymond stated he did not buy the house with the intention of tearing it down. Mr. Raymond stated he bought the house because there was a lane that ran to the west of it between the property he purchased with the Chamber of Commerce building and the property next to it, there was a lane next to it that was owned by the person who owned the house next door. Mr.

Raymond stated he wanted to get that land for his parking lot for the present building that has now been constructed which happened. Mr. Raymond stated that was the original purpose was to just acquire the lane. Mr. Raymond stated he spoke to the owner several times about buying the lane but he wasn't interested in selling it. Mr. Raymond stated one day his lawyer called and said Mr. Hetrick wants to sell the whole thing, and asked if I was interested. Mr. Raymond stated he said yes without even going through the property because he needed the property to the west of the parking lot. Mr. Raymond stated they spent a great deal of time, and they put their construction office in the house and at that time we had one tenant. Mr. Raymond stated he does not know if he even went down in the basement to look at it because he had achieved what he wanted to achieved and he thought let's get the original building finished and then we will address that.

Mr. Raymond stated as they got into it they started redoing the first floor because I thought I had a tenant for it but it didn't work out. Mr. Raymond stated he then got into the building more and found the bathroom ceiling upstairs fell in and we had a window fall out and went downstairs to look at the condition of the foundation and all the mechanicals of the building which were, for lack of a better word, atrocious. Mr. Raymond stated there were active wires hanging from the ceiling because the building had a fire in it once upon a time, the structural trusses are charred and it became very apparent that we were either going to have to redo this thing or tear it down and build something like we just did. Mr. Raymond stated that is how he reached his decision to demolish the building. Mr. Raymond stated to put it back to where it was 40 to 50 years ago is cost prohibitive. Mr. Raymond stated he is a business man, he does this for a business. Mr. Raymond stated if you are going to do the renovation to your own house, good for you, that's nice but this is not going to be where I live or where anybody else is going to live because it's just not structurally sound.

Mrs. Traves asked Mr. Raymond how he feels about submitting a plan to the Board to give them an idea of what the footprint might be. Mr. Raymond stated the footprint, the lot itself, the house itself, occupies about half the lot and they can utilize, probably, almost all of the lot. Mr. Raymond stated from looking at an aerial he feels he can put the building pretty close to the size of what he did on the corner. Mr. Raymond stated he thinks he has a track record in town of when he says this is what he is going to do, his intentions are good. Mr. Raymond stated this is what he wants to do with it. Mr. Raymond stated he hopes to make a go of it and he thinks it would be a real asset to the historic district downtown and he kind of resents the fact that they would refer to his building as Disneyland, he thinks that is silly. Mr. Raymond stated that is the history of his association with the building.

Mrs. Traves thanked Mr. Raymond for his time.

Mr. Lamb stated his point about the Disneyland thing is that you don't tear down a building that is historic and then build another building that has an appearance of being historic. Mr. Lamb stated if you are a business person, and for whatever reason, I understand why that building was purchased, but if you are a business person and you

buy a building and you actually have an office in it and you have never looked at the building to see the condition that it is in, and then only with some improvements, you leave it in that condition, that is demolition through neglect and that cannot be the excuse that is used in order to allow for demolition. Mr. Lamb stated that the idea that because we know who somebody is and we've seen what they've done, we can't judge people that way because we've seen something they have done so we assume they are going to do something else. Mr. Lamb stated this demolition through neglect could end up being an empty space for years or it might not but we don't really know and at the moment, there is nothing that requires the applicant to submit a plan to show what will be done. Mr. Lamb stated this is simply a vote decision based on whether to demolish a building in the Historic District that has been allowed to deteriorate to that condition while it has been under that applicant's ownership.

Mr. Jones stated he understands that argument to a point but where is the line drawn. Mr. Jones stated what if he had bought that property and it visibly had the roof caved in. Would he then have rebuilt the roof once he assumed ownership of it? Mr. Jones stated the easy answer would be no, it is too far gone. Mr. Jones stated this building is the same scenario but it's just a lot of little things that are getting it to that point so he gets that it was neglected previously for decades and that is wrong, he agrees with Mr. Lamb there but he does not think that it is malicious to have purchased this building, invested a portion of money into it and then realize that it is just not going to work out as it stands unless it gets up to date repairs where Dan gave that estimate but that would just be getting it kind of to where it is the same building but fixed up. Mr. Jones stated we talked about how shutters that would be historically accurate are a lot more, that windows that would be historically accurate would be a lot more. Mr. Jones stated thee is a lot of cost that would be even, in addition to his fixing it to bring it up to something that would appear historically significant because that wouldn't have new siding that replicates the original siding or repaired whatever might be there that is salvageable. Mr. Jones stated he thinks there is logic to that argument but he thinks there is also some flaws in it and to assume, he just thinks that is not a fair assessment of this situation, just personally. Mr. Jones stated he thinks those principals could be applied to a different building but this was no way, I couldn't imagine that it was malicious for two years where investments are made and its just running away. Mr. Jones stated the foundation, its more deteriorated than it was two years ago and it is just unfeasible to do improvements to make this last for another decade.

Mrs. Traves asked if it is possible to suspend the discussion and go into an executive session. Mr. Mendel stated yes. Mrs. Traves stated she knows there is another board waiting. Mr. Mendel stated we have Planning Commission waiting but there would have to be a motion to do that. Mrs. Traves asked the board if they would like to take a vote on whether to demolish the building or would they like to go into an executive discussion to have a discussion. Mrs. Biggins-Ramer stated she would like to go into an Executive Session and have a discussion. Mrs. Banks agreed.

Mrs. Biggins-Ramer made a motion to go into an Executive Session and Mrs. Banks seconded the motion.

Vote:

Traves	Y
Banks	Y
Biggins-Ramer	Y
Geitz	

Mr. Mendel stated the session would include the board and if they wanted to invite someone, typically it would be staff but they do not have to. Mr. Mendel stated it could just be the board but they need to make it explicit.

Mr. Mendel stated if the board wants to do an Executive Session, he would suggest the board could make a motion to continue to another meeting and start that meeting in Executive Session, come out of Executive Session and then continue from there. Mr. Mendel stated they could do a motion to continue to the November 12th meeting date and then they can start the meeting off with an Executive Session. Mr. Mendel stated that probably would be appreciated by the other applicants and the other Commissions that are waiting upstairs but that is up to you.

Mrs. Biggins-Ramer rescinded the motion to move into Executive Session that is on the floor and would like to make a new motion to table the case until the November 12, 2020 meeting at which point they will begin the November meeting with an Executive Session inviting Jonathan Mendel, Community Development Director, Dan Gladish, Chief Building Official after which the board will move into regular session.

Mrs. Traves seconded the motion.

Vote:

Geitz	Y
Banks	Y
Traves	Y
Biggins-Ramer	Y
Approved	4-0

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandy Davis

Sandy Davis

Leslie Traves

Leslie Traves, Chairperson