



**CITY of MEDINA**  
**Historic Preservation Board**  
**February 10, 2022**

---

Meeting Date: February 10, 2022

Meeting Time: 5:00 PM

Present: Elizabeth Biggins-Ramer, Rebekah Knaggs, Patty Stahl, Leslie Traves,  
Andrew Dutton (Community Development Director), Sarah Tome (Administrative Assistant)

Absent: Paul Wood

**Approval of Minutes**

Ms. Traves made a motion to approve the minutes from January 13, 2022, as submitted.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Knaggs.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer	<u>Y</u>
Knaggs	<u>Y</u>
Stahl	<u>Y</u>
Traves	<u>Y</u>
Approved	<u>4-0</u>

The Court Reporter swore in all attendees.

**Old Business**

1. H21-13 Rose Company 241 S. Court St. COA

Mr. Dutton stated that the case had been previously tabled so the applicant could present samples of the proposed materials, light fixtures, and paint colors.

Present for the case was Anthony Cerny, of Architectural Design Studios, Inc., 620 E Smith Rd, and Brenan Rose, 23 Public Square, Suite 200. Mr. Cerny presented the Board with examples of the Hardiboard siding, paint colors, and light fixtures. Mr. Cerny did not provide the color chosen for the six panel replacement doors.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer asked if the sleeping porch was original to the building. Mr. Cerny stated that it was unknown how old the sleeping porch was. He noted that the condition of the sleeping porch had been unsafe and the Building Official had administratively approved its removal.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer asked if it was possible to reinstall the second-floor door and sleeping porch if it turned out that they were indeed historical. Brandon Rose stated that it would be difficult to reinstall. Mr. Rose noted that the sleeping porch had not been in use due to its condition.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer asked what the state of the brick had been. Mr. Cerny stated that he did not know the state of the brick and indicated that it had been faced over to make the rear exterior uniform.

Ms. Traves noted that the first floor had not been brick. Mr. Cerny added that the first-floor façade had been vertical pine wood siding. Mr. Cerny noted that the rear façade was not seen by the public.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer noted that the application was part of an ongoing situation where property owners were rehabilitating buildings without permission.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer asked if anyone present had comments regarding the application.

Bill Lamb, 721 S. Court St., stated that the case exemplified the ongoing issue that people were doing work on their properties without the approval of the Board. Mr. Lamb stated that the rules and regulations did not exempt backs, sides, or fronts of buildings. He stated that there was no reason the changes couldn't have gone before the Board. Mr. Lamb continued that it would be best for the Board to require the Hardiboard to come down and request approval for new work. Mr. Lamb stated that the sleeping porch had been original to the building.

Ms. Stahl stated that, in order to do their due diligence, the Board needed to know if the sleeping porch had been original to the building.

Mr. Cerny stated that there wasn't anything mandating that everything had to be saved or preserved. He continued that the guidelines acknowledged that things could change over time. Mr. Cerny stated that the building's owners were trying to maintain the building and noted that Hardiboard was appropriate for the back of the building.

Ms. Stahl stated that the applicant should present pictures of the original building. Ms. Stahl stated that it was up to the applicant to prove that the sleeping porch did not have historical significance.

Ms. Traves made a motion for the application to be tabled until the next meeting to give time for research to be done into whether the sleeping porch was a historic part of the building.

Ms. Stahl seconded the motion.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer            Y

Knaggs                    Y

Stahl                        Y

Traves                    Y  
Approved                4-0

The Board requested that the applicant present a complete application with photos and drawings, as well as a sample of the color for the gutters and a visual representation of the proposed doors.

2.                    H21-14                    Spencer Smith                    100-144 N Court St.                    COA/CSP

Mr. Dutton stated that the case had been seen by the Board at its previous meeting. Mr. Dutton noted that the proposed alterations had all been approved, save for the addition of conduit and junction boxes on the front of the building to address concerns of leaks with the installation of new sign lights.

Present for the case was Spencer Smith, 952 N Huntington St. Mr. Smith presented the Board with a sample of the proposed lights and a drawing of the conduit. Mr. Smith noted that, after discussing the project with an electrician, he had discovered that he could make four penetrations through the wall so that the conduit would only run above the signs, rather than across the whole front of the building. He state that this would decrease the chance of leaks and create a cleaner look.

Ms. Traves asked if the junction box could be placed around the corner, on the side of the building. Mr. Smith stated that he was not sure if it could be relocated, but he would be willing to look into it and would relocate the box if it was possible.

Ms. Traves made a motion to approve the application as submitted.

Ms. Knaggs seconded the motion.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer        Y  
Knaggs                    Y  
Stahl                    Y  
Traves                    Y  
Approved                4-0

Mr. Dutton stated that the case had been previously tabled so that the applicant could present the Board with an example of the sign material.

Present for the case was Molly Watson, 6915 Fairhaven Oval Dr. Ms. Watson presented the Board with a sample of the sign material.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer asked if the red border around the current sign would still be visible. Ms. Watson said that it would be.

Ms. Traves inquired about the trim color of the building. Ms. Watson stated that the building's trim was cream in color. Ms. Watson noted that the current sign had white in it in order to match the color of the door. Ms. Watson noted that the new sign would keep the same color scheme, but simply flip the colors.

Ms. Knaggs made a motion to approve the application as submitted.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer seconded the motion.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer	<u>Y</u>
Knaggs	<u>Y</u>
Stahl	<u>Y</u>
Traves	<u>Y</u>
Approved	<u>4-0</u>

### **New Business**

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was requesting Certificate of Appropriateness approval for fire escape reconstruction and paint alteration, and Conditional Sign approval for the relocation of a projecting sign. Mr. Dutton noted that two of the requested changes had already been made.

Mr. Dutton stated that the original fire escape was not safe and had been replaced. Mr. Dutton stated that the new stairway was constructed of a composite material with dark brown stairs, white railings, and black balusters.

Mr. Dutton continued that in March of 2021, the applicant received approval from the Historic Preservation Board for a variety of exterior renovations. He stated that the approval included the painting of the bay windows with a two-color scheme incorporating a darker green and lighter green, as presented at the meeting. Mr. Dutton stated that the bay windows had been

painted a single dark green color and the applicant was requesting that the Board approve the bay windows as painted.

Mr. Dutton stated that Conditional Sign Approval was requested for a sign that had been relocated. He noted that in January of 2018, a hanging sign was approved on the southeast corner of the building and was installed. Mr. Dutton continued that the sign was damaged by passing trucks and was relocated to the northeast corner of the building. He stated that the applicant was requesting approval for the relocation and face change of the hanging sign. Mr. Dutton noted that the black metal sign frame had remained the same, however, the sign face itself had changed and was red and white in color.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer suggested that the Board make three separate motions, one for each of the items presented in the application.

Present for the case was Craig Sturgill, 445 W. Liberty St. Mr. Sturgill stated that this was the first building he had owned in the Historic District, so he was still learning how the approval process worked. Mr. Sturgill stated that he had been working on roof maintenance when he realized the poor condition of the fire escape. Mr. Sturgill noted that the connection between the first and second stairway was open, without a railing, making it extremely unsafe. He continued that the stairway had been falling apart and was not properly secured to the roof. Mr. Sturgill stated he had not realized that the stairway had to be approved by the Board, as he had looked at it as maintenance.

Ms. Traves stated that she preferred the light green to be added to the front of the building as previously agreed upon and for the white railings to be painted green as well. Ms. Traves stated that she understood that plastic could be painted. Mr. Sturgill stated that paint would not stick to vinyl well and would peel or chip.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer noted that the applicant should have come to the Board for approval of the stairway.

After a discussion on painting the railings and the required maintenance, Mr. Sturgill asked if the Board would accept black paint. Ms. Stahl and Ms. Traves agreed that black would be acceptable. Ms. Traves suggested that the approval of the stairway should be tabled until it was discovered if the vinyl could be painted.

Ms. Stahl stated that she believed that a two-tone paint scheme was needed and that the current color scheme looked too much like that of a new build. Mr. Sturgill noted that there were two other buildings in the district with a solid green color scheme and he stated that he had received good feedback on the paint.

Ms. Knaggs noted that, upon reviewing the minutes from the previous application for this address, the agreed upon two-tone color scheme was a compromise.

After some discussion about the color scheme and possible contrasting colors, Mr. Sturgill presented the Board with a sample of a light green paint color (Oakwood Moss Light Green) for the contrasting panels.

Mr. Sturgill presented the Board with a sample of the sign material. Ms. Biggins-Ramer stated, for future reference, that sign permits were not transferrable.

Ms. Knaggs made a motion to approve the relocation of the sign and change the sign face, as presented.

Ms. Traves seconded the motion.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer	<u>Y</u>
Knaggs	<u>Y</u>
Stahl	<u>Y</u>
Traves	<u>Y</u>
Approved	<u>4-0</u>

Ms. Traves made a motion to approve the painting of the 18 recessed panel areas on the front bay windows Oakwood Moss Light Green (Sherwin Williams #6180).

Ms. Knaggs seconded the motion.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer	<u>Y</u>
Knaggs	<u>Y</u>
Stahl	<u>Y</u>
Traves	<u>Y</u>
Approved	<u>4-0</u>

Ms. Traves made a motion to table the rear fire escape and stairway part of the application to the next Historic Preservation Board meeting.

Ms. Stahl seconded the motion.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer	<u>Y</u>
Knaggs	<u>Y</u>
Stahl	<u>Y</u>
Traves	<u>Y</u>
Approved	<u>4-0</u>

The Board directed the applicant to provide alternate colors for the vinyl posts on the stairway. Nathan Case, 513 E. Washington St., stated that black was not a feasible paint color to use on white vinyl.

2. H22-03 Kevin Holliday 238 S. Elmwood Ave. CSP

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was requesting Conditional Sign Permit approval for a wall sign and an instructional sign. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was proposing two signs for a new business at the location including a 12 sq. ft. wall sign on the east face of the building and a 1.5 sq. ft. freestanding instructional sign in the northeast corner of the property. Mr. Dutton noted that both proposed signs were aluminum composite material with a white background and black lettering.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of application H22-03 for a wall sign and an instructional sign with the condition that the wall sign shall be relocated to a more appropriate location on the building. Suggested locations for the wall sign included north of the shed or south of the entrance.

Present for the case was Jerry Keller, 3555 Lake Ridge Dr. Mr. Keller stated that he was filling in for Mr. Holliday, who was unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Keller presented a sample of the sign material to the Board.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer inquired into the placement of the signs. Mr. Dutton stated that they were both to the rear of the building.

Ms. Knaggs made a motion to approve the application as submitted.

Ms. Stahl seconded the motion.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer	<u>Y</u>
Knaggs	<u>Y</u>
Stahl	<u>Y</u>
Traves	<u>Y</u>
Approved	<u>4-0</u>

**Adjournment**

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Sarah Tome

---

Elizabeth Biggins-Ramer, Chairwoman