

City of Findlay
Design Review Board
Third Floor Conference Room, Municipal Building
Wednesday, January 10, 2024 – 6:00 p.m.

Minutes

Members Present:

Brian Hurt
Heather Clow
Tim Mayle
Eric Van Renterghem
Jeff Fort

Members Absent:

Charles Gerringer

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 and Jeff Fort.

NEW ITEMS

- 1. Petition for Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-01-2024 filed by Wettle Corp for St. Andrews United Methodist Church to approve a new awning at 120 W. Sandusky St.**

GENERAL

The subject property is located at 120 W. Sandusky St.

PROPOSAL

- The applicant wishes to install a new awning on the rectory entrance. The awning will cover the sidewalk entrance measuring at 26' x 7'9" and will be a tan color.

STAFF ANALYSIS

- The proposal is using an appropriately sized and colored awning.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

HRPC Staff recommends approval of CA-01-2024 at 120 W. Sandusky St.

Mayle motioned to approve, seconded by Hurt. All members voted "yes"; the motion was

approved.

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

GENERAL

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

PROPOSAL

- The applicant wishes to amend the original certificate of appropriateness for an added sign, a change to the bronze seal and change in some of the exterior material used. The sign measures 101 ft² and will be located on the awning facing W. Main Cross and will have anodized aluminum standoff lettering. The bronze seal will be changed to stained glass. On the front of the building, they would like to change the material used from brick to eifs only on the feature stair tower. They would also like to change the rear façade to eifs. The rear wall corners will be wrapped with brick.

STAFF ANALYSIS

- The material change for the seal from bronze to stained glass is an upgrade. The front of the building measures at 166' in length, which allows sign measuring up to 115 ft². The lettered sign being proposed is within the size allowed and is using the preferred raised lettering. The material change to the tower on the front of the building is a standalone feature, which mimics the Marathon Performing Arts Center across the street and is a small portion of the façade. The material change to the rear façade faces the alley. Although the use of eifs is discouraged in regulations, the use of the material in this case is minimal when viewing the front of the building and mirrors the use of eifs on the Marathon Performing Arts Center.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

HRPC Staff recommends approval of amendments to CA-04-2023 at 209 W. Main Cross St.

Amber Clason and Brett Geis from RCM Architects were in attendance as well as County Commissioner Tim Bechtel.

Mayle asked if the MPC were not across the street, would they still use EFIS.

Clason stated that she would use it because it provides a nice change vertically when compared to the other material. The eifs on the front of the building would cover 7% of the north wall.

Mayle asked if the change on the rear of the building is for cost saving or for architectural purposes.

Commissioner Bechtel stated that the rear of the building is for secure entrances and is not a focal point of the public.

Clason stated that the eifs on the south wall will serve the building well and do it no harm. The brick wraps around on the corners of the rear wall and the windows are the same as the rest of the building.

Cordonnier stated that the Mayor asked if the red brick color could be used on the top two floors of the building of the south wall.

Clason was concerned that changing the color would not look appropriate since there are dimensions to the brick color.

Cordonnier agreed that it could look better or worse, but trusts the architecture's opinion.

Hurt stated that he wanted follow the guidelines and that the guidelines state that eifs should not be a primary façade. He felt like the rear of the building is not following the intent of the guidelines. He had no issues with the front eifs feature. Mayle agreed.

Fort asked how long eifs will last compared to brick.

Clason stated that it will not need repainted. When she considers the rear of the building façade it is only 25% of the building and is not the primary façade of the building.

Hurt stated that when compared to the MPC building the main entrance is eifs, but not a whole side. He felt that the eifs on the Court building would make up 30% of the façade.

Mayle stated that the Downtown Design Board approved brick and that this is a significant change.

Fort asked what would happen if the board votes "no", and is there a problem with money.

Hurt stated that we have gone around and around about this. When the board deals with small business owners who have financial constraints that the board always goes back to the guidelines.

Mayle agreed and stated that this is a long-term decision and does not want to do three sides of a building with premium material instead of four sides. He stated that you don't know what the future holds and no one knows what may be facing that side of the building with eifs.

Heather Clow stated that if the board is following the guidelines that it now comes down to what percentage of the building the rear façade covers.

Clow asked if there are other materials that can meet the same financial goals.

Clason did not feel there was another material to be used. She explained the details of the back façade and that it includes a fence, a seal and 10' of wrapped brick and stone.

Hurt asked what the options are if the board does not approve south wall.

Cordonnier explained that any decision made by the board can be appealed to the board of

zoning appeals.

Geis asked if each topic needs its own vote for a motion.

Mayle motioned to approve all the proposed changes on the north side of the building which include the seal material change from bronze to stained glass, the addition of the sign and the eifs on the north stair tower, and denying anything on the south facing wall.

Fort did not like that this was like a change order and felt like now we are over a barrel.

Hurt seconded the motion.

Clow felt the rendering was a disservice to what it will really look like.

Hurt asked if there were options to work more brick in to see that it's not as primary on that side.

Clason stated that there is construction going up that is meant for the eifs.

Mayle asked if the construction is already up for the installation of the eifs, why is it just now being presented.

Clason stated that it was felt as a small portion of the façade and it was planned to be brought in with the sign approval, but that it was not a "smoke and mirrors" tactic.

Van Renterghem stated that if the jail comes down it will be very visible.

Mayle stated that the jail will come down as it is already being spoke about.

Clason stated that downtown buildings have a back side and you can't always see the what future will bring.

Mayle stated that all the buildings around the courthouse have all sides of the buildings that match.

Clason stated that when the courthouse was built it was accessible from all directions. This new building is designed so that there is only one front door to be used.

Mayle stated that was not what was asked to be approved a year ago. He asked when this decision was made architecturally.

Bechtel stated that construction began in June. He stated that also what is missing from the rendering is the fence which will come out to the alley and it will be a privacy fence.

Hurt stated that he will stick by staying with the guidelines.

Cordonnier asked if the bottom of the rear were stone and the top were EFIs would that be better?

Mayle stated that he would not like to discuss that issue and would like to vote on what was

presented.

Van Renterghem called for the vote as well as Mayle.

Roll Call Vote : Yes (5) Van Renterghem, Fort, Hurt, Clow & Mayle. No (0), Abstain (0).

Cordonnier stated that the permit will be ready tomorrow. He explained that if the County wishes to appeal the decision of the Downtown Design Review Board that Eric Adkins in zoning can help them.

The meeting was adjourned.