

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
JUNE 11, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Michael Losacco, Pete Griffin, Martin Pratt, Scot Draughn, Larry George and Scott Failor. Tim Greenway was excused.

OTHERS PRESENT: Bob Parrott, Bruce Eberly, Terry Emery, Rob Priestas, Jason Hollbach, Donald Boerger, Robert Shepherd, Tom McCarthy, Tony Eufinger, JR Rausch, Anita Bailey, Richard Bailey, Karen Page, John Cunningham, Miriam Kahn, City Law Director Tim Aslaner, Code Enforcement Officer Derek Hutchinson, Secretary Barb McCoy.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes from May 14, 2014 were approved as presented.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: None.

ADMINISTRATION COMMENTS: Mr. Hutchinson reminded members of the Beautification program currently in progress. Members are encouraged to nominate properties for this award program. The inclusion of store fronts is new this year.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS:

To hear a request for a sign variance to permit a freestanding monument identification sign not permitted; B-3 zoning district. Filed by Robert B. Eberly for Shearer Banks Insurance, 118 W. 6th Street, Marysville, OH 43040.

Mr. Eberly stated he is requesting a monument sign in the front yard of this older building. It is a hardship because he feels the property should not be in the B-3 zoning district. The B-3 zoning district has 0' setback and this property has a side, front and rear setback. The church next door has a sign. It is a 186 year old brick dwelling and there is plenty of frontage.

Mr. Pratt reviewed the items in the City Planner's staff report. It appears special conditions and circumstances exist with this land. The lot, unlike most lots in the B-3 zoning district, contains a front lawn and the tree lawn by the street already has a freestanding historical marker. The literal interpretation of the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance deprives the applicant rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district. It contains an entrance that is located about 23' from the sidewalk. Even with the option of a projecting sign in the B-3 zoning district, the projecting sign can only extend 6' from the structure. It appears special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant. The zoning district does not match the built environment. It does not appear the proposed variance will be detrimental to neighboring properties. It appears the variance request meets the findings of fact under Section 1129.13 of the Planning & Zoning Code.

Mr. Griffin made the motion to approve the variance request. The question put, stood:

Mr. Failor Yes Mr. Draughn Yes Mr. Lasocco Yes
Mr. George – not present Mr. Pratt Yes Mr. Griffin Yes

The variance was approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness – To permit freestanding monument sign and wall sign; B-3 zoning district. Filed by Robert B. Eberly for Shearer Banks Insurance, 118 W. 6th Street, Marysville, OH 43040

Mr. George arrived at meeting at 6:40 p.m.

Mr. Eberly stated this is a tasteful ground sign in the front yard of the property. The current sign is mounted over the entrance of the building’s addition and is completely blocked by the large maple tree in the side yard. To avoid removing the tree, not because of the expense, but because of the beauty of the tree, they would also like to replace that sign.

The proposed low profile ground sign will have brick pillars to match the house that will be constructed of carved high density urethane that simulates weathered wood. The sign will be lit with low intensity lighting that will be recessed in the brick pillars. There will be a soft glow on the sign, although they are rarely open after dark.

Mr. Draughn made the motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness as presented. The question put, stood:

Mr. Draughn Yes Mr. Lasocco Yes Mr. George Yes
Mr. Pratt Yes Mr. Griffin Yes Mr. Failor Yes

The Certificate of Appropriateness was approved as presented.

Exterior Plan/Landscape Plan – Renovation of existing buildings and addition to a building - The Meadows Apartments – Meadows Drive. Filed by Kontogiannis & Associates Architecture Planning Design

Bob Shepherd stated the Meadows development is undergoing a minor remodeling project. They will be installing new windows, vinyl siding, HVAC and renovating the mansard roofs. There will be a small addition on one of the buildings where they are changing an office back to an apartment. Along SR 33 they are using two colors of vinyl siding to help break up the walls. The gutters will be aluminum. The doors will be metal clad or fiberglass clad painted the same color to match the green shutters. The service building will have white vinyl louvers. The window header/seal will be white vinyl. There are no new lights except a plan to straighten the existing light poles. There will be metal standing seam roof, green in color.

Mr. George made the motion to approve the Exterior Plan/Landscape Plan with the following noted:

- New vinyl windows
- New vinyl siding

- New HVAC
- Renovating the mansard roofs
- Small addition on one of the buildings from an office back to an apartment
- Using two colors along SR 33
- Gutters will be aluminum
- Doors will be metal clad or fiberglass clad painted the same color to match the green shutters
- Service building will have white vinyl louvers
- Window header/seal will be white vinyl
- No new lights except a plan to straighten the existing light poles
- Green metal standing seam roof, green in color
- Per Section 1125.01 of the Planning & Zoning Code, the applicant shall obtain a Zoning Permit prior to commencing work. Once a zoning permit is issued, work shall commence within 6 months or the permit expires

The question put, stood:

Mr. Lasocco Yes
Mr. Griffin Yes

Mr. George Yes
Mr. Failor Yes

Mr. Pratt Yes
Mr. Draughn Yes

The agenda item was approved with the above noted.

Exterior Plan/Landscape Plan – Approval of light pole banner signs – 500 London Avenue - Filed by Memorial Hospital of Union County

Jason Hollbach stated the Memorial Hospital property is a spread out campus built in pieces with 9 different entrances. The goal is to improve patient navigation. Coming to the hospital is often a stressful situation, such as in an emergency, appointment, the elderly. The banners will tie in with the entrance letters. The internal maps will be color coded for the way-finding process. He stated the material will be 8 ounce black out vinyl that helps reduce UV rays. They will switch out as often as possible. The banners are predicted to last approximately two years. They will be on a 6-8 month switch out schedule.

Mr. Pratt stated the code recommends changing out every 90 days. They are approving tonight the shape and look of the banners. City staff will approve the content.

Mr. Griffin stated he feels they look a little intrusive. It is very busy signage.

Mr. Hollbach stated there will be one banner per entrance area.

Mr. Pratt stated that is much better than what was originally presented because they first came in requesting over 30 separate banners. It is getting to look a bit like advertisement. The Planning Commission spent a year on this ordinance and we do not want to get away from the code. He stated that he would hope with over 100 directional signs on the grounds, they will pull some of them.

Mr. Hollback stated that is one goal with these banners.

Mr. Griffin made the motion to approve the request with the following noted:

- Fiberglass rods that are white with stainless steel band
- 8 oz. blackout vinyl expected life span at least 2 years
- 6-8 months change out
- Campaign will be on 90-day turnover

Question put, stood:

Mr. George Yes

Mr. Pratt Yes

Mr. Griffin Yes

Mr. Failor Yes

Mr. Draughn Yes

Mr. Lasocco Yes

The agenda item was approved with the above noted.

**Certificate of Appropriateness – Demolition of existing structures – 222 S. Main Street
– Filed by City of Marysville**

Mr. Pratt said procedurally tonight all witnesses will be sworn in.

Mr. Aslaner, Law Director for the City of Marysville, stated he is present on behalf of the City for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of 222 S. Main St. This house sits directly south of the proposed Partners Park and across from the fire house. The City is in the process of building an exceptional park uptown. The house is currently owned by the Bailey’s, technically owned by the Bailey Trust. They bought the building 2002 and are currently renting it out as a church office. We are here tonight because the house is within the Historic Design Review District which was established in 2006 by City Council. It is a rather large district as it goes all the way out to Five Points on the east side of town. The original historic plan was submitted to the National Register in 1978 that did not actually include the parcel at 222 S. Main Street. The area in the Historic Design Review District is much broader than the original historic district that was contemplated by the City in 1978. The Mayor has been given authority by City Council to enter into a proposed purchase contract with the owners of the property for its appraised value. The short term goal for the property is for parking for the uptown area. This is the short term goal for the property due to its strategic location of the property. Obviously that can change over the years. In accordance with City Code 1136.13, the City is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the house. With the paperwork the Board has been given, attached is a report by Miriam Kahn to see if it has historical significance by using objective criteria. City Code 1136.13 states this Board has to determine if this property carries historical significance. That is the burden.

There is clearly a difference between a structure that is old and one that is historically significant. After having talked with Mr. Parrott with the Historical Society, that is the sole inquiry here – does it have historical significance? If it does not, Certificate of Appropriateness can be granted and the owner can do what they want, demolish the house if they so choose. If it does have historical significance, then it is not so dilapidated, it does not have to be torn down. The inquiry here today is does it carry historical significance. You also have a letter from Mr. Bob Parrott with the Historical Society who argues on

behalf of the Society that the house does have historical significance and that it should not be torn down. The City respects the Historical Society and respects the preservation of Marysville's historically significant homes and buildings but we disagree with Historical Society's position in this case. It is old and we don't disagree that a mayor lived there and built the house. But we do disagree that the house has historical significance because it was built in the 1850's and a mayor once lived there.

Mr. Aslaner stated we have a report from Miriam Kahn that discusses whether the house made any significance in the broad pattern of our history. Using the National Register and using objective criteria we disagree that the house has historical significance. Mr. Aslaner reviewed Ms. Kahn's letter and her being present to discuss her research. She looked at the national register to see how the criteria are applied. The first criteria - that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. No one has put forward a broad pattern of any significant events of any one that has lived in that house. Secondly, structures associated with lives and significant persons in our past. This is the probably the particular criterion that needs to be discussed the most because a prior mayor lived in this house. A prior mayor that doesn't have any biological sketch as far as I know and after he served his term left Marysville and moved to Nebraska and eventually passed away. There's been no judgment or biography of Mr. Frank or of Mr. Sellers who apparently bought the house shortly after Mr. Frank moved. That is extremely important. If someone with a historic title lived there, it needs to be evaluated to see if they may be important. There have been over 60 different mayors for the City. Until the mid 1960's when the Marysville started to expand, most if not all of the mayors lived in what is now considered historic district of Marysville. The fact that a mayor once lived in this house does not make it historical, it just doesn't. The third criterion is again objective. Structures that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction. Is the person who constructed the house someone that is a master or has a history of distinction? The house has a very small blueprint and has been modified on more than one occasion. There is no allegation or argument it has any architectural design that needs preserved. The porch has been enclosed, additions made, etc. The house has been architecturally modified - there has been no allegation that the house carries any distinctive design or anything that says the house needs to be preserved. The blueprint of the house does not even come close to the house that was built in 1850. It didn't have any architectural features to begin with.

Mr. Aslaner said Terry Emery is present tonight to share a light of the history of the decision of purchasing this house and why we are here tonight asking for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the house. Mr. Aslaner stated Tom McCarthy, a 5th generation resident of Marysville is here to speak. We have John Cunningham and Karen Page here also to speak. They are informed Marysville citizens. They do not know who Mr. Frank or Mr. Sellers are. They have driven by that house hundreds if not thousands of times and had no idea the historical significance of that house.

Mr. Pratt swore Miriam Kahn in.

Ms. Kahn reviewed her credentials and her experience in the field of historical preservation. In reviewing the process of her reviews she stated the National Register does not include this property.

Mr. Lasocco asked Ms. Kahn if there are two different issues because of her presentation on the Federal National Register criteria.

Ms. Kahn explained how the National Register that was done in 1978 for Marysville does not include 222 S. Main – it only includes the original downtown. It stopped at E. 6th Street. Every building had to be evaluated to be seen if it was historically significant and to see if it contributed to the history of Marysville. The house at 222 S. Main nor the house south of there was not included in that evaluation. The Marysville Historic Review Board District was expanded to include this house. She further explained the federal district guidelines.

Mr. Pratt explained why the district was expanded – to make Main and 5th Street more of a gateway into the Historic District. Still want every house to be reviewed even though it may not be historical.

Mr. Griffin stated he was involved in this process and the Board wanted a larger district. It was not practical to stop the district where it was.

Ms. Kahn stated even though it is in Marysville's district, it is important to review the federal criteria. That is subjective. She reviewed how it would be part of the National Register. It would have to be reviewed locally, at the state level and then federally at the National Park level. They ask three questions in the application. Is it over 50 years old? Yes it is. Is it significant to the state, local or federal history? The answer is probably not. Does it have historic integrity; are all the original features of the house still there? No, it does not. If you answer one or more of these questions with a no, it is over on the national level.

Miriam Kahn stated she understands this old building is not historically significant. It's not architecturally significant. The external features of the building have not been maintained. Could not photograph any ornate woodwork. Inside has been modified so that she could not identify the original floor plan or the original flow of the building, even when looking in the basement. No longer a dirt floor. The brick blocks that would be there in 1850 are no longer there. The ceilings from the basement are not large plant boards. No evidence of the original heating system or illumination system. No original electric lines. That shows the building has been significantly modified. On the federal level that would eliminate the building from being acceptable. Ms. Kahn stated William Frank purchased the lot in 1848 and built the house in 1850. He was a mayor and a coroner. She reviewed his biography stating he is not on the 1860 census in Union County. George Sellers was born in Maryland and shows up on the 1860's census. He was a tanner and lived in the house. He served in the Union army and came back and opened a tannery. He then had local grocery but did not open a chain in Ohio. Those are some of the ways I used to evaluate the house.

Mr. Pratt asked if Ms. Kahn has ever done work in Marysville.

Ms. Kahn stated no, other than title work. She reviewed projects she has been involved with but never in any historical district of a City.

Mr. Failor stated it is down to the building not being historical. The architectural footprint has been changed. There is less concern about other criteria such as the Federal Register, only interested in Marysville. How these residents contributed to the history of Marysville. Mr. Frank had pretty prominent roles in the City as mayor and coroner.

Ms. Kahn stated while they were early settlers, it is important if they made a difference in the City of Marysville. Did living in that house contribute to their career? Did living in the house make him mayor and coroner? It is a hard sale at the state level to find him influential, even to Columbus. Mayors are important but did he contribute to the political landscape to this area of the state. Mr. Sellers was a prominent citizen and had a grocery store. Was he important and did it make a difference that he lived in that building. He had a grocery store...but has anyone ever heard of Sellers grocery store until now. Was he important to a grocery store movement in Ohio? That would be something to think about. Did he nurture the agriculture movement and influence the farmers who grew the products that they sold to him. Just because the house is old doesn't mean it is significant. Unfortunately, he does not meet those criteria. If you want to say he was very important to the City of Marysville, that is something you can say.

Mr. Failor stated we are held to no architectural or no historical significance. What we are asking you is there no historical significance at all?

Ms. Kahn said she did not think so. If he was important to the grocery store movement, it would be pretty hard stretched to say he did. I have never heard of Sellers Grocery Store, although there are a lot of smaller grocery stores.

Mr. Pratt read City Code 1136.05(a)(3) which states "Its identification with a person who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City." Our code actually takes it down a step. Historic is extremely important. Based on that, would you give the same answer?

Ms. Kahn stated she did not think it is historical. Did Mr. Sellers really contribute to the agricultural movement with things in his store? She continued her discussion on whether these people contributed to the City in changing the direction of the City. Did Mr. Frank go on to be state representative, senator or governor or another office in the State of Ohio?

Mr. Aslaner stated in applying criteria, does the fact that an individual from the past held a prominent position, like a mayor or surgeon, is that in itself historically significant? Is there any criterion that speaks to that?

Ms. Kahn discussed, as stated in her letter, the National Register Criterion B applies to properties that are associated with individuals whose specific contributions individually have been identified or documented. Within that, one of the questions about applying the criterion about the significance of the individual – person must be individually significant within a historic context, politics, agriculture, etc. A property is not eligible if its only justification for significance is that it was only used by a person who was a member of an identifiable profession, class or social or ethnic group. One way to be eligible is if you were a doctor, mayor or a merchant, but not eligible if that person did not contribute significantly. If that person did not contribute significantly in a scholarly manner. The most you can find out about Mr. Sellers is going to be in the newspaper in small tidbits. Perhaps looking at his small political footprint. When you look even at the local area, it just doesn't stand perhaps as much as some of the other mayors or merchants do.

Anita Bailey was sworn in by Mr. Pratt.

Ms. Bailey reviewed the history of their ownership of the property, the renovations and who has occupied the building since their purchase. She stated it was purchased in 2001 for \$121,000 with \$65,000-\$70,000 renovation. They occupied the building until 2006 when another real estate agent rented it and then the church rented it and has been there since.

Mr. Pratt asked if there was ever any discussion to the age of house and not making changes.

Ms. Bailey stated no. The only way they knew the property was in the historic district was they wanted to repaint the shutters because they were faded and they painted basically the same color. It came up with the City at that time. They removed layers and layers of wallpaper and nothing ever fell out of the walls to lead them to believe it was historical. She stated she had never heard of Mr. Frank or Mr. Sellers. Ms. Bailey stated the house has aluminum siding and asphalt shingles.

Tom McCarthy was sworn in by Mr. Pratt.

Mr. McCarthy stated his family has been involved in businesses around the City for many years. He feels he is part of the community. He has a building around the corner and this Board helped make decisions about the brick and other items several years. He has tried to preserve the history of our City. He was once a county commissioner and was involved with the restoration of the Veterans Memorial auditorium and the courthouse. He also appreciates the passion the historical society has. They are the conscience of the community and make them double check where they are. My father is on the Board of the Historical Society and I am a member of the Historical Society. However, he does not see at this point where this building is historical. It has lost any significance it once may have had. He reviewed several buildings that have historical significance by the general appearance of them. He stated he does not think you should simply tear down buildings for parking lots. There isn't a lot of family lure that I can see. No family member of the Frank's or the Sellers' is coming forward. The City has made a significant investment in this City Hall saving an old historic building in the process. He stated he is not in favor of going away tearing down old buildings and putting in parking lots. The City is asking property owners downtown to preserve and make their buildings viable. There are more tough calls to be made. The building may be old but doesn't rise to being significant. There may be some houses in downtown that need to be removed to make downtown viable. If businesses are not viable, you have a lot of empty storefronts.

Mr. Pratt swore in John Cunningham.

Mr. Cunningham stated he was once on the Design Review Board for 12 years and faced similar type decisions. He relocated to Marysville wanting to buy an old house, which he did. He fell in love with his home and Marysville. He was a member of the Uptown Revitalization Team. The Design Review Board has made a significant difference since their conception. He feels this specific property does not meet the criteria of historical significance. He discussed Mr. Frank and Mr. Sellers and their significance with the City. He asked who in this room knew their names until a month and a half ago.

Karen Page was sworn in by Mr. Pratt.

Karen Page stated she has lived in Marysville for over 30 years and they have rehabbed several houses and buildings in that time. She stated she highly respects Mr. Parrott. Unfortunately, she agrees with Mr. McCarthy. There is not a Frank Road or Sellers Road. Somewhere they got lost in the history.

Mr. Aslaner stated the house is old, the City is not disputing the house is old. Up until a few weeks ago the people that lived was unidentifiable. He is asking the Board to find it has no historical significance and allow a Certificate of Appropriateness is granted.

Mr. Pratt swore in Bob Parrott.

Bob Parrott reviewed his history with Marysville and the Historical Society. He stated he has been president of the Historical Society for 25 years. He has been involved in many projects. He stated he is very familiar with the history of Marysville and the buildings in Marysville. He helped draft the current version of the City Code for the City that helps protect the buildings in the historic district. Pulled out a few of the reason why this code is important. He stated the code that states the historic structures are considered assets that establish the character of this community. The historic building has meaning and livability to our City. The historic building effects economic, social, historical and cultural well being of this community both to the residents and also visitors to this community. These buildings are important that they be protected for the City. The Code states The Design Review Board shall review Certificate of Appropriateness applications for this Design Review District and shall ensure that all the provisions of this Chapter are enforced. The Board must determine if this building has no architectural or historical significance. Chapter 1136 stating 1136.13 states if the building has NO historical significance – not low, not medium – but NO historical significance. The City stipulated it does have economic use. It has been used since the first day it was built. It is not deteriorating. The only issue before this Board tonight is if this building has no historical significance. This is how the Board is required to vote.

Section 1136.05(a) 1-8 is very clear, especially 1, 3, & 4 are applicable. Its character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage of cultural characteristic of the City of Marysville. Its identification with a person who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City. Its exemplification of the cultural, economic, social or historic heritage of the City. This is what you look at, nothing else. This is a 164 year old building. Its age is all that you need to look at. That's the code. You don't have that many 164 year old buildings left in this our Historic District. When the town was platted it was here. It is totally healthy and completely usable. It is viable and in good condition. Why destroy a healthy building. They don't want this building. They want a parking lot. They don't want the old building, they want something else. This building is viable. It was the original building on that lot. This is the exact type of building the code is meant to protect. If you don't agree that the age of the building is not enough, the people who contributed to the development of our City are significant.

Mr. Parrott reviewed the biographies of Mr. Frank and Mr. Sellers as stated in his letter to the City dated April 20, 2014. Mr. Frank came to Marysville in 1837. In 1839 he became Justice of the Peace. He purchased the lot in 1848. He built his home in 1850 and he has strong reason to believe he built his own house with his carpenters. House was built very well. He was one of the leading businessmen in town. Mr. Sellers lived in the house the longest from 1862 to 1914. He ran one of the leading tannery businesses in town where the old City Hall was located. He established the old Union Banking Company in the old Oakland Hotel. He ran a grocery in town. He formed an infantry in the Civil War

and fought for the Union Army. John L. Sellers, his son, became a Major and led the local company in Cuba and Puerto Rico in the Spanish American War. The large collections of items from that war at the historical society are from John L. Sellers.

Mr. Parrott stated he wanted to discuss one of the other factors - Its exemplification of the cultural, economic, social or historic heritage of the City. What the building shows are the size, age and shape and the character and style of a home in the 1850's. He stated some people think only log cabins were built in the 1850's but that is not true. This is exactly what a building looked like in the 1850's. We had saw mills that made lumber in the 1850's and brick factories. Mr. McCarthy stated tonight it is small and plain it's not a Marysville mansion. It was a Marysville mansion in 1850 - it did not have to be a large house. This is type of building a person with Mr. Frank's status built in 1850. If you remove it, you don't have it. It shows the culture at the time. If you don't have it you will have a gap in that period of history.

The City says the building was not exactly as it was when it was built in 1850. They say because it's not exactly as it was in 1850 it is not historically significant. To put that in perspective the church staff would have to be using kerosene lamps and the building would have dirt floors. This is what I call the Amish argument. You are not going to find any building that is exactly as it was when it was first built. Every house and building is not exactly the same. Every single older building has changes from its original state. Inside of buildings and outside of buildings have changed. The buildings have all changed. Mr. McCarthy's building is 1875 building. It is all renovated on the inside and changes have been made to the exterior. The inside has been completely changed. It has a modern balcony on top. There was not a balcony based on the City's argument, Mr. McCarthy's building would not be historic today and could be demolished and that is not true. Mr. McCarthy's father's building where the Sherwin Williams Paint store is located has been completely gutted on the inside and updated. That is an 1869 building. All buildings in downtown are historic even though there have been cosmetic changes. The building does not have to look like it did when it was constructed to be historic. People have said they have never heard of William Frank's history so it's not historic. What is the remedy? Let's educate the people so they will know what the building really is. What is the remedy? Take the siding off, remove the enclosed porch, and try to make it look like it once did, not demo the building.

The City hired a lady away from Marysville. It doesn't come to any of your gentlemen's attention that the person they paid comes up with a report to demolish the building. That is the way it is done. If someone from Steubenville came to me and said there is an old building they want demolished and I reviewed that building and I have never lived there, I have no interest there, I will never live there. I don't care.

Mr. Parrott stated about 95% of her report was based on the National Register of Historic Places. That is looking at something that is not in the code and making the decision. That is not the way it is. You look at our own code and that is what the board is supposed to look at. One house, the Henderson House is the only building in the City that is on the National Historic Register. Based on the City's evaluation every building in the downtown does not meet the criteria of being historic and that is not the case here.

The last part of that report states that the historic and architectural nature of the building is not significant and its former 19th century residents in the 1800's were not relevant to the City. That's the only one that applies. It makes me angry because if someone is going to tell us who is important or

who is not important to early Marysville or important to our town's history, that person better know what they are talking about. That person better be an expert on the City of Marysville, know the history of Marysville and know the history of every building in the downtown area and the people from Marysville. How is she an expert of Marysville. She received the call from Tim Aslaner on May 16 so in one week she found out all the information she needed to render a decision. I believe all the history she found is all in a period of seven days. I don't consider that an expert.

Which is the more reliable? They can only tear it down if there is no historical significance. How reliable is the information they are giving you? They have to give you the information they have given you for that decision to be made the way they want it to go. I don't argue the buildings in the historic district should be preserved. That decision was made in 1991. The existing City Code spells out what is required.

The Board has information given to you by two different sources. What needs to be determined is the following: The building is an important example of a home built in the 1850's. It is a 164 year old survival pioneer of the beginning days of our town. It is connected to importance to individuals of the early beginnings of our town. It is a look at the type of structures that began in our City. For these reasons it is important you find that this house does have historical significance and therefore the City's applicant should be denied.

Mr. Draughn asked if there are still walking tours of the history of Marysville.

Mr. Parrott said there is one through the library.

Mr. Draughn asked if it is on any of the walking tours.

Mr. Parrott said there is one by the Historical Society and it's not on that one. But to follow that up the house south owned by Sarge Chamberlain was constructed in 1839 and is also not on that tour.

Mr. Draughn asked if at the time it was built, was it a City hub, anything other than somebody's house that they thought they wanted a house right here.

Mr. Parrott stated the reason this house was built was probably because it was close to his factory and same for Mr. Sellers - it was close to his tannery. This is a great section of the City. Chamberlains house and Don Frazier's building are other examples. That is a great section of our City there that needs to stay intact. The City could want more parking. He stated he is concerned about this being a precedent and more parking will be requested.

Mr. Draughn asked if there is anything from the house from the 1850's. It's been remodeled, it's been added onto. Are even the bones of the house from 1850?

Mr. Parrott stated he was actually more impressed with his tour of the house. He stated he is not sure anything in the interior should be considered because this Board does not deal with interior. Every single building is changed on the interior. He discussed the tour stating some of the original wood work still remains and it appears the panes of wavy glass are excellent examples. We have the right to remove certain things if you do demolish it and the glass we would want. There is little change from time it was

built. Original footprint seems to be unaltered. The porch was enclosed at the entryway and kitchen built on at rear. Original building replaced with current garage. Discussed German Village in the 1960's and how people have renovated the houses.

Mr. Draughn asked if Mr. Sellers was involved in any particular Civil War battles.

Mr. Parrott stated he would have to research that. He formed the Company from here that fought, that is why that is important.

Mr. Draughn stated there were a lot of those from this area. He asked Mr. Parrot how many people lived in Marysville at this time... more than a thousand, less than a thousand?

Mr. Parrott stated he didn't know, he would have to research but he would guess definitely fewer than 5 – I would guess in the range of 2,500.

Mr. Pratt stated this sat in front of City Council for 2 ½ months and no one commented except Mr. Boerger. Did you not feel it was the not the time to speak up until later?

Mr. Parrott stated on March 17 is when the archivist was approach by the City and he did the research finding Mr. Frank purchased the property in 1848 and built the house in 1850 with the rest of the information. That was before the application was filed. I contacted the mayor and had a discussion with the Mayor. Rob Priestas contacted me on March 31. I reviewed the time frame stating the Historical Society is not required to make a report until the official application is given to him by City Staff after receipt of the application, which wasn't until May. Before any contract was ever signed, before any resolution was every passed, they knew it was in the historic district and they didn't embrace the history. They fought it.

Mr. Draughn asked if any pictures exist in case anyone wanted to restore it.

Mr. Parrot stated he did not believe so.

Mr. Draughn asked if the original siding is underneath or the shutters original?

Mr. Parrott stated he did not check on that and the shutters are not original but they are not original on Shearer Banks building either.

Mr. Lasocco asked if one could make a legitimate case of historical significance based on age alone.

Mr. Parrott stated that is how he feels, that is enough. How much older would it have to be to be protected.

Mr. Pratt asked if the code supports that. Similar to how you stated Ms. Kahn's research is not supported by the code, do you feel our code supports that.

Mr. Parrott stated the code supports that. By definition that makes it historic.

Mr. Pratt wanted to go on record that Mr. Parrott did a nice job but ultimately they must go by the code. The eight items in the code. I truly believe #3 is an important section to him. An individual who made a significant contribution to the City.

Mr. Failor asked if it has no historical significance.

Mr. Parrott stated he didn't see how anyone can say it has absolutely no historical significance.

Tony Eufinger – 629 W. 7th Street. Mr. Eufinger stated he wasn't asked to be here tonight but he read the article in the paper. He stated he is a 5th generation resident. The history of Marysville is very important to his family. He has renovated a building on Court Street. The building at issue today does come down to definition in code. One word is significance or significant. - Synonyms include importance, consequences, meanings, compelling, and understanding. Not people who have lived in the residence, but do the structure have architectural significance. Can argue the Hardy home in Marion is historical not because he lived there but because he ran a presidential campaign from the porch of that structure. A former mayor does not make it significant but what you do in that office. There is no doubt Mr. Frank contributed to the community at the time. But they have not been able to point to any action or consequence as his service as mayor. Mr. Sellers was a banker and tanner. That may have been important at the time, but the lasting consequence to the community is long gone. The structure is where they lived, where they cooked their meals and raised their families. No political movement or action was done in this building. The architectural features are not original. Mr. Eufinger reviewed several people and buildings that appear to be historically significant. Some economic use – every property has economic use that can generate some money or profit. Original structure is not there – it has modern looks and design. It is not the same building as Shearer Banks building. Same brick façade is there, etc. The decision the Board makes will set a precedent. Some are concerned of future progress of community and some want to draw a line in sand that this is too much, one building too much. It's a nice building. The owners have done a good job in putting it in the condition it is. However it's a modern office building, not a historic building. You can find bits and pieces that might be special or important in any building. The building as a whole lacks a significance. There is no question where this Board should come down.

Donald Boerger – 420 E. 5th Street resident. He stated no matter what vote is tonight, no one should be angry. He stated Mr. Parrot has done a beautiful job. He discussed his opinion on how both parties have presented their sides fully. For so many years people have not taken care of the historical history of the buildings in this City. He discussed his own property how they did not renovate historically but at the time they were unaware of what that was. Historical preservation is very important to every community. It is the City's job and people like Mr. Parrott to preserve the communities. He stated he gives Mr. Parrott and the City credit for preserving many buildings in the community to date. Encourage administration to look at other ways to preserve in the future. The Fire Station is step in right direction. Whatever decision made, both parties did fantastic job.

Mr. Aslaner stated he is representing the City. The City administration wholeheartedly respects the work the historical society does. He knows it is extremely important to the culture and history of the City of Marysville. Although this building is old, it is not significantly historic. Tony did a very open job of stating that is the benchmark here. If the code wanted to say a building is historic if it is old, the code would state that. Anybody who had a real life that lived in a house that was built in the 1850's

does not translate into “significant”. Historical Society is trying to argue that any house that is old cannot be torn down. That is a slippery slope here. People in this country have the right to use their own property. If this Board disapproves an application for demo permit just because it is old, anyone that lives in an old house will not be able to demolish it, no matter what. Regardless what, that is a slippery slope argument this Board needs to be careful of.

Mr. Pratt stated that based on 1136.13(a), does this building have historical significance or not based on 1136.13.05? He pointed out this is important, once this decision is made if it is for demolition, there is no going back. We heard a lot of information.

Mr. Failor stated in Subsection 3(a) – 4 is more important than 3. I am not a Marysville native so I looked on line and there wasn’t a bank in the City until it was started by Mr. Sellers. At this time in American history cabinet making, tannery, etc., was intriguing. But starting a bank was a cultural example of its time. When you look at what going on at the time, the people did exemplify the economic social history of that time. We heard a lot about the people. Not sure of the importance of that. If writing code today, he would make it clearer. I struggle with no significance.

Mr. Pratt stated when we vote on the following, we must decide if this building has no historical significance.

Mr. Failor made the motion that this building has no historical significance. A yes vote means there is no significance. A no vote means there is significance. Question put, stood:

Mr. Pratt Yes	Mr. Griffin No	Mr. Failor No
Mr. Draughn Yes	Mr. Lasocco No	Mr. George Yes

Vote was 3-3.

Discussion was held by Mr. Aslaner on how the motion was made. A motion should be made to grant the application for the Certificate of Appropriateness. Mrs. McCoy stated the motion should be in the affirmative.

Mr. Draughn made the motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the structure located at 222 S. Main Street. Question, put, stood:

Mr. Griffin No	Mr. Failor No	Mr. Draughn Yes
Mr. Lasocco No	Mr. George Yes	Mr. Pratt No

Vote was 2 Yes and 4 No. The Certificate of Appropriateness was not approved.

COMMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Pratt encouraged every resident to do something because we have a history in this City. Third time in two years I’ve seen buildings going done that had some kind of historic story behind them that we had never heard of before it came to that point. We must find out what is going on with the buildings. I had no idea the first City Hall was actually on this property. That’s a pretty serious thing. All of us as a

community need to do a better job of recognizing our history.

Terry Emery stated before they got started on this project, I was standing in the Mayor's office with the executive assistant and the Mayor approached the vice chairman of the historical society when he was in his office and gave him a description of their project and asked if that building had a historic history and he said no it didn't. We believed at that point we had enough information to comfortably move forward. As we moved forward, the City would ask Historical Society and City representatives to approve our project. You would have thought the vice president of the Historical Society would have been a valid person to ask. It would have been better for him to say let me do a history review on that. That was a huge impact on the direction the City went. We are being asked to do things to try to provide resources to help uptown businesses. We were beginning with the right channels and we were not given information we needed.

Mr. Cunningham stated does it have historical designation, no it doesn't. Better question is it historically significant.

Mr. Draughn stated he goes back to this not being on walking tour. Now it is historical. I too am very strong about the history, I am an architect. He knows history, he knows buildings. The buildings do get destroyed. When they have been destroyed beyond recognition and you can't tell what year it was built, or you have to guess, then you have gone past it.

Mr. George asked if the building was in disrepair or shabby looking, would the Board have the same decision that was made tonight or because it is well maintained, the decision was made. Appreciate Bob's report.

Mr. Failor stated said there were some questions about the intended use. The question is not about the intended use. It's about the existing structure. Everyone here supports Partner's Park and the work that is being done there. The way the code is written today made him make the decision he did. The decision was made on two experts' opinions, not on the Historical Society.

Mr. Griffin stated everyone is much more aware and there is much better appreciation for this City.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.