

**NOTE: Agenda and Reports may be amended as necessary or as required.
Applicants, Please Review Your Proposal for accuracy.**

Board Members

Snyder	Beckman	Bloch	Brown	Essman	Fairbanks
Combs					Jacobs
Sandlin	Spoonster	Traub	Weltzer	Whalen	
			Ripperger	O'Neill	

- I. Roll Call:
- II. Swearing in of Those Providing Testimony to the Board:
Notary Public
- III. Approval of Meeting Minutes – Written Summary and Audio Recording for these dates:
 - A. March 17, 2020
- IV. Properties Seeking COA - New Business
 1. 622 Dayton Street (Dayton Lane) – Fencing
- V. Miscellaneous/Discussion/On the Radar
 - Report of Administrative COA's
- VI. Adjourn



AGENDA
Architectural Design Review Board
Tuesday, May 05, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subject: AGENDA ITEM # 1 3
622 Dayton Street – Fencing 3
Introduction: 3





To: Architectural Design Review Board
From: Daniel Tidyman – ADRB Secretary
Subject: **AGENDA ITEM # 1**
622 Dayton Street – Fencing
Shi O’Neill, Applicant
Meeting Date: 5/5/2020
Received Application: 4/15/2020
Impacts: Dayton-Campbell ([Location](#))

Introduction:

The Applicant, Shi O’Neill, has submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness Application for the property of 622 Dayton Street. The proposal involves fencing.

The subject property of 622 Dayton Street is part of the Dayton-Campbell Historic District and is Zoned R-O (Multi-Family Residence Office District).

This property is also part of the State of Ohio Historic Inventory, referenced as BUT-981-9 – see attached.

PROPOSAL

- Fencing:
 - Existing:
 - Front yard: Ornamental fence
 - East Side Yard: Picket fence, galvanized fence posts for chain link fence.
 - Proposed:
 - Removing existing picket fence
 - Install chain link fence
 - Run from behind large tree on property to rear of property
 - Screened by trash and recycling bins from neighboring property (644 Dayton)
 - Partially screened from existing ornamental fence in front of property
 - Planting climbing vines (honeysuckle and clematis)
 - Can install sand cherry bushes along the fence line for additional screening.

ADRB Policies & Guidelines; and Other Requirements

This application broaches the topic of fencing in the ADRB Policies and Guidelines. They board may approve chain-link fences if they follow one of multiple constraints. The constraint that aligns the most with the proposal includes using chain-link fencing with the same color and height of another appropriate type of fencing that is prominent on the property. This includes using the black chain link fence to continue



from the existing ornamental fencing located in the front yard of the property. Additionally, the chain link fence can be screened with shrubbery.

Recommendation:

The ADRB can approve, modify, or deny the COA request for fencing. Should the ADRB decide to approve the COA request, the Planning Department recommends the following motion:

To approve the COA request for fencing given the following finding:

1. That COA request is compliant with Section 1126.50 of the Hamilton Zoning Ordinance.

Attachments:

1. Please see the agenda attachment file





Architectural Design Review Board

Phone: 513-785-7350

Fax: 513-785-7359

Email: hamiltonhistoric@hamilton-oh.gov

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Exterior changes made to buildings, outbuildings, landscapes, or other exterior features located within one of the City of Hamilton's Historic Areas or properties individually listed by Ordinance shall not be permitted unless and until the Architectural Design Review Board issues a Certificate of Appropriateness for the action. The ADRB will review the plans, monitor the work and administer the Architectural Conservation/Historic District section (Section 1126.00) of the Hamilton City Zoning Ordinance.

A fee will be charged for any Certificate of Appropriateness application that is required to be heard before the ADRB, unless the proposed change is returning to or restoring to previous or original historic materials that can be referenced in past Architectural Design Review Board or other official City of Hamilton/State of Ohio Historic Inventory records. A proposal that is Like for Like (A repair or improvement in relation to a property in which the repair or improvement utilizes the existing materials/colors and replaces them with matching materials) does not require ADRB review and will be approved by the Secretary.

A nonrefundable twenty-five dollar (\$25.00) fee for Residential property or fifty dollar (\$50.00) fee for Commercial property is due when a Certificate of Appropriateness application is submitted.

Fee Schedule		
Proposal:	Residential	Commercial
Exterior Change	\$25	\$50
Like for Like Work (no board review)	\$0	\$0
Return to Original Historic Materials	\$0	\$0

Property Address: _____

Applicant Name: _____

Applicant Mailing Address: _____

Owner/s Name: _____

Owner Mailing Address: _____

Daytime Contact Phone: _____ Email: _____

Applicant Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPLICANTS ARE HIGHLY ENCOURAGED TO APPEAR BEFORE THE BOARD TO SUPPORT THEIR APPLICATION.

Please see Page 4 for the Meeting Dates and Application Deadlines.

DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE PERFORMED

Please **specify** the exact location on the structure, the nature of the work, the materials to be used, and the existing historic features to be repaired or replaced. Landscape, fence, and out buildings, etc., should include a sketch of the property showing the proposed location. In order to make an appropriate, fair and timely decision the ADRB may request additional detailed information. This may include plans, sketches, photographs, and information about the materials to be used, including brochures, catalog information, and paint chips.

Work Proposed: (Describe type of work, existing conditions, and methods to be used, materials proposed)

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY & FILL IN THE CORRESPONDING INFORMATION

Paint Sample Provided
Appearance of Color: _____
Color Name & Manufacturer: _____
Location (body, window trim, specific trim, accent): _____

Siding Sample Provided
Existing Siding (style, material, color, location): _____
Proposed Siding (style, material, color, location): _____
Manufacturer: _____ Proposed Size: _____

NOTE: If proposing vinyl or aluminum siding, per ADRB Guidelines, applicant must be provided a copy of Preservation Brief 8, concerning siding. It is HIGHLY recommended that applicant provide pictures and document extensive reasons why vinyl or non-historic siding is being proposed.

Roof *Please note, Roofing requires a building permit*
Existing Roof (material, style, color): _____
Proposed Roof (material, style, color): _____
Manufacturer: _____ Location: _____

Windows / Door
Existing Windows/Door (style, material, size, color, location): _____
Proposed Windows/Door (style, material, size, color, location): _____
Manufacturer: _____ Type (if applicable): _____

NOTE: Per ADRB Guidelines, it is recommended that proposed windows are the same size as the original window opening. Covering of windows is highly discouraged. For vinyl or other non-historic windows, it is recommended to document existing windows, including the condition and reasons why original windows should be replaced.

Fence
Existing Fence (type, material, color): _____
Proposed Fence (type, material, color, location, course): _____

Gutters
Existing Gutter (material, style, location, color): _____
Proposed Gutter (material, style, location, color): _____
Manufacturer: _____

Soffit
Existing Soffit (style, material, location, color): _____
Proposed Soffit (style, material, location, color): _____

Other Work not listed above: _____

Demolition

NOTE: 1126.60 Certificate of Appropriateness – Demolition: In the event an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness includes demolition of any property in the Architectural Conservation/Historic District the applicant shall be required to submit evidence to the Architectural Design Review Board indicating that at least one of the following conditions prevail:

- That the property proposed for demolition is not inherently consistent with other properties in its area of the Architectural Conservation/Historic District,
- That the property proposed for demolition contains no features of architectural and/or historical significance; or
- That there is no reasonable economic use for the property as it exists or as it might be rehabilitated, that there is no feasible means or prudent alternative to demolition,
- Existing structures listed in section 1126.110 (Central Area Building Inventory) shall be maintained. For buildings listed in that inventory, the cost of rehabilitation must exceed 67% of the replacement cost of the same structure at the time of the proposed demolition based on the Marshall Swift Construction Cost Index or a similar industry standard index before a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition can be issued. No building listed in the Central Area Building Inventory may be demolished without approval by the Architectural Design Review Board regardless of existing building condition. (OR2013-2-22)
- Both the architectural and historical significance of the property, its relation to the street and to the historic district as a whole shall be considered.

Please Explain the selection made above: _____

Please attach additional sheets if necessary.



View from Dayton Street



Existing picket fence on East property line



Screened fencing on 644 Dayton Street Side



Sand Cherry Bush



ADRB meeting
March 17, 2020 4:00 pm

Board Members

Albinus x	Beckman	Bloch X (teleconference)	Brown	Essman x	Fairbanks x
					Jacobs
Sandlin x	Spoonster X (teleconference)	Traub X (teleconference)	Weltzer x	Whalen	
			Ripperger	O'Neill	

I. Roll Call: Because of the state of emergency that the State of Ohio issued because of Covid-19, the Ohio Attorney General is allowing board members to temporarily participate in meetings via phone.

II. Swearing in of Those Providing Testimony to the Board:

Notary Public Daniel Tidyman

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes – Written Summary and Audio Recording for these dates:

March 3, 2020

- o Motion to approve: Weltzer
- o Second: Albinus
- o Motion approved unanimously.

III. Properties Seeking COA - New Business

1. 730 Dayton Street (Dayton Lane) – Building Addition

Staff Presentation:

Introduction:

The Applicant, Ashly Hong (John Senhauser Architects), has submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness Application for the property of 730 Dayton Street. The proposal involves removing a non-original addition in the rear of the dwelling unit and creating a new addition in the same location.

The subject property of 730 Dayton Street is part of the Dayton-Campbell Historic District and is Zoned R-4 (Multi-Family Residential District).

This property is also part of the State of Ohio Historic Inventory, referenced as BUT-989-9 – see attached.

The applicant contacted the Planning Department about the proposed improvements and maintaining zoning compliance. The purpose of this request is to allow the property owners to expand their kitchen and dining area.

The Planning Department made suggestions such as maintaining the existing side yard setbacks, providing an administrative variance for lot area coverage, and minor suggestions for the scope of the project.

PROPOSAL

- Demolition:
 - Remove existing non-historic addition from rear of the dwelling.
 - Height: One (1) Story
 - Exterior Finish: Lap siding
 - Patio doors to rear deck
 - Remove masonry wall and chimney between addition and dwelling
- New Construction:
 - New addition
 - Finish: Brick veneer to match dwelling unit on the property
 - Trim: Wood to match existing trim
 - Roofing: EPDM (Addition only) (rubber roofing membrane)
 - Gutters: Aluminum Ply Gem Seamless (Color to match wood trim)
 - Soffit: Smooth Hardie panel (Color to match wood trim)
 - New concrete exterior stair, painted steel handrails
 - Windows: Marvin Ultrex Ebony
 - In new addition and replacing two existing windows
 - Material: Fiberglass
 - Style: Double Hung
 - With between the glass divided lites.
 - Used to create one continuous space between new and existing spaces.

ADRB Policies & Guidelines; and Other Requirements:

The COA request broaches many topics of many ADRB Policies and Guidelines. Overall, the project intends to remove a non-original addition to provide space for an expansion intended to have a similar look to the historic buildings.

The removal/demolition of the addition is a special case for a number of reasons. These reasons include:

- The area of the building being removed does not have historic or architectural features similar to the historic building on the site.
- The demolition would not affect the front façade or facades that are visible from the right of way.



- The result of the demolition would be a new addition that would be more appropriate for the historic building.

Regarding windows, the applicant chose a manufacturer listed in the window section of the ADRB Policies and Guidelines. The difference in the windows being the material and style, which required board approval.

Recommendation

The ADRB can approve, modify, or deny the COA request as applied and presented to the board. Should the ADRB wish to approve of the request, the Planning Department recommends the following motion:

That the ADRB approve and issue the COA request given the following findings:

1. That the COA request is compliant with Section 1126.50 of the Hamilton Zoning Ordinance

Staff Comments/Basis

Staff has reviewed that application and recommends that the ADRB approve the COA request given the following findings:

1. The addition adheres to the ADRB Policies and Guidelines regulations on New Additions to Existing Structures in the following ways:
 - a. The height will not exceed the height of the original structure.
 - b. The applicant intends to remove a non-historic addition to provide a new addition, which would utilize materials and a design that are more complementary to the historic building.
2. The proposed windows are listed on an approved list found in the ADRB Policies and Guidelines.
3. The addition is located in the rear of the building and will not be visible from the right of way.

Public Hearing:

Ashly Hong, the architect and applicant, attended via conference call, and was available to answer questions.

Demolition of the non-historic structure – ADRB asked about demolition of part of the historic foundation. Ms. Hong confirmed it is only the foundation of the addition that is being demolished.



Questions about brick veneer – Ms. Hong clarified that a brick veneer looks like brick but is not a full masonry wall.

Staff clarified that the trim is going to be fiber cement, which is better known as “hardie board.”

ADRB asked if they considered a higher pitch that did not require a rubber membrane. The property owner considered it but because of windows and other concerns they wound up deciding on this design.

No questions on the soffit and trim, no questions on the stairs.

Windows – ADRB asked about the design of the windows since they do not match the style of the windows elsewhere on the building. Ms. Hong explained their rationale of making sure all of the windows on the back matched.

Ms. Hong confirmed that the windows on the back of the house were replaced in a different renovation and they will remain. They match the new windows in design.

ADRB stated that the addition looks nice. The property owner, Ms. Daniels, stated that she is really looking forward to completing this project.

ADRB asked if the property owner intended to change the design of existing windows to match these new windows. She stated that she does not plan to change the other windows to match but these new windows are not visible from the right-of-way. ADRB stated that there will be one window on the rear of the building that will not be consistent with the other windows.

ADRB discussed the pitch of the roof to avoid having the rubber membrane roof. ADRB asked about future replacement windows, but the applicant stated they do not plan to replace other windows on the property.

Motion to close the public hearing: Bloch
Second: Weltzer

Discussion:

Motion: To approve as presented.
Motion by: Bloch
Second: Albinus

2. 736 High Street (Historic Inventory) - Signage

Staff Presentation:

Introduction:

The Applicant, Triangle Sign Co, has submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness Application for the property of 736 High Street. The proposal involves Painting and Signage. The subject property is located in the DT-3 (Downtown East High Street District). The property associated



with these requests is listed as a State of Ohio Historic Inventory, referenced as BUT-998-9, known as the J & J Tire Company or Gimbel's Motor Car Co.

The former business, Jeff Pohlman Tire and Auto Service recently occupied the property as a minor auto service business until recently selling the business to a new tenant, Tire Choice, who is interested in some façade improvements.

Recent approvals on the property date back to April 2018 where an existing wall sign was relocated to the front façade on High Street and face changes to the existing pole sign were approved.

PROPOSAL

- Signage:
 - Removing existing Pohlman Auto wall signage
 - Install two LED Wall Signs (Not Scrolling Message Signs)
 - One (1) 24" X 504" (84 S.F.) wall sign
 - "Tire Choice Auto Center
 - One (1) 21" X 455" (66 S.F.) wall sign
 - "Tire Choice Auto Center)
 - Reface existing pole signs with company name and services provided
 - Existing LED sign to remain

- Painting
 - Painting
 - Colors to match company branding color scheme
 - Medium Blue - Fascia Band
 - Dorian Gray (SW 7017) - Building Body
 - Galvano (SW4027) - Bay Doors
 - Vaccum Black (SE4032) - Light Poles, Main Door Frames,

ADRB Policies & Guidelines; and Other Requirements

The application requests broach the topic of Painting and Signage in the ADRB Policies and Guidelines.

The proposed color scheme from the applicant is primarily neutral colors on the body of the building, bay doors, and light poles. The proposed blue color of the fascia band also appears to match the new signage as part of the companies branding.

Regarding signage, the policies and guidelines encourage pedestrian oriented signage, which includes wall signage and projecting signage. The proposed signage is designed in a simple manner to include the business name, logo, and function. Furthermore, the property is located in an area outside of the historic district where illuminated wall signage and freestanding pole signage is common. The board may consider this in making its decision.

Recommendation

The ADRB can approve, modify, or deny the COA request as applied and presented to the



board. Should the ADRB wish to approve of the request, the Planning Department recommends the following motion:

That the ADRB approve and issue the COA request given the following findings:

1. That the COA request is compliant with Section 1126.50 of the Hamilton Zoning Ordinance

Staff Comments/Basis

Staff has reviewed that application and recommends that the ADRB approve the COA request given the following findings:

1. Per the ADRB Policies and Guidelines, pedestrian oriented signage such as wall signs are encouraged.
2. The face changes for the freestanding pole sign can be considered a like for like proposal.

Painting color scheme appears to align with the new businesses branding strategy.

Public Hearing:

ADRB asked about the signage. The applicant, from Triangle Signs, stated that it would be a typical backlit plastic sign with a film that creates the brand colors – a standard channel letter sign like Kirsch CPA Group, ODW Logistics sign. The blue background is paint. ADRB asked about what is illuminated. He stated the TireChoice Auto Service Center on both sides of the building will be illuminated. Staff stated that the pole sign is a like-for-like change and the LED changeable copy sign currently exists.

Painting – ADRB asked about the blue band, stating that it is very dominant and takes away from the mural on the building. The applicant stated that he cannot speak to the need to have the striping, although it is their brand identity. The body paint is just a neutral color, not necessarily is part of the brand.

ADRB suggested eliminating the blue band on the original building so that it does not compete with the mural. Other members of the ADRB stated they disagree that the blue band detracts from the mural.

ADRB questioned whether the electronic sign on the side street is necessary. The applicant stated that the proposal will be a site improvement.

ADRB suggested eliminating the small blue line on the front corner canopy – keep it white/neutral - and remove the blue line to the right of the mural. The applicant stated that he thought the business owner might be open to this compromise. Some ADRB members stated they think even the compromise is not appropriate for a historic district.

The applicant stated that the proposal is similar to the surrounding community, including Wendy's, Jocko's, and similar uses. He stated that he believes this project will be an



improvement to the area. ADRB stated that no other property has similar large illuminated signage that close to the historic district.

Motion to close the public hearing: Fairbanks
Second: Bloch

Discussion: There was discussion about the signage on N 8th Street and its appropriateness in this area.

Motion: Motion to table the agenda item to get feedback from the members of the Dayton Lane Historic District.

Motion by: Spoonster
Second: No second
Motion fails to move to vote.

Motion: Motion to approve the COA as presented and amended regarding the blue paint that intersects the mural.

Motion by: Fairbanks
Second: Weltzer

Motion approved with seven yes votes and one no vote.
Spoonster was the “no” vote.

IV. Miscellaneous/Discussion/On the Radar

- Board of Zoning Appeals Update – 29 N D Street – ADRB asked questions about that process.
- Future meetings –
 - Motion to cancel the next meeting – Bloch
 - Second: Fairbanks
 - Motion approved unanimously.

- #### V. Adjourn at 5:31 pm
- a. Motion: Fairbanks
 - b. Second: Albinus

