

City of Findlay
Design Review Board
Third Floor Conference Room, Municipal Building
Wednesday, February 28, 2024 – 6:00 p.m.

Minutes

Members Present:

Brian Hurt
Heather Clow
Tim Mayle
Jordyn Taylor
Meredith Wirth
Eric Van Renterghem

Members Absent:

Jeff Fort

Staff Attending:

Matt Cordonnier, HRPC Director
Laura Ewing, HRPC Staff

CALL TO ORDER

Matt Cordonnier called meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Heather Clow, Brian Hurt, Tim Mayle, Jordyn Taylor, Meredith Wirth and Eric Van Renterghem.

NEW ITEMS

- 1. Petition for Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-02-2024 filed by Michael Fraley to install a new sign at 201 E. Crawford St.**

GENERAL

The subject property is located at 201 E. Crawford St.

PROPOSAL

- The applicant wishes to install a new sign on the west wall of the building. The sign will be red, backlit channel letters and measuring at 42 ft². The maximum allowed sign area for that wall is 60 ft². The owner has approved the sign.

STAFF ANALYSIS

- The proposal is using an appropriately sized and colored sign. It has backlighting, channel letters and meets the requirements of downtown design review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

HRPC Staff recommends approval of CA-02-2024 at 201 E. Crawford St.

Mayle stated that there are different types of signs on Crawford, some of them the hanging style, and asked how the owner decided on this type of sign. Michael Fraley, owner, explained that is what he has at another business location.

Hurt motioned to approve the certificate of appropriateness, seconded by Mayle. Brian asked if the current sign would be removed. The owner stated that it would be removed. All members voted "yes", the motion was approved.

2. Petition for Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-03-2024 filed by Charlie Hayward to paint the RCR building at 301 E Sandusky St.

GENERAL

The subject property is located at 301 E Sandusky St.

PROPOSAL

- The applicant wishes to paint the building using similar paint colors that have been used previously.

STAFF ANALYSIS

- The proposal is using an appropriate paint color.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

HRPC Staff recommends approval of CA-03-2024 at 301 E Sandusky St.

Cordonnier asked if the new color is as olive as it looks in the rendering. Charlie Hayward, contractor for the RCR building, stated that it's not quite that green. Cordonnier stated that the code calls for neutral colors and this meets those requirements. Cordonnier also clarified that there is work being done on a wall and that the windows are being worked on to be refurbished.

VanRenten asked why the columns are being changed in color. Hayward stated that's what the designer picked.

Clow motioned to approve the certificate of appropriateness, seconded by Van Renterghem. All members voted "yes", the motion was approved.

Hayward asked if there is a change color does it need to be brought back to the board for approval. Cordonnier stated that any color change to the trim and body will need board approval. Columns or an insignificant changes, like one shade change, can be done administratively and to send those changes to Cordonnier.

3. Petition for Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-04-2024 filed by Renz Salanga for STIX

GENERAL

The subject property is located at 110 E Sandusky St

PROPOSAL

- The applicant wishes to install fencing for an outdoor seating area.

STAFF ANALYSIS

- Staff recommends switching from white to black aluminum fencing. The black will blend into the surrounding environment much better than the bright white.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

HRPC Staff recommends approval of CA-04-2024 at 110 E Sandusky St

Mayle asked about the outdoor container area that was approved last year. Renz Salgana, STIX owner, stated that project has been scratched.

Cordonnier stated this has already been approved by the City as the property owner for the safety issues, pedestrian safety and right of way issues. Salgana explained that the proposal was for metal wrapped in vinyl but that staff asked for black. Salgana stated that it will look like the railing at Bourbon Affair at the front on Crawford.

Salgana stated that he was able to find similar color to the brick used, but there will not be the mortar in between the pieces of stone and that the stone is not permanent.

Mayle asked if the setup is seasonal. Salgana stated that the sidewalk railing will be moved, but the stone will stay during the winter. He explained that there will be three posts between the stone columns to hang lighting. Salgana explained that the set up is to accommodate the liquor license.

Cordonnier asked if Salgana considered using the railing for everything instead of the stone work. He said he considered it but the way he has proposed it that it will help keep out the trash that collects there.

Hurt stated that it seems like the fencing fits the code, but is there anything about temporary fencing. Cordonnier said there was not, and that his concern was the use of the manufactured stone. Salgana explained that the stone is very heavy and not hollow.

Mayle stated that the stone is for a fence, not part of a building.

Cordonnier stated that the black railing can be approved after a picture of the black railing has been emailed.

Hurt asked about the using the post with the cable or chains across it. Salgana stated that sometimes bicyclers don't see the chains.

Mayle motioned to approve the black railing as long as Matt can review administratively, via

email for the railing going east west, and approves the north south wall as presented, seconded by Hurt. Hurt stated that it matches with what was designed by the Millstream students. All members voted “yes”, the motion was approved.

4. Amendment for Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-04-2023 filed by RMC for the Judicial Building requesting a change of material.

GENERAL

The subject property is located at 209 W. Main Cross St.

PROPOSAL

- Change proposed construction materials from brick to stenciled EIFS, matching the adjacent brick pattern
 - a. Rear elevation (*facing alley and Hancock Co. Jail*)

STAFF ANALYSIS

- The initial amendment for the South wall which was submitted in January was denied due to the large amount of EIFS being proposed. The amount of EIFS being proposed has not changed.
- City of Findlay Codified Ordinance 1139.02 Section 2.02 Building materials such as utility brick, concrete masonry units, and Exterior Insulating Finishing Systems (EIFS) as a primary façade material are discouraged but may be used as accent materials. Figure 207 Discouraged Materials: Discouraged – vinyl and aluminum siding, and EIFS as a primary material.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

HRPC Staff recommends denial of this amendment to CA-04-2023 at 209 W. Main Cross St.

Cordonnier explained that a different EIFS design for the rear of the building went before the board and was denied in January 2024. He also explained that for security reasons there is a fence at the rear of the building. It was asked if the fence had been approved. Cordonnier stated that the fence was approved in the original request and would be discussed separately from the EIFS design amendment request.

Cordonnier explained that the new request is stenciled and colored EIFS to mimic the color of brick.

Tim Bechtol, Hancock County Commissioner, presented an example of the proposed stenciled EIFS and explained the installation process. He explained that changing to EIFS deducts the expense by \$75,000, which will be reduced to have it stenciled. He also stated that a future board would have an easier time taking down the wall if the wall is EIFS as opposed to brick. He also explained that no one will be close to the wall since it will be blocked by a fence located near the alleyway.

Mayle asked if there is any change in the amount of EIFS presented as compared to the

submission in January.

Bechtol stated that it was not changed.

Clow asked if there is a reason to discourage EIFS.

Mayle stated that it's an inferior material. Cordonnier stated that EIFS is a newer material, and there is the belief that the majority of downtown buildings use brick or natural materials.

Bechtol pointed out the area of recessed brick would follow the same pattern on the back with the EIFS.

Hurt stated that last month it was pointed out that from the code that EIFS as a primary material is discouraged and that the primary material for the rear wall is still EIFS. Mayle agreed and stated that although it looks different, the EIFS amount has not changed and that the board is being asked the same thing. Mayle stated that the brick was approved over a year ago, the EIFS is inappropriate and didn't know why we are looking at the same material again.

Mayle motioned to deny the request for stenciled looking EIFS on the south wall as it is the same amount denied last month, seconded by Hurt. Van Renterghem asked if the material change was mostly to save money. Bechtol said yes. Hurt stated that some of the code recommendations are not always cost effective, but that it ultimately comes down to what is in the code. Hurt asked what the appeal process is. Cordonnier stated that the design guidelines are in the zoning code and any part of the zoning code can be appealed to the board of zoning appeals. If they do not feel they have received justice at BZA it can be taken to the courts. Bechtol stated that the EIFS has been approved by Wood Co for installation value. He asked if the opposition to the EIFS is based off aesthetics or material use. Hurt stated that the objection is based off of what the code is. Mayle stated that the material itself is the issue. Bechtol asked if it's the stability that's at issue. Mayle stated that he would not get into that, but that he is following the code. Clow stated that they do not have a problem with EIFS personally, but are trying to follow the code. Cordonnier stated that relief from a section of code is generally approved through BZA. Mayle, Hurt, Clow, Van Renterghem and Taylor voted "yes". Wirth abstained, the motion was approved.

Cordonnier stated that a dark bronze fence is to be placed at the rear of the county judicial building. Gies stated it is for security and it is galvanized steel. There will be two pedestrian gates and two car gates. He showed that the dumpster pad has been moved, and two parking spaces have been removed for it. There will be two gates on the fenced in area for the dumpster. Cordonnier did not have any issues from a design stand point. The colors, design and aesthetics are fine and it has a specific security purpose. Mayle asked if the parking at the fence for the Sherriff's Office. Bechtol stated that yes it is for the Sherriff parking.

Cordonnier stated to Bechtol that the deadline for BZA is soon and that is an option for them.

Mayle motioned to approve the fencing, seconded by Clow. All members voted "yes", the motion was approved.

