

**CITY OF CIRCLEVILLE
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD
104 EAST FRANKLIN STREET
CIRCLEVILLE, OH 43113
(740) 477-8224**

**August 8, 2022
CITY HALL ~ COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present: Richard Verito – Chairperson, Richard Rhoades, Paul Johnson, Mike Combs and Clerk – Tami Robison. Jessica Calder was absent.

The first item on the agenda is, **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #6-22**, as requested by Curtis Christopher, 430 N. Court Street, Circleville, OH 43113, for 2 30 x 48 metal signs hanging from metal rod located at 105 S. Court Street, Circleville, OH 43113, in a Downtown Business District (DB) within Historic District Overlay (HD).

The second item on the agenda is, **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #7-22**, as requested by Kevin Steward, 19624 London Road, Circleville, OH 43113, for window, paint colors, north court doors and signs located at 105 E. Main Street, Circleville, OH 43113, in a Downtown Business District (DB) within Historic District Overlay (HD).

It is now 5:30 p.m. and my name is Richie Verito, I am the chairman of the Historical District Review Board, and we will now open the meeting for August 8th. Can I have a roll call please. Roll call was done. Jessica Calder was excused. We have enough members for a quorum; everybody should have received a copy of tonight's agenda. If anyone has any conflict of interest with this agenda items, please excuse themselves. Does anyone have any conflicts of interest? No members have responded. Has everyone received last month's meeting minutes? Paul Johnson stated, I did, any additions or corrections to those minutes? Paul Johnson made a motion to approve the July 11th minutes, Seconded by Rich Rhoades, all in favor, minutes have been approved.

Richard Verito – anyone who wished to speak on tonight's agenda will have 3 minutes to do so, once the applicant is done presenting, when it is your turn, please come to the podium, state your name and address before starting to speak and the clerk/secretary will alert you once your time is up. Anyone who wishes to speak will be sworn in. The first item on the agenda will be Kevin Steward. Kevin if you guys would please sit over here (table with the microphones).

Kevin Steward stated I have some additional information for your packets

Richard Verito asked are they other than the items listed on the Certificate of Appropriateness?

Kevin Steward stated basically it is the cut sheets, windows, doors,

Richie Verito stated so it pertains to what is on here, windows, paint colors, doors

The first item on the agenda is, Certificate of Appropriateness #7-22, as requested by Kevin Steward, 105 E. Main Street, for changes to the windows, paint colors, north court doors and signs located in Downtown Business District (DB) within Historic District Overlay (HD).

Kevin Steward stated I will start with the windows and the store front. On the handout we just gave you on the last page is the existing as you can see there the republican building to the south of me and the white door that goes upstairs to the apartments, 2nd and 3rd floor apartments. I was going to have that changed to be a store front just like the republican building, and then the one with the ugly brick around it that used to go into the restaurant. That will be exactly the same, it will have the arch and everything. I don't know if anyone needs to see that type of material but I do have a small piece of what type of material that will be, this will be the same for the window frames

Richard Verito asked so that is standard to what is on the administration buildings and most store fronts downtown

Kevin Steward stated yes, just like Chase Bank and the Republican Building and in this pack, I have cut sheets for each of the windows and it will show the arch doors which will be made the glass, it will basically be just like it except it will be metal. One of the things that I have talked about is the big issue with the glass on this building is that is it single pained and it is original and it's a safety issue, a kid running thru it or something like that, so it is a huge safety issue, so that is why I am going with the storefront glass because of the safety issues. One thing I do have the luxury of is I have a lot of the existing brick that was on the building, so what I want to do is, we are going to cut the brick at $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch and because it is double faced, we can get two out of one. Over the existing doors once I put the arch in, we will be able to put the brick back in to match the building because I have existing brick. Then on the front of the building, this is a tough store front, over the existing doors I am going to do the same thing with the brick, so the doors will be bricked in, and over top of the doors so there will not be any paint, right now it is kind of like a green plywood. So, around the doors will be basically bricked in just like the top and I have the original brick so it should blend right in.

Richard Verito asked have you noticed if those doors are bigger doors?

Kevin Steward stated no, we have nothing that shows that, we did get some pictures from Brenda and Tami that they found at city hall and we could not find any that had full length doors. So, the existing doors we did get a color swatch and it will be a walnut color, the doors that are there will be this color. this color with the brick around them. Now comes the tough part, the corals, the stuff that is pink or white, some of them are steel, and some of them are concrete. The ones that are concrete, will not hold paint very well, so Paul told me a way to try to get the paint the paint off. There are some companies that specialize in soda blasting

Beth Steward stated where you see the white that will still be white, where you see the orange color that will be the blue and any other color that needed painted would be gray and we thought that would all coordinate well with the brick color and freshen it up

Kevin Steward stated so you would have white where the white is on the big picture

Beth Steward stated the decorative corals will be the blue

Kevin Steward the decorative corals would be blue and anything else would be gray

Beth Steward answered yes

Kevin Steward so if you go back to the pictures that Tami and Brenda sent to me from city hall, that was the original colors, white, gray and blue and what doors we could see were walnut. We sent you a cut of a sign an 18 x 24 sign we would have one of these signs over every door, and this would be the only sign, no neon, no posters, no banners, it is in the lease

Richard Verito asked how many of those will you be putting up

Kevin Steward answered there will be one above every door, so a total of 8. By the republican side there will be 2, one will say apartments and one will say the name of that vendor, and then there will be 6 on the front of the building on the main street, over each door

Richard Verito asked, the sign was in the packet but not written on the face of the application.

Kevin Steward stated it was a 36 x 36 sign

Richard Verito stated it is the number of signage that you will have to file for a variance. It would be per frontage and you have two frontages on that building so you would be ok. Michelle, do you have a copy of the new code?

Michelle stated yes, I do

Kevin Steward stated and there are two different parcels there

Richard Verito stated you are allowed so many signs per frontage

Paul Johnson asked how many parcels are there Kevin?

Kevin Steward answered, there are 2, 105 and 109

Richard Verito stated so you would get 2 per parcel per frontage, so now you are up to 6

Kevin Steward stated so yes, I should be ok. I was going to have a sign over every door, so that sign will go over every door and the light will go above every sign and that would be the only lighting on that sign it is a 24 in and has a 2.50 watt led light bulb. It would light up the sidewalk and the sign. We are trying to get something vintage

Richard Verito stated since this wasn't submitted in the time frame, this would have to be re-submitted at a different time for the next meeting.

Beth Steward asked so the sign needs to be submitted?

Richard Verito stated so the sign was submitted with the packet but not written on the application, the lights, even though the signage wasn't written on the front of the application it was submitted with the application, we have to follow policy and procedures on when things are submitted because they have to be public notice on what we are discussing

Kevin Steward asked if anyone has any questions? I try to explain everything I can, a building that big you have a lot of moving parts

Paul asked standard panel at the bottom?

Kevin yes,

Hannah asked, what is the wattage of the lighting over the signs?

Beth stated they can hold up to 1.50 watt

Hannah stated the max is 1.50 watt

Paul Johnson stated, Mr. Chairman, if I could make a motion to accept the application for the Certificate of Appropriateness and to update for the signage that was a part of the package.

Richard Verito stated so I have a motion on it that the application was submitted with the sign but was not written on the face of the application, do I have a second? Mike Combs seconded the motion, all in favor, motion passes to update the paperwork correctly to what was submitted for the application to contain the sign

Kevin Steward stated that you for your time

Richard Verito stated do I have a motion to accept the COA 7-22 windows, paint colors, north court doors and signage. Richard Rhoades so moved, Paul Johnson seconded, all in favor? Roll Call Please. Motion passes, the COA is approved

Richard Verito stated so the only thing you will have to do is submit a COA for the lights

Kevin Steward stated thank you so much, we want to comply and be a good neighbor and I did read the code. Toughest thing is parking, We, did buy the lot behind the tattoo place so we address our parking issue. Thank you

Richard Verito stated our second applicant is not here yet, so I want to move forward with some discussions on the agenda. Did everyone get the packet sent by AT&T? About the antenna, the antenna is behind the police station, 9.8 ft shorter and wider antenna according to the paper. They just wanted our opinion.

Hannah stated I believe they already have a conditional use permit for the antenna, they were just reaching out if you had any comments to make or they just gave you that option to respond back, but if you don't want to, the letter said if there is no response within 30 days, they will just assume that you guys are ok with it.

Paul Johnson stated I have not read the whole packet, but a couple of quick questions. Is it located on the same footprint as the current antenna?

Richard Verito stated, I believe so,

Paul Johnson stated it is 10 ft shorter, is that correct

Richard Verito stated 9.3 and a little bit wider, obviously they would be doing some. That is the existing area so, they would be using the same area

Paul Johnson stated which would make sense and there will be some location on it of the use

Richard Verito READS FROM THE AT&T PAPERWORK GET IT FROM THE PACKET an existing police communications tower will be replaced with a proposed cellular tower. The compound area is a 29 ft. by 16.5 ft. rectangular shaped area which will be located within an existing parking lot. The proposed tower is a 126 ft. monopole structure and will include a 6 ft. lightning rod. It will stand at a total height of 132 ft. The associated equipment platform will be placed next to the tower onto a 14.5 ft x 9 ft. concrete equipment pad with canopy. Because replacement of the tower and the location of the associated equipment shelter will be within an asphalt parking lot, archaeological background research and testing were not warranted. As a result, this proposed cellular tower will have no effect on any archaeological site. . If anybody would like to read that

Paul Johnson asked it is the same monopole, correct?

Richard Verito answered yes. So, they are changing the antenna and they are changing the equipment that you see sitting out there moving it apparently and putting a canopy over it

Paul Johnson stated, looks like there is a fence enclosure around it too

Richard Verito stated yes it does, and it will make that area around it look a lot nicer

Paul Johnson stated It would certainly seem that it would be less of an attracted nuisance right now and any kid could climb it

Ashten Hines (Curtis Christopher's fill in), I am here on the behalf of Curtis Christopher

Richard Verito stated please have a seat. We will finish up our discussion and be right with you.

Paul Jonson stated, so it is a replacement antenna and an improvement, fencing enclosure an attractive nuisance multiple agencies will locate on it. Esthetically it is not changing and look like what we have existing antenna. I would be conformable making a motion that we appreciate the opportunity to review

Richard Verito asked, Tami can you write something up for us that states that? So that we can give them something, is everyone ok with that?

Paul Johnson, I make a motion that we accept the proposed monopole, fence enclosure and canopy as submitted as a replacement tower for one that is currently in use, as esthetically we see no issues within this historic district, and we appreciate the opportunity to review it

Richard Verito asked can I have a motion of what Paul just said. Motion by Mike, Richard Rhoades seconded it, all in favor, motion passes. Tami if you could get that typed up so I can sign it and we can get it sent out. Tami will type letter.

Richard Verito states, second agenda on tonight's list is Certificate of Appropriateness #6-22, submitted by Curtis Christopher, 430 N. Court Street, Circleville, OH 43113, for 2 30 x 48 metal signs hanging from metal rod located at 105 S. Court Street, Circleville, OH 43113, in a Downtown Business District (DB) within Historic District Overlay (HD). Hello Ashten, could you tell us about the sign?

Ashten Hines stated so Curtis Christopher stated there are 2 30 x 48 signs hanging from a metal rod coming down, and the only difference is from what you guys have is that they may be smaller and that is the maximum size they would be. I do not have exactly what will be on them yet, but that is the material is they will be metal sigs with rods

Richard Verito asked does anyone have any questions? Do I have a motion to accept? Richard Rhoades made a motion to accept. I have a motion to accept the COA 6-22 for 2 30 x 48 in maximum size hanging from a metal rod, all in favor, roll call please, Tami did roll call, motion passes.

Richard Verito states that the only other thing for discussion is, has everybody looked at the by-laws? They will not take effect until September 1st when the new code goes into effect. There is nothing that needs to be done, just any corrections, updates or anything while looking at it you might see for any changes. As of the new code we now fall under the jurisdiction of city council instead of the mayor's office, so that is who now appoints all members to the board, all new members to the board. From my

understanding if you want to stay on when your term is up you will be re-appointed by council. Do we know yet or not?

Paul Johnson states that current procedure is that the mayor appoints

Michelle Blanton – we are reviewing our process for our appointments thru committee now to make a rule change probably of council rules, and we are in the middle of developing that process.

Richard Verito asked and that falls under judicial, correct?

Michelle answered yes

Paul Johnson stated they are always looking for committee members, and we are lucky to have council people and committee people to serve the community

Richard Verito so we will talk about these by-laws again and will schedule a meeting to go over it. Most of this has come from the code and Hannah has worked on putting this together for us and have gone over it multiple times. Does anyone have any new business?

Paul Johnson asked do you want to touch on raising the fee for the COA application?

Richard Verito states that city council is the city, the city has a whole new fee schedule coming up, when I spoke with Jim, the city will be getting new fee schedule

Hannah stated that will have to go thru council first for all zoning permits and the COA is included in that list so when we update that we will change the fee for the COA then

Richard Verito states so right now the fee is \$25.00 for the COA. With the new procedures we will have to advertise in the paper which will cost more money per advertisement notice for it so with that, this fee has probably been in effect for at least 10 plus years or more, and as we all know the cost of things have gone up. So, the proposed discussion was to raise the fee to \$50.00 per application to try and offset some of the cost of the advertising with the notice in the newspaper cost

Richard Rhodes asked do we have to advertise it in the newspaper?

Richard Verito states that in the new code

Richard Rhoades stated we need to find some news ways to advertise, digital advertisement is the way to go these days. Scioto Post is in-effective if we are going to get people to show up and participate, we need to get it to them so that they know

Richard Verito stated I think that we can advertise the meeting in other ways to get people here, we had a discussion about maybe doing something with the city's Facebook page, and things like that, but according to the code for the moment, and correct me if I am wrong Hannah, the code states we have to post it in a newspaper at least 10 days prior to the meeting

Richard Rhoades asked the new code is the same way?

Richard Verito stated that it is in the O.R.C., so unfortunately that is where that falls, that is why we talked about doing a Facebook page for the Historic District Review Board or the city so we can put what agenda's we have or what postings there are so we are still working in that realm of things to get that

Hannah states that you have to hear an application within 30 days

Paul Johnson asked does anyone have an idea of what it costs to advertise it in the Herald, which will cover the expenses

Tami Robison stated on average it will cost \$100.00 every time we do the ad

Paul Johnson asked is \$50.00 efficient is the question

Richard Verito states if it is costing us \$100.00 then it is not

Tami Robison stated that it will depend on what applications come in as well, so if we only get 1 then no it will not cover it, but if we get in 1 or 2 or 3 that would. And as we all know sometimes, we don't get things in so therefore we don't have to post

Hannah states so like the next meeting, there won't be a next meeting because we haven't gotten anything in, so we would be off for 2 weeks

Richard Verito stated so we had this meeting here because of the AT&T thing, so I asked the city to reach out to Kevin and Curtis if they had any applications to get them in so we could have a meeting to see if we could their things looked and get them approved

Paul Johnson stated so there is a content scale if you have more than one application, but you cannot bank on that, so again I question is \$50.00 sufficient if you only have 1 applicant at a time

Richard Verito states then my thought is from the aspect of that position moving the application to the \$100.00, so, with that being said, the applicant do they need to have one application per environmental change the city stated no, it is ok to approve them all together on one application, so if they have 4 things it will only cost them \$100.00 instead of costing them, if you put it at \$50.00 add 4 things it would cost \$200.00

Paul Johnson stated so there could be some accommodating scale even in a singular applicant

Richard Verito stated if we vote on putting it at \$100.00 then that turns around and gives somebody the incentive to do multiple things in at one time so they don't have to pay multiple fees. And this being the Historical Review Board presenting a concept drawing of what they have and the materials they are using just so they can get everything they need and it doesn't have to be that final thing that you are working on. Any thoughts?

Mike Combs stated that I think a \$100.00 fee is too much. I think we would get back to people dodging, they would be like the heck with them, I am not going to pay that fee, I am just going to do it

Richard Verito asked what is the fine for just doing it? For not getting a COA and just doing it, what is the city's stance on that

Hannah Wynne answered I believe the first offense is \$500.00

Mike Combs asked but is that enforced?

Richard Verito stated that is what Hannah does. Do you know when the new fee schedule list is coming out?

Hannah Wynne answered we haven't started on it yet, we will change everything together

Richard Verito stated we have some time to think about this, but I do agree \$100.00 seems a little steep

Paul Johnson stated there is an adjustment that needs to be made. If you charge too much you discourage them from following the rules even though there is some teeth in the back end of it there will be some who will ignore it

Richard Rhoades stated that this is important as structure, this is a fix vs structure. I am not in favor of \$100.00, \$50.00 maybe. It will be nice when we could get tuned up to do everything at once. We could try a \$50.00/\$200.00 max in case the applicant forgets something, or put them on when someone else applies, stick them on with that

Richard Verito stated the code is 10 days out for the submission, so someone had to submit the application by 3:00 p.m. this afternoon in order to be on the next meeting agenda. If we were able to accept the lights today, if we were able to accept the sign today but cannot because it wasn't submitted in time.

Richard Rhoades stated I think there should be a maximum that they have to spend with us. A maximum per project, I don't know, there has to be a better way than nickel and dime forever, and then Hannah comes when you forgot one

Paul Johnson stated maybe a onetime fee for that time and that property. That property, that project for a set period of time, a year or two years, then that gives them an incentive to come back the next one to make sure you get your sign permit. Interesting way to look at that

Richard Verito stated I do like the concept of that. Is that something we can do or would that have to go to council in order for us to make that kind of change

Hannah Wynne stated you would have to go to council to change the fee, and put a section in your by-laws that would describe this with a little more detail

Richard Verito stated so this could be submitted to council with everything else your doing

Richard Rhoades stated that would give you incentive if you are the one enforcing compliance when a building is sold to be able to let them know right up front what they need to do, let them know all the rules upfront

Richard Verito stated I like this idea, let s all of us get together to write down your thoughts and idea, it is a great concept

Hannah Wynne stated that the way we have to list it is changing. In the past it has been in the public meeting section which is free, but under the new code it has to be advertised under legal notices section so we have to post the agenda and list each Certificate of Appropriateness that is coming up so that is where it costs money per word or per line or per character or something like that

Richard Verito stated that the Historic District Review Board does not have an operating budget to pay for things out of, it currently comes out of Planning & Zoning. I have been talking to Mark Bidwell on putting something together and getting some numbers together on all the things we could possibly need a year, which may be \$5000.00 in case we would have to hire in outside council or if somebody filed an appeal or needed to have a professional transcript done of meeting minutes for a court proceeding which could range from \$200.00 to \$500.00 dollars. Also, we have copies that we make along with all the other things we need to do which comes out of someone else's budget

Richard Rhoades asked does that mean someone else's budget will be cut down?

Richard Verito answered that is not my job, that is the city's job to figure out where that money comes from

Richard Rhoades stated So far, they have figured out where it comes from and that is where it comes from, and who are we to fight were it comes from. If council wants to change it and put us on our own, then we would have to worry about that. Why create something if it is not necessary? Like a budget or whatever the finance committee put together they are happy with it and who are we to try and change it

Richard Verito stated I don't know if the finance committee has put anything together, I think it just hasn't been mentioned before

Paul Johnson stated what you are trying to say is if it isn't broke don't fix it

Richard Rhoades stated exactly, why create another step in the process that is going to be monitored if we just call it Planning & Zoning who fixed up these fees, they always have so they are used to it and they are watching over it, why do we need to have a watchdog over it for a smaller piece of pie. Then would we need a secretary, treasure, etc?

Richard Verito stated that no that those things still fall within the city

Paul Johnson stated maybe we should just leave it behind the curtain

Richard Rhoades stated our fee is \$25.00, make it \$100.00 and that would get whatever you need until the project is done

Jeremy with Scioto Post – you could always have a minimum, you have to have 2 minimum coming in to cover your \$100.00 costs, and withhold the meeting until you have 2 unless its' an expedited order, and then explain to them that it will be \$100.00

Richard Verito stated I understand what you are saying but then we are holding people up on continuing their projects

Jeremy stated unless it is an expedited order then they pay the \$100.00

Paul Johnson stated so what you are saying is that they owe us \$50.00 but if they need it within 2 weeks, they would pay \$100.00 if no one else comes in

Hannah Wynne stated you have to hear the application before 30 days

ADJOURNMENT

Richard Verito asked, any new business, any comments: Do I have a motion to adjourn, Richard Rhoades made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Mike Combs. All in favor. Motion approved and meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Submitted by Tami Robison – Clerk