

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
JULY 8, 2015**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Scot Draughn, Alan Seymour, John Morehart, Peter Griffin, Chris Runyan, Tim Schacht, Virginia Elliott.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** City Zoning Administrator - Derek Hutchinson, City Planner - Chad Flowers, Stephanie Seely, Andrew Sonarra, Peter Nunez Jr., Robert Wagar, Jillian Mohler, Jason Goodwin, Brad Annan, Amanda Morris, Bruce Daniels, James Mitchell, Tom Powers.

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from June 10, 2015 are changed as follows:

**COMMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL COMMISSIONERS:**

Mr. Seymour asked if we are a business friendly community or not.

It was Mr. Griffin who made the statement.

The remaining minutes were approved as presented.

**CITIZEN COMMENTS:** None

**ADMINISTRATION COMMENTS:** Mr. Flowers gave an update on staff reports; we started incorporating staff recommendations which was not on previous reports, as a way to acknowledge our review process on applications.

Mr. Hutchinson introduces Stephanie Seely, taking minutes

**OLD BUSINESS:** None

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**Application for Certificate of Appropriateness in the Historic Design Review District to permit the partial demolition of the structure and to finish the rear of the existing building located at 110 S. Court St.**

Jim Mitchell, a representative for McCarthy/Cox, states that the business on 127 W. Main St is interested in purchasing 110 S. Court St. which backs up to their property and making a physical connection between the buildings to expand the business. The garage in the rear of the property would be demolished, the office building would remain.

Mr. Draughn said the board would rule on the historic significance of the structure before demolition of the structure. The Historical society has agreed that the structure is historic but it's beyond repair. We can deem it historical or no significance due to deterioration. This is a two-fold application; the demolition of the existing structure, then the redesign of the new structure.

Mr. Draughn understands the historical significance but there comes a point in time when it becomes too great of a situation that you can't save the structure.

Mr. Seymour asks about retaining anything of the building that would be salvaged in demolition. Mr. Mitchell said there were no materials of historic significance worth saving.

Mr. Morehart asks the estimated value of the existing garage as it stands. Mr. Mitchell replied that it's in such poor condition and if you applied a depreciation factor, it would be around \$20,000 to \$30,000 mostly in materials, on the other hand in order to restore it would cost \$200,000.

Mr. Draughn moved to pass the demolition of the structure, Ms. Elliott seconded and the question put, stood:

Mr. Draughn YES; Ms. Elliott YES; Mr. Morehart YES; Mr. Schacht YES;  
Mr. Seymour YES; Mr. Runyan YES; Mr. Griffin YES

Mr. Draughn continued with the redesign of the new structure and asked for any comments. Mr. Morehart asked if any of the old materials could be used on the new structure. Mr. Mitchell replied that the garage may have some salvageable brick that could be used again. Mr. Schacht asked about ground treatment of the site. Mr. Mitchell said it would remain grass. Mr. Draughn asked about the light fixture over the back of the door of the garage. Mr. Mitchell said any fixture would stay within the time period of when the building was built. Mr. Seymour commented on the sloped roof. Also, there is a handicap ramp being added. Mr. Mitchell said there would be a sidewalk going around the side of the building to the front. Mr. Griffin stated that he thinks there would not be enough space to place the sidewalk along the side of the house. Mr. Mitchell agrees it would be tight. Mr. Draughn asked about any other mechanicals added to the structure. Mr. Mitchell said no new mechanicals will be added.

Mr. Draughn recapped: Any existing brick salvaged for new facade, landscape area returned to grass, exterior light is to mimic characteristic of existing building with the right time period, any roof work will be sloped, sidewalk leading to the handicap ramp will have access from the alley way with a wrought iron handrail, no new mechanicals.

Mr. Draughn moved to approve the redesign of the new structure, Mr. Griffin seconded and the question put, stood:

Mr. Draughn YES; Ms. Elliott YES; Mr. Morehart YES; Mr. Schacht YES;  
Mr. Seymour YES; Mr. Runyan YES; Mr. Griffin YES

**Sign Variance Request - An application for a variance request to permit four (4) canopy signs vs. two (2) canopy signs permitted for the property located at 318 E. Fifth St. in the B-R (Business Residential) zoning district.**

Bruce Daniels and Amanda Morris were present to represent Hinkley's. Mr. Daniels thinks the biggest challenge of the restaurant and the uniqueness of the house itself, is for people who are not familiar with Hinkley's, when driving by do not know what it is. Mr. Daniel's wants to add a touch of class to the property and let people know information about the restaurant is a subtle way.

Mr. Draughn asks for comments from the commissioners:

Mr. Seymour clarifies the request. A variance; they are permitted 2 signs and they are asking for 2 more. How is this different than the other 2 proposals submitted? Ms. Morris replies that we reviewed the signage plan again and wanted to look at the overall signage as a whole. We still decided to request 2 signs to keep things looking balanced. Mr. Griffin still thinks that we have a code issue. He thinks that a number of years ago, there was an extensive review of the sign code that we have now, and doesn't think that we should deviate from the code that so many people put so much time and effort into. Ms. Morris replied that it was a number of years ago and maybe it's time in some cases to take a look at the code and reevaluate because there are so many challenges in the Historic District. Mr. Daniels agrees with the code, how many signs are we going to allow a business to put on a facility? There is something that need to be taken into consideration; it is a Historic house. Traditionally Historic houses have been used as an attorney's office, a dentist, antiques shops, restaurants, offices. With Hinkley's on the front, it doesn't explain what we are. It is a real challenge to explain what we are for people who don't know. Mr. Seymour explains that with the code, there is the option for a variance, and that's what Hinkley's is requesting. They are conforming to the code by requesting a variance. Mr. Flowers adds that there are situations that allow for a variance. Ms. Elliott asks if Hinkley's had ever considered adding to the already existing sign on the front of the property? Mr. Daniel's replies that they are looking for a more richer, touch the heart kind of message. With these signs being requested, it would deliver a softer, less, in your face type of message, and add a touch of class. Mr. Schacht thinks the signs are subtle and go along with the era of the house. With the ability to grant a variance, and in situations like this, this isn't visually polluting Marysville, and think that we can grant this variance. Mr. Runyan has nothing further to add. Mr. Morehart asks if this house was on the Historical Registry? Ms. Morris said she reached out to the State, they told her it would take a while for them to get back with her. The local Historical Society did not have anything either. Mr. Seymour points out that from the beginning, Hinkley's has compromised. They are once again requesting a variance. From previous presentations they have shown that there is cause for a variance. They are in a unique situation, Marysville should be very proud that we have an upscale restaurant. What they are presenting is not detrimental, and encourages the board to approve it. Mr. Draughn adds one condition; requesting a variance for 2 additional signs with the contingency that this variance would go back to code standard if this business is no longer a restaurant.

Mr. Draughn moved to pass the variance, Mr. Schacht seconded and the question put, stood:

Mr. Schacht YES; Mr. Seymour YES; Mr. Runyan YES; Mr. Draughn YES;  
Mr. Griffin NO; Mr. Morehart YES; Ms. Elliott YES

**Certificate of Appropriateness - An application for renovation of an existing structure to be used as a Restaurant/Bar located at 326 E. Fifth St. in the B-R (Business Residential) zoning district.**

Jason Goodwin, president of Goodwin Services, representing for the restaurant.

Mr. Draughn and Mr. Goodwin discuss the run-down property and the proposed plan. It is as follows:

Landscape will remain grass; parking will have no on-site parking, off street parking; Skin and painted

CMU on the front will stay the same; garage doors made out of aluminum; board and batten is treated wood painted green to match Hinkley's; new soffit and fascia will be aluminum; there will be full bricks on the exterior of the building; steel doors; pole lights on patio will try to match Hinkley's; wall pack lighting is standard and will be dark colored; the existing windows are extremely inefficient and leak, so they will be replaced with a double pane window with the same grid as with what was existing; down spouts will match the charcoal trim; patio seating with similar umbrellas to Hinkley's, color to be brought back to city staff; using Hinkley's oversized dumpster so no additional dumpster needed; HVAC located at the rear of the building, the neighbor currently has a 6 foot vinyl fence between the properties.

Mr. Draughn asks for comments: Mr. Schacht suggests some type of vegetation along sidewalk. Mr. Griffin thinks it would be a fine addition to the community and Ms. Elliott agrees. Mr. Draughn thanks Mr. Daniels for taking an existing building in our downtown and doing something with it.

Mr. Draughn moved to pass the Certificate of Appropriateness, Ms. Elliott seconded and the question put, stood:

Mr. Runyan YES; Mr. Schacht YES; Mr. Seymour YES; Ms. Elliot YES;  
Mr. Griffin YES; Mr. Draughn YES; Mr. Morehart YES

**Certificate of Appropriateness - An application for a new roof with a change of material to the existing structure located at 124 E. Fourth St. in the B-1 (Service Business) zoning district.**

Tom Powers, Pastor of The Rock Church is looking to replace the existing roof on the property. He wants to replace with a white metal roof. Building materials: the cupula, keeping them and painting white; flashing will be placed on top of the roof and white; 1 inch ice guards towards the bottom of the roof. Mr. Draughn places a condition: The exterior plan approval shall be good for 2 years, if no work is done within that period of time, the approved exterior plan shall become null and void.

Mr. Draughn moved to pass the Certificate of Appropriateness, Mr. Runyan seconded and the question put, stood:

Ms. Elliott YES; Mr. Runyan YES; Mr. Griffin YES; Mr. Draughn YES;  
Mr. Seymour YES; Mr. Morehart YES; Mr. Schacht YES

**Certificate of Appropriateness - An application for an identification wall sign and a business window sign on property located at 100 N. Main St. in the B-3 (Central Business) zoning district.**

Jillian Mohler was present to represent the business Minutemen HR. The main sign located on the brick will be acrylic, sign colors are blue, red, and white and match the existing sign in the window. Sign is not illuminated and will be mounted with a drywall mount. The wall sign should be mounted in relation to the window moulding. The window sign is vinyl.

Mr. Draughn moved to pass the Certificate of Appropriateness, Mr. Morehart seconded and the question put, stood:

Mr. Seymour YES; Ms. Elliot YES; Mr. Draughn YES; Mr. Schacht YES;  
Mr. Morhart YES; Mr. Runyan YES; Mr. Griffin YES

**Application for Exterior Plan/Landscape Plan - An application to construct a new +/- 6,600 sq.ft. (Test Lab) building addition at the current facility of the property located at 591 Allenby Dr. in the TOC (Traffic Oriented Commercial) zoning district.**

Mark Sheppard and Sam Jeffers from Honda Lock were present. No new landscape will be provided; mechanicals will be placed on roof; lighting will match existing building; existing trash enclosure will be used just moved; the new addition and corridor connector will have the same construction of the existing building; there are 2 windows located in the office, any more windows added shall be reviewed by City staff.

Mr. Draughn moved to pass the Exterior Plan/Landscape Plan, Mr. Runyan seconded and the question put, stood:

Mr. Griffin YES; Mr. Seymour YES; Mr. Runyan YES; Ms. Elliott YES;  
Mr. Draughn YES; Mr. Morhart YES; Mr. Schacht YES

**~~Application Withdrawn - Application for Exterior Plan/Landscape Plan - An application to construct a new +/- 25,000 sq. ft. Warehouse and parking lot on property located at 15120 Industrial Parkway in the M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) zoning district.~~**

#### **COMMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL COMMISSIONERS:**

Mr. Seymour no comment, Mr. Griffin no comment, Ms Elliott is very excited to be apart of this, and it it exciting to see all the wonderful things happening in our town. Mr. Schacht welcomes Ms. Elliott. Mr. Runyan no comment. Mr. Morehart said it was a very productive meeting. Mr. Draughn congratulates Ms. Elliott on this opportunity.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 8:07 p.m.