

**MINUTES  
DESIGN & REVIEW BOARD**

**September 9, 2014**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Dick Kinder, Louise Keating, John Campbell, Sandra Hull, Dick Deffenbaugh and Susan Bates

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Keith Speirs

**STAFF PRESENT:** Andrew Dutton

**I. MINUTES**

Susan Bates moved, Sandra Hull seconded, to approve the Minutes of August 12, 2014 as received. Motion carried.

**II. PROJECT REVIEW AND/OR APPROVAL**

**DR-519. Chris Butdorf of LetterGraphics Inc.** requesting Board approval for a wall sign at 146 East Liberty Street (**Liberty Street Commons**). [Public Square Landmark District]

Chris Butdorf, LetterGraphics Sign Company, stated the tenants at the Liberty Street Commons were asking for more outside exposure. A changeable, vinyl tenant panel was proposed; the window tenant signage which existed would be removed.

Mr. Butdorf stated the exact colors had not yet been determined because they were looking to freshen up some of the painting on the building which was currently green and beige. Ms. Hull stated the Board needed to know the colors which would be used. Mr. Butdorf stated the colors would remain green and beige but might be a shade darker or lighter. Mr. Campbell stated he assumed they would try and match the green on the aluminum frames. Mr. Butdorf stated that was correct.

Louise Keating moved, Dick Deffenbaugh seconded, to approve signage as submitted for Liberty Street Commons at 146 East Liberty Street. Motion carried.

**DR-520. Chris Butdorf of Lettergraphics Inc.** requesting Board approval for wall and window signs at 147 South Market Street (**Flex Yoga**). [Public Square Landmark District]

Mr. Butdorf stated in order to get exposure for Flex Yoga, there were five windows facing South Market Street (10 total panes), and Flex Yoga wished to use the five upper panes in those windows and the three center lower panes and place a vinyl graphic in them. Mr. Butdorf stated on the south side, essentially the same thing would occur. Mr. Butdorf stated the entrance door into Flex Yoga (to go upstairs) was next to the back door of South Market Bistro, and Flex Yoga wished to add door graphics as well (replacing the South Market Bistro sign).

Mr. Campbell questioned if the graphics on the window panes were the print only (lotus flower and text). Mr. Butdorf stated yes—the dark area on the rendering represented glass.

Mr. Dutton stated the Zoning Code regulations for window signs on upper floors permitted one per floor, so only two of the signs would be permitted per the Code. Mr. Dutton stated if the applicant wished to place the signs as proposed, they would need to obtain a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals. Mr. Butdorf stated he was not certain the applicant would apply for a variance but had asked that the request be presented to the Board as a “best case scenario” for signage to see what the Design & Review Board thought of it.

Mr. Campbell questioned, should the variance not be granted, what the applicant would be able to do. Mr. Dutton stated the applicant would be permitted to have one window sign (top and bottom) on each side (different walls). Mr. Butdorf stated if the variance were not granted, they would use the center window on the Market Street side, and the applicant would pick one of the two windows under the fire escape.

Mr. Campbell questioned the color of the sign. Mr. Butdorf stated the sign would have a white background with the color copy as shown on the printout submitted and would be painted with digitally printed graphics.

Louise Keating moved to approve signage as submitted for Flex Yoga at 147 South Market Street, subject to obtaining a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals. If no variance was granted, then the applicant had the right to put signs on two windows as allowed by the Zoning Code—one on the Market Street side, and one on the south side of the building, in addition to the wall sign.

Susan Bates seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

**DR-521. Garrett Lapping of AODK, Inc.** requesting a recommendation from the Board for exterior changes on the north side of the building at 116 North Buckeye Street (**Gionino’s Pizzeria**). [C-4 District]

Dave Kipfer stated on the north facing side of the building, they wished to brick in two windows and paint them to accommodate an electrical service. Mr. Kipfer stated the original electrical service was not as big as what the package now called for. Mr. Kipfer stated the entire building would be repainted (previously approved by the Board). Mr. Kipfer stated the awning would be the same color as previously proposed.

Dick Kinder moved to accept the exterior changes on the north side of the building for Gionino’s Pizzeria at 116 North Buckeye Street.

Mr. Campbell stated he felt the proposal should blend in just fine.

Sandra Hull seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

### III. **MISCELLANEOUS**

Certified Local Government (CLG) information and training session.

Nathan Bevil from the Ohio Historic Preservation Office presented information to the Board on the City's CLG designation. Mr. Bevil stated preservation was based on different laws—review laws which included the Department of Transportation Acts and Environmental Protection Acts, both of which had provisions for historic resources, and the 1976 National Historic Preservation Act. Mr. Bevil stated the National Historic Preservation Act created the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Bevil stated if something was listed on the National Register or was eligible for the National Register, then it would have to go through the Ohio Historic Preservation's Office for a review to see how it would impact the historic district.

Mr. Bevil stated the CLG program was created in the 1980's and gave cities the power to control National Register nominations. Mr. Bevil stated by having a qualified Commission with qualified members, which also met all of the State and Federal requirements, the city was then eligible for the grant program. Mr. Bevil stated in the State of Ohio, there were 65 CLG's; 3 or 4 were still in the works and noted that any community of any size was eligible to participate.

Mr. Bevil stated he would be working with Mr. Dutton to update the ordinance and noted there would not be many changes to it. Mr. Bevil stated it was largely some Sunshine Laws that the Federal government and the state guidelines actually required. Mr. Bevil stated it would also highlight more of the outreach aspects of the Board.

Mr. Bevil stated by being a part of the CLG program, it opened the City up to training and technical assistance.

Mr. Bevil stated that, with regard to the CLG grant, it was a 60-40 match reimbursement grant which meant 60% was paid out by the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, and 40% was paid for by the local government which amounted to 10% of all of the money it received from the Federal government each year. Mr. Bevil stated Ohio had the third most National Registered properties in the country, and about \$100,000 was used for the CLG grants. Mr. Bevil stated the grant did require the local government to sign off of it as to what the grant money was being used for. Mr. Bevil stated everything would need to meet the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Mr. Bevil stated each year, State funding priorities were determined. Mr. Bevil stated the State's preservation plan was being updated, and ideas, goals and objectives from the plan became the State funding priorities. Ms. Keating questioned that if a project was not funded one year, if it could be submitted the following year. Mr. Bevil stated yes.

Mr. Bevil stated volunteer labor or in-kind services (architectural services) were required for grants and could be applied towards the matched portion of the grant. Mr. Bevil stated the match was 40% of the total project cost, and you could not use Federal money or CDBG money for the match.

A non-profit, such as Main Street, was eligible to apply for CLG grants but indicated the City would have to sign off and function as the pass through organization. Mr. Bevil stated eligible items would include planning (preservation plan/element, Comprehensive Plan, Historic Preservation Plan, individual buildings to plan for use), surveying (more intensive level of survey of the districts, producing a survey report, producing an OHI form), registration (registration nominations, updating national registration nomination), pre-

development (feasibility studies, historic structure reports, farmsteads/barns), development projects (elements to buildings, replacing windows, new lead in stained glass), public education (walking tours, green study and guidelines) and acquisitions (threatened National Register properties). Mr. Bevil stated things which could not be funded were lobbying, mitigation projects, fundraising, and signage.

Other Grants available:

**History Fund Grants.** Local and State District projects, programs and events such as the local Historical Society. Non-profits or government public entities and included organizational development, programs, and National Register listings.

**National Register Nominations:** Intent to promote something for tax credits. Program by the Development Services Agency to help promote getting things to the National Register to list them so that they would be eligible for tax credits and included adding an additional building, historic district, and an integrity investigation.

**Tax Credits:** Mr. Bevil stated this was a good avenue for small and medium sized projects. Ms. Hull stated no one wanted to do the paperwork involved and that there were “strings attached”.

Mr. Bevil questioned when the last time was that the City passed a local ordinance for designation. Ms. Hull stated the Bever Street area was looking to apply for a local designation. Mr. Bevil stated there was designation criteria, and whether or not a building was contributing or non-contributing. Mr. Bevil stated with the “50 year rule”, 1964 was historic and 1965 was considered eligible prehistoric. Mr. Bevil stated a lot of the buildings which were originally done for the National Register were done in the 1970’s, so 50 years back, that would have included buildings in the 1920’s. Many of the 1930’s and 1940’s buildings, that were now of value, were not included.

Mr. Bevil stated the definition of “contributing” was that the building was constructed within a period of significance, fit within the theme of significance, and that it also retained its integrity. “Non-contributing” lacked the integrity and was beyond recognition or repair.

Mr. Bevil questioned if there was an active update process and suggested if there was not, it may be something the City should look into.

Mr. Bevil stated with the CLG designation, there would be a little less problem with tax credit reviews.

Mr. Dutton noted that the Design Guidelines were about 20 years old and should be updated.

Mr. Dutton stated a survey was done of a lot of the properties in the City, but he did not believe it was ever formally submitted.

Meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

---

**Andrew Dutton, Staff Liaison**