

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
August 13, 2014**

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Mike Rubino, Rob Priestas, Jeremy Hoyt, Tim Schacht, Jim Page, Zoning Administrator Derek Hutchinson and Code Enforcement Officer Ron Todd.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes from July 9, 2014 were approved with the following modifications: the date should read July 9, 2014, and the extra number should be removed.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: None.

ADMINISTRATION COMMENTS: Welcomed new Code Enforcement Officer, Ron Todd.

OLD BUSINESS:

Certificate of Appropriateness – Construction of 5,000 sq. ft. building- 702-714 E. 5th Street-Filed by James R. Pullins for Spider Holdings (NAPA) (tabled from July 9 and July 30, 2014)

Mr. Pratt stated referred to the letter from Jim Pullins that was passed out to the committee regarding this agenda item being tabled until the regularly scheduled meeting in September. Mr. Pratt stated that he wants to go on the record; this seems to be put on and on the agenda. He is very concerned with what we have, it not appropriate for the entrance into the City. The color they have for the new NAPA building the way they have it now is, he is hoping that they will come up with something a little more muted that goes a little more with the area.

Mr. George made the motion to table this agenda item until the regularly scheduled meeting in September. Question put, stood:

Mr. Pratt YES	Mr. Failor YES	Mr. Draughn YES
Mr. Griffin YES	Mr. Greenway YES	Mr. George YES

The agenda item was tabled to the regularly scheduled meeting in September.

NEW BUSINESS:

Certificate of Appropriateness – Changes to the exterior of an existing building-210 N. Plum Street. Filed by James Page for Flamingo Bar & Grill

Mr. Page stated that the photographs that were attached to the application, shows wood that has fallen off the building, it is difficult to repair that type of wood. He has a very good tenant and would

like to see awnings over the windows. It is three awnings over the windows and there is a nice awning over the door. It would be the same color brown canvas as the one over the door.

Mr. Pratt asked how they are going to be mounted? Mr. Page stated that the people he is buying them off of are going to mount them. They have a standard mounting procedure as you can tell by the photo that was given. Mr. Pratt stated make sure that they do not damage the exterior of the building.

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

Mr. Failor	YES	Mr. Draughn	YES	Mr. Griffin	YES
Mr. Greenway	YES	Mr. George	YES	Mr. Pratt	YES

The agenda item was approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness – Addition to ATM to existing wall-PNC Bank- 204 E. 5th Street. Filed by Mike Rubino, GPD Group for PNC Bank

Mike Rubino with GPD Group (architects for PNC Bank). PNC bank is adding walkup ATMs, and another drive through atm. He stated that this is for a walk-up ATM; it will be placed under the canopy which has been there for sometime.

Mr. Pratt asked the promotes materials for the surround? Mr. Rubino stated that it is posit plastic materials shown in the graphics that was provided. It also stated that we would have to apply for sign permit as well, the contractor would do that.

Mr. Pratt asked if you had the names of the colors? Mr. Rubino replied that the blue color is actually called PNC blue, and he does not have the names for the orange color used.

Mr. Failor stated the written materials indicate that the unit is completely in the enclosure. Mr. Rubino stated that it is going to be sticking out of that enclosure. If the structure is needed to be reconstructed it is something that could be done. Mr. Failor said I know there was a light above it is there any additional lighting being installed. Mr. Rubino stated that under that sign there, there is some lights that are being put in, that are abided by law.

Mr. Greenway stated that I am going to summarize what was just discussed: We talked about the materials and decided that is was going to be a composite plastic in PNC colors blue, orange and white. We also discussed that the planter might need to be moved depending on the exact location of the ATM.

Mr. Greenway stated conditions for approval for application of Certificate of Appropriateness in the historical district approval: the terms shall not exceed a period of two years from the approval of the date of the application. If no construction has begun within two years after the approval is granted the approval shall become null and void. The applicant shall obtain a sign permit from the City and the necessary building permits from the Union County Building Department prior to the installation of the ATM.

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

Mr. Draughn	YES	Mr. Griffin	YES	Mr. Greenway	YES
Mr. George	YES	Mr. Pratt	YES	Mr. Failor	YES

This agenda item was approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness – Construction of new off-street parking for Partners Park- 125 E. 6th. Filed by Robert Priestas, Assistant City Engineer, City of Marysville.

Mr. Priestas stated that there are two diagrams; one depicts the actual layout of the parking lot that we decided to construct for the Partners Park expansion. It was revised a little bit to the rendering to keep the garage located at 222 South Main Street to be utilized for storage for the Partners Park, for the watering vehicle for uptown flowers; the stage, chemicals for the splash pad, etc. The rendering depicts idea of what the landscaping will look like. In general the landscaping will be an extension of what is currently approved as partner's park with regard to trees and vegetation surrounding the perimeter of the parking lot. The only caveat about that is we are planning to leave two fairly mature trees on being a maple in the southeast corner of the property and the other being a somewhat large buckeye tree on the southwest corner of the property that will not be affected by the parking lot improvement. So we are hoping to preserve those and incorporate those in Partners Park.

Mr. Griffin asked so where will these trees be? Mr. Priestas stated that these trees are not going to be planted we are going to keep the existing; we would plant the two center trees to fill in that gap. Mr. Griffin asked and where would they be? The materials that were approved a green-laced park elm.

Mr. Pratt stated that overall with this parking how does that balance out to useable parking compared to what we use to have. Mr. Priestas stated that with this concept we are able to maintain two way traffic which was a major concern for the fire department and actually increased the usable parking spaces to 142, we are added 18 spaces or so to the overall uptown area. Mr. Griffin asked over what we had? Mr. Priestas stated that it is more than what we had, he stated during a typical workday in the uptown area based on occupied City Hall, we had available uptown 58 parking spaces across the street with at the lots on Sixth and Plum and Main and Sixth. With this concept with police and court moving out, we are going to have at all times 142 available spaces to the uptown area. It is an increase of almost 100 parking spaces for the uptown area.

Mr. Failor stated is the existing garage going to get updated or remain the same as it is now? Mr. Priestas stated that it will get remodeled, we are looking at gutter, and we are going to look at painting to incorporate colors that match Partners Park and City Hall. We will probably look at a logo or something or some sort of signage at a later date.

Mr. Failor stated that originally the library alley would empty out into the second lot, is it now going to empty into the first? Mr. Priestas stated that the primary plans of egress need to be through the first lot to help reduce traffic through the actual park area and adjacent to the pavilion, it also helps maintain the library book drop.

Mr. Failor stated that on the pedestrian walkway you have a painted walkway there will there be any sort of traffic control there? Mr. Priestas stated we are looking at a similar means of an alert signage like the rectangular rapid flash beacon that was incorporated in the intersection of Fifth and Vine Street to help notify any motorist of any pedestrians entering the roadway. Mr. George asked will pedestrians have the right of way there? Mr. Priestas replied yes.

Mr. Greenway stated that on the southern lot you said there are going to be nine spaces, he counted ten is there a difference in spacing on this than that? Mr. Priestas stated there is these are 9x20 and those are 10x20. We would like to incorporate larger parking space to accommodate turning elements of larger vehicles but in an effort to preserve the number of parking spaces and the garage as well, we went with a little smaller parking spaces.

Mr. Greenway made the motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Partners Park.

The question put, stood:

Mr. Griffin	YES	Mr. Greenway	YES	Mr. George	YES
Mr. Pratt	YES	Mr. Failor	YES	Mr. Draughn	YES

This agenda item was approved.

Mr. Pratt asked when are they going to see the signage since it has been six months? Mr. Hoyt stated with regards to when the signage is going to go through. The Law Director, Tim Aslaner, sent me an email that stated thought his research he found some parts in our code and in the Ohio Revised Code, that state: Signs that the City is going to erect or cause to be erected at Partners Park do not need Design Review approval. Sec. 1143.02(b), Codified Ordinances, provides that "signs erected and maintained pursuant to and in discharge of a governmental function ... are excluded" from compliance with the Sign Ordinances.

Further, Sec. 2744.01(2)(u)i ORC includes as a governmental function the "design, construction, and operation of any ... recreational area or facility, including, but not limited to a park, playground, or playfield." The design and construction of Partners Park falls within the definition of a governmental function.

The City has entered into written commitments regarding signage that name the pavilion and certain designated areas of the park. These agreements were made in order to fund the City's construction of the park, and thus directly made in furtherance of a governmental function.

Mr. Failor made a motion to add this item to the agenda as new business, in order to have formal discussions:

The question put, stood:

Mr. Greenway	YES	Mr. George	YES	Mr. Pratt	YES
Mr. Failor	YES	Mr. Draughn	YES	Mr. Griffin	YES

Mr. Failor stated he would like to have a copy of the opinion from the Law Director. Precedent would be that this building was approved and it is government use and the fire house was approved signage, and every park has been approved, it is a little curious that this would take place in this situation but he would like to see it the opinion. Mr. George would like to ask that even if it does not come into this board as a public form, when the signs will be up for public discussion? Mr. Pratt stated a third one to add to Mr. Aslaner, that this board has already ruled on the signage and has put a condition of signage in our very first approval which he may say is that stale, but Mr. Pratt believes that it is it might actually be good for Mr. Aslaner to come to the next meeting because I will tell you as a citizen and it will be my request to this board that we appeal his decision through the City process, and if it needs to go to Board of Zoning Appeals and Court it will do so. Mr. Pratt believes it is clearly an effort to circumvent systems of the City while may or may not technically be correct it smells very bad on face value.

Mr. Failor stated while Mr. Aslaner was interpreting the Code, I wouldn't mind hearing his interpretation of off premises signage. Mr. Pratt made a Motion to table this to our September meeting.

COMMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL BOARD MEMBERS: Mr. Pratt spoke about the resignation of Michael Losacco, if anyone know of anyone interested in taking his place then please get those names to Mr. DeLong so he may give them to Mr. Taylor.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.