



CITY of MEDINA
Historic Preservation Board
January 13, 2022

Meeting Date: January 13, 2022

Meeting Time: 5:00 PM

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

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Knaggs made a motion to approve the minutes from November 10, 2021 as submitted.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Biggins-Ramer.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer	<u>Y</u>
Knaggs	<u>Y</u>
Stahl	<u>Y</u>
Traves	<u>Y</u>
Wood	<u>Y</u>
Approved	<u>5-0</u>

Swearing-In of Board Members

Ms. Traves lead the swearing-in of Board Member Patty Stahl for a new term on the Board.

Old Business

1. H20-06 Loren A. Raymond 133 N. Court St. COA

Mr. Wood made a motion for the Board to go into an executive session to obtain legal advice from the attorney assigned to the Board regarding hearing procedural matters and to deliberate over quasi-judicial matters.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer seconded the motion.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer	<u>Y</u>
Knaggs	<u>Y</u>
Stahl	<u>Y</u>
Traves	<u>Y</u>
Wood	<u>Y</u>
Approved	<u>5-0</u>

At 5:06 the Board and Attorney Hunt entered an executive session.

At 5:14 the executive session ended.

Ms. Knaggs made a motion to deny the application for the demolition of the structure at 133 North Court St and to adopt conclusions of facts as drafted by the Board's attorney.

Mr. Wood seconded the motion.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer	<u>Y</u>
Knaggs	<u>Y</u>
Stahl	<u>Abstain</u>
Traves	<u>Y</u>
Wood	<u>Y</u>
Approved	<u>4-0</u> with Ms. Stahl abstaining

The Court Reporter swore in all attendees.

New Business

1. H21-12 Rose Company 207 S. Court St. COA

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant, Mr. Rose, was requesting Certificate of Appropriateness approval for the replacement of the front door, a project which had been completed. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant indicated that the original doors were glass with an aluminum frame and incorporated a plywood overlay to simulate a historic look. Mr. Dutton stated that the newly installed doors were glass with an aluminum frame.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of application H21-12, as submitted.

Present for the case was Anthony Cerny, 620 East Smith Rd.

Ms. Traves asked if the building owner was aware that approval was required prior to changes being made on buildings in the historic district. Mr. Cerny stated that a Certificate of Appropriateness was required for making changes and that the building owner viewed the replacement of the doors as maintenance.

Mr. Wood stated that the new door was not the same as the door it replaced. Mr. Cerny stated that, while the building owner had not replaced the plywood overlays, the installed aluminum frame door was of the same type as the previous door. Mr. Wood noted that the previous door looked Victorian, while the new door looked institutional.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer noted that the ordinance stated that anyone who altered or reconstructed a structure within the historic district without a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Preservation Board shall be fined no more than \$100 per offense, with each day of violation being considered a separate offense. Ms. Biggins-Ramer stated that the code also required that the structure or feature must be restored in full detail, in addition to any criminal penalty.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer asked if the doors that were replaced were the ones on the building when it was purchased by the current owner. Mr. Cerny stated that the doors were there when the building was purchased.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff initially attempts to remedy violations with the property owner. He continued that if the owner is unwilling or unresponsive, charges can be filed by the city. He noted that penalties were only issued after proceeding through a formal legal process and could not be issued directly by the Board or the City Administration.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer asked if there were any other types of doors that were investigated prior to the replacement. Mr. Cerny stated that the doors that had been replaced were not original to the building, nor were they in keeping with the building's era. Mr. Cerny noted that the purpose of the code was to preserve historic features, and that the doors in question faked history, rather than being actually historic.

Ms. Traves asked if anyone present had comments regarding the application.

Bill Lamb, 721 South Court St., stated that this case spoke to a larger issue. Mr. Lamb continued that there was no reason not to follow the correct review procedures. Mr. Lamb noted that he had worked 54 years to bring the square and the historic district to what it currently was, a thriving economic center. Mr. Lamb stated that issues required immediate attention and the applicant should follow the law and appropriately submit changes for Board approval.

Matt Wiederhold, 39 Public Square, stated that he worked with the business owner on replacing the doors. Mr. Wiederhold stated that there was a serious issue this the lock, which lead to the owners being locked either in or out of the building. Mr. Wiederhold added that the business owners contacted Medina Glass to see if there was a way to replace the lock, but were

unsuccessful. Mr. Wiederhold asked the Board if, since the doors were nonfunctional and had already been removed, the owners should put another plywood panel up and to capture an era, or if this should be taken as a learning experience going forward.

Mr. Wood a motion to approve the application.

Ms. Traves seconded the motion.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer	<u>N</u>
Knaggs	<u>N</u>
Stahl	<u>Y</u>
Traves	<u>N</u>
Wood	<u>N</u>
Denied	<u>4-1</u>

The Board recommended that the applicant research doors that would be in keeping with the era of the building and submit an application with more appropriate doors to the Historic Preservation Board.

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

Mr. Dutton stated the applicant was requesting Certificate of Appropriateness approval for completed changes to the rear building façade. Mr. Dutton noted that there was a second-story overhang structure that had been administratively approved for removal by the Building Official due to safety concerns. Mr. Dutton stated that the application encompassed a number of completed and proposed alterations, including:

- The installation of grey Hardiboard siding
- Painting the aluminum flashing and gutters white
- The installation of two white rear doors with white trim
- The removal of pavers and bricks and the installation of a concrete walk

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of the application H21-13, as submitted.

Present for the case was the architect, Anthony Cerny of Architectural Design Studios, Inc., 620 East Smith Rd. Mr. Cerny stated that there had been a summer porch on the back of the building that had been in disrepair. Mr. Cerny stated that after the porch was removed he was asked to design the new rear façade. Mr. Cerny noted that, since the removal of the porch, the owners have made the following improvements:

- Adjusted the grade so that there is a uniform level at the exterior of the building

- Finished over the deteriorating brick with Hardiboard
- Replaced the pavers and bricks with a concrete walk to improve accessibility

Mr. Wood asked if there was a reason the second-floor door was removed. Mr. Cerny stated that it was still there, behind the siding. Mr. Cerny noted that without the summer porch, it had to be closed off for safety.

Ms. Knaggs inquired if there had been any consideration of cleaning and repointing the brickwork. Mr. Cerny noted that there was a mixture of materials on the building. He stated that the back of the building was also not readily visible.

Ms. Traves stated that she owned the building next door to the property and noted that the rear of the applicant's building had been in rough shape. Ms. Traves asked if there was a reason they did not change the second-floor door to a window. Mr. Cerny stated that it was a possibility and could be changed in the future.

Ms. Traves asked if the applicant would return with samples of the colors to be used in painting the Hardiboard and doors. Mr. Cerny stated that they were willing to do so. Mr. Wood noted that this application should have appeared before the Board prior to the work being done.

Mr. Wood made a motion for the application to be tabled until the next meeting, when the applicant could present samples of the Hardiboard, paint colors, and light fixture to the Board for approval.

Ms. Traves seconded the motion.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer	<u>Y</u>
Knaggs	<u>Y</u>
Stahl	<u>Y</u>
Traves	<u>Y</u>
Wood	<u>Y</u>
Approved	<u>5-0</u>

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was requesting Certificate of Appropriateness approval for completed alterations and Conditional Sign Approval for a wall sign. Mr. Dutton stated that the alterations included:

- The replacement of the center two doors on the west building facade with similar style doors and painted beige.
- Glass installed in the transoms above the doors, which had previously been filled with wood.
- New trim installed around windows and doors painted beige. The trim was Azek composite material painted beige.
- The creation of four sign backgrounds by painting the background black and the trim white.
- “The Walker Building – 1936” sign installed with beige lettering.
- Two black gooseneck lighting fixtures installed on the north building facade.

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was also proposing the installation of 12 black gooseneck light fixtures above the signboards on the west building facade.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of the application H21-14, as submitted, with the condition that the applicant submit a Sign Permit application for the installed wall sign.

Present for the case was the building owner, Spencer Smith, 952 N. Huntington St.

Mr. Smith stated that, while the building looked like a four-unit building, there were only three units. Mr. Smith stated that the Walker Building sign had been added in order to pay tribute to the man who originally built the structure in 1936.

Ms. Stahl noted that the sign had not been approved by the Board prior to its installation. Mr. Smith stated that he was unaware of the fact. Mr. Smith noted that he worked with Mr. Wiederhold of Main Street Medina on the project to make sure everything was done correctly.

Ms. Traves asked if the applicant had brought any color samples to the Board. Mr. Smith stated that they did not change the color of the building, but kept the original color scheme. Mr. Smith noted that the transom windows above the front door were already there and that he wanted to bring back the historic features of the building.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer inquired as to the addition of new lights above the signs. Mr. Smith stated that the lights were requested by the tenants to improve the visibility of the signs. Mr. Smith noted that the lighting company recommended three lights per sign background.

Mr. Smith stated that the roof of the building has a parapet wall along the north, south, and west side of the building. He continued that he wanted to run conduit for the new lights along a mortar joint on the face of the building in order to keep from drilling through the parapet wall and potentially compromising the integrity of the roof.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer asked if the applicant could come back with a rendering that would show the proposed conduit on the face of the building. Mr. Smith stated that he would do so.

Ms. Stahl stated that, as a fellow building owner, she appreciated the improvements made to the building. Mr. Smith thanked her as well as Mr. Wiederhold, who was instrumental in the improvement process.

Ms. Stahl made a motion to approve the application with the provision that the applicant return with a sketch of the conduit for the sign lights.

Mr. Wood seconded the motion.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer	<u>Y</u>
Knaggs	<u>Y</u>
Stahl	<u>Y</u>
Traves	<u>Y</u>
Wood	<u>Y</u>
Approved	<u>5-0</u>

5. H21-15 Molly Watson 28-30 Public Square CSP

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was requesting conditional sign approval for the replacement of an existing wall sign with a new sign of the same size. Mr. Dutton stated that the new sign would be made of an aluminum composite material and would be white with black lettering.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of application H21-15, as submitted.

Present for the case was Molly Watson, 6915 Fairhaven Oval Dr.

Ms. Traves asked if the sign was on a transom window. Ms. Watson stated that it was solid behind the sign. Ms. Watson noted that she was a tenant in the studio space in the building. Ms. Watson stated that two apartments had been added to the building and that she wanted to make the building more accommodating for all the units by putting the address on the sign.

Ms. Stahl clarified that the sign would be black lettering on a white background. Ms. Watson agreed, stating that the color scheme would be the reversal of what was currently there.

Ms. Traves asked if the new sign was the same size as the current sign. Ms. Watson stated that the signs were the same size.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer asked if the applicant had brought a sample of the sign material. Ms. Watson stated that the sign was made of an aluminum composite. Ms. Watson noted that the

current sign was made of the same material. Ms. Traves asked if the applicant could bring a sample of the material to the next meeting. Ms. Watson stated that she would have to contact the sign manufacturer for a sample.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer made a motion for the application to be tabled until the next meeting, when the applicant could present the Board with a sample of the sign material.

Ms. Traves seconded the motion.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer	<u>Y</u>
Knaggs	<u>Y</u>
Stahl	<u>Y</u>
Traves	<u>Y</u>
Wood	<u>Y</u>
Approved	<u>5-0</u>

6. H22-02 David Pelligra 320 S. Court St. COA

Ms. Stahl stated that she was a part-owner of the property in question and recused herself from the proceedings.

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was requesting Certificate of Appropriateness approval for the installation of a smoker, the infill of a window, and minor brickwork. Mr. Dutton stated that the proposed site was on the north side of the building between the existing silos and dumpster enclosure. Mr. Dutton stated that the project included the relocation of condensing units, the installation of the smoker, and the infill of a window with brick matching the existing brick. Mr. Dutton stated that the smoker would be behind the silos and would not be visible from the street.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of the application H22-02, as submitted.

Present for the case was the owner of Big Dog Daddy's, Kirk Davenport, 4619 Riverrock Way. Mr. Davenport stated that he wanted to incorporate the smoker into the new kitchen for Big Dog Daddy's, located in the lower level of the building. Mr. Davenport stated that he would be replacing the evergreens to help mask the smoker. Mr. Davenport stated that the smoker would sit on a concrete pad outside the building, with the only access inside being the door where wood could be loaded and unloaded from the unit.

Ms. Traves asked if there would be a door to the smoker from the interior. Mr. Davenport stated that he would have to walk around the building to access the smoker to put wood in it.

Ms. Biggins-Ramer asked if a fence was needed around the smoker for safety purposes. Mr. Dutton stated that a fence was not required. Mr. Dutton noted the existing sidewalk on the north side of the building would be extended to allow access to the smoker.

Bill Lamb, 721 South Court St., asked if residents would be able to smell the smoke from the interior of the building. Mr. Davenport stated that the unit vented outside, so there would not be smell inside the building.

Mr. Baran, 536 N Broadway, asked how often will the smoker be operating. Mr. Davenport stated that the smoker was designed to operate for six hours at a time. Mr. Davenport stated that he intended to run the smoker overnight, with it being used during the day only if he was running a special.

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

Mr. Wood seconded the motion.

Vote:

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

Ms. Stahl rejoined the Board.

Election of Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board

Ms. Traves made a motion to appoint Ms. Biggins-Ramer as Chair.

Mr. Wood seconded the motion.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer	<u>Y</u>
Knaggs	<u>Y</u>
Stahl	<u>Y</u>
Traves	<u>Y</u>
Wood	<u>Y</u>
Approved	<u>5-0</u>

Ms. Biggins-Ramer made a motion to appoint Mr. Wood as Vice-Chair of the Historic Preservation Board.

Ms. Stahl seconded the motion.

Vote:

Biggins-Ramer	<u>Y</u>
Knaggs	<u>Y</u>
Stahl	<u>Y</u>
Traves	<u>Y</u>
Wood	<u>N</u>
Approved	<u>4-1</u>

Adjournment

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Tome

Leslie Traves, Chairwoman