**DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION**

**MINUTES**

**SEPTEMBER 9, 2021**

**10:00 A.M.**

**RAVENNA CITY HALL CONFERENCE ROOM**

Rick Hawksley called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Cliff Soudil – present

 Ted Manfrass – absent

 Patrick Madonio – present

 Rick Hawksley – present

 Angie Reedy – absent

 Diana Kane – present

Eric Hummel – present (10:09am)

Larry Silenius (resident)

 Cheryl Wood (Councilwoman)

 Diane Smith (Record Courier reporter)

**Approval of August 12, 2021, minutes:** Cliff Soudil moved to accept the minutes as written. Diana Kane seconded the motion. All in favor.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**City website:**

* Bob Finney – 1. Map showing the Historic District

2. 1434 Ordinance

3. Guidelines

* Rick Hawksley – Link to the historic properties. Regional Planning is working on making a database of historic properties in Ravenna & also out in Township.
* Bob – Could submit to our IT next week, but guidelines are outdated. We can do the 2014 guidelines as they are and when the 2014 guidelines are revised to the 2021 guidelines, then he can just swap that out.

**Design Review Guidelines:**

* Rick – Bob & Rick breezed through the guidelines and did some marking up of the guidelines. Highlighted what they thought with changes.
* Rick: - made a change to Pg. 6 (which should actually be Pg. 5) with Note, Section on Signs moved towards rear of document 1/10/2016 at the bottom of the page. Stated that what’s confusing is that there is a sign code in the building book and then there’s also a sign section in the Design Review’s standards.

- Sign section is organized very carefully like the zoning code. When Ravenna created the DRC, it’s based on blessings from the Ohio Historic Preservation standards, to which they will comply with historic standards.

- Asked if it was an issue that the signs section gets moved to the back to Pg. 13 based on the principles found in preservation briefs?

* Eric Hummel – He feels that it’s perfect to move the sign section to the back because the Building section should be first.
* Rick - The DRC does not have any jurisdiction, per say, over the final decision about colors of the building; they don’t need to come before the DRC. If someone wants to paint the front of their building, they don’t need to come before the DRC.
* Bob - Has been requiring all façade changes, be it paint, awning or siding, to come before the DRC.
* Rick - In the first paragraph under Building Exteriors, the word “may” has been used versus “shall”. Brought up Vance’s Creamery’s pastel colors that they went ahead and painted. Their pastel sign and they painted the stonework below with the pastel colors.
* Cliff Soudil - Nothing in there to need a Building Permit to paint. Since there is nothing in there in regard to painting.
* Rick - Just wanting clarification because it’s an issue. Some people think that buildings are signs. Where does the DRC role start & stop as a commission?
* Diana - Is there some difference between paint & brick compared to siding? Thought that there was some difference historically between painting over stone, brick, concrete & siding and maybe there should be some mediation on that.
* Rick - Section on Masonry that the Secretary of the Interior Standards that does not recommend painting over brick or stone.
* Bob - The guidelines have no meaning if this Commission has no teeth. Why are they meeting if there’s no teeth? In the end, City Council will have to approve these guidelines, so City Council will have to make the decision if the Design Review, how are they going to continue to exist. Just being an advisory committee to simply say that if you need them, then you can get their advice, if not, then the group can dissolve because there’s no purpose. Crossroad that it’s at before there’s any review of the guidelines or anything else. Decide what teeth this group has – is it only advisory. If there’s been three (3) denials on an application, does it need to go to Council. He’d prefer to see it go to Planning Commission. Planning Commission would be more of the planning end of things. If the word “shall” keeps getting removed, then the DRC has no purpose. Feels that they need to stop and go through the guidelines and make some decisions.

Jumped to Ordinance 1434 things on the table.

**Ordinance 1434 discussion:**

* Cliff: - What’s the point in having Ordinances that no one wants to or will enforce. Has a back pocket full of notes that are out there that haven’t been enforced. Believes the DRC should be advisory and keep their hands out of people’s property rights.
* Bob - If “may” is put in every place that the word “shall” is, then why are they there. If Design Review modified them, sent them to City Council….. modified them, voted to approve, sounds like there would be a 4-to-1 vote, which they would get pushed on to City Council for approval. Does the DRC want to move forward with the guidelines or send it to council for them to decide before more time is spent on it.
* Rick - To date, there is some proposed changes….Larry’s made some proposed changes to the Ordinance as well as the guidelines. He’s made them to the DRC and to City Council.
* Bob - Monday night, council is going to review the changes that the DRC made and will review what the Design Review wants/agrees to change.
* Rick - Asked if someone needed to show up Monday and defend what has been proposed.
* Cliff - It’s going back to council. Is it even legal with the way it’s being handled. Stated that Rob Kairis is stepping out of procedural steps to handle this correctly.
* Cheryl Wood - Stated that she had questioned at the City Council meeting why Larry’s c omments were not included at the meeting with what he, Rob Kairis, had received because they were going into the third (3rd) reading. She was confused by it herself. In her opinion, everything should have been included entirely from the start. They are hoping to see everything at Committee on Monday.
* Rick - Stated that he was under the assumption that the DRC was going to talk about everything and then tell the council what they thought. He also stated that he wasn’t sure why it was being discussed at council before the DRC could even tell council what they thought.
* Larry - Stated that changing the guidelines is going to be a separate issue in the future. What is being discussed right now with council is the laws, Chapter 1434. The guidelines when the DRC is working on and when they present them to council, will have to be okayed by council, but that’s a separate issue in the future.
* Bob - Table this until it gets ironed out, which he is meaning the DRC Guidelines.
* Rick - All Rob had sent was changes to Chapter 1434. Nothing about…..one of the changes was that City Council should review the DRC’s changes.
* Cliff - Also what Larry has proposed.

**Guidelines (reverted back):**

* Rick - What has been collected over the last several years, has been clarifications; do they allow them to paint brick….long discussions about discouraging people from painting brick. Put a footnote and refer to the Secretary of Standards and Preservation Briefs that go into detail. Clarifying gutter situation. Larry had proposed about siding and signs. Obsolete signs and making sure that they’re removed. Briefly talked about demolition of buildings. Do they need to have anything separate in their guidelines, about something in the Historic District.
* Bob - Go through Larry’s recommendations.
* Rick - Go to the 1434 proposed and get that done.

**1434 Ordinance (reverting back to this) - Suggestions from Larry Silenius:**

* Rick - 1434.04(a): Bypasses the review by the DRC if the repair is needed that does not change the shape of the structure.
* Eric - #3 to where there’s a $100 fine per day provision.
* Cliff - Larry’s asking to have that one removed because there’s already a $100 fine that he (meaning Bob Finney) if the standards aren’t followed. So, there’s a 2-$100 fines if possible; we’ve put an ordinance on top of an ordinance.
* Larry Silenius – Two (2) things: $100/day fine applies to:
1. Doing something without the proper permits. It’s illegal in the whole city, covered in chapter 1472.
2. The same applies to letting a building deteriorate.

 - Suggesting to get rid of the $100 fine in chapter 1434. That leaves a bad taste in people’s mouths and it’s not necessary because it’s already covered for the entire city.

* Rick - Stated that Larry was saying the $100 fine is redundant because Bob already has that authority in the code.
* Eric - Doesn’t find it redundant because the Building Department doesn’t have some of the criteria that they have in their review.
* Patrick Madonio - Do they directly overlap or are there some things that might be with this Commission that aren’t necessarily with the Building Department.
* Eric - This gives the Commission some teeth that Bob is looking for.
* Bob - If that were the case, they would get charged once, not twice.
* Cliff - They would need to change that to put in there that you could only charge once, because if Bob leaves, for another job somewhere else, the next person could come in and say that they’re going to use it twice. If making that statement, then it should be in there written.
* Diana - If removing that then, they’re removing their teeth again and they’d be an advisory group.
* Rick - Go systematically through Larry’s suggestion:
1. If a repair is needed and it will not change the shape of a structure.

 - Rick asked Larry what he was meaning by that. What is the shape of the structure?

* Larry - My example was that if somebody’s roof was leaking and they want to replace exactly the same type of shingles, they should be able to get a Building Permit immediately and not have to wait possibly a month for the DRC to meet again. He means literally the shape, which the guidelines cover for the shape of the structure.
* Bob - Asked Larry is he was speaking specifically for roofs?
* Larry - He said that it didn’t and that it could be for anything. Brought up about the vehicle that crashed through Eric’s building a couple weeks ago and Eric went out and made repairs. He asked him if he had come before the DRC for permission. He didn’t make any changes to the building.
* Rick - It does beg the question that if someone does repair something exactly the way it was, would they have to come to them.
* Eric - You’re getting through the weeds if you’re talking about someone putting new shingles on and they’re wanting 3-tab versus 2-tab. At some point they have to establish a very reasonable commission in here to deal with things. To enhance the city and raise the value, probably should be a little bit more detail in the standards.
* Bob - If there’s an emergency like Eric’s building or if someone says that their roof’s leaking, Bob would tell them to absolutely get it done and don’t worry about replacing your roof.
* Larry - That’s why he uses the word “may”.
* Rick - #2 of Larry suggestions: Essentially eliminates the council’s role in appeal after three (3) denials on an application by the DRC and allows an applicant a permit so long as a matter was on the DRC’s agenda for three (3) meetings.
* Eric - Asked if they had ever denied an application three (3) times.
* Bob - The only one was the Dennis Andrei issue. That’s the only issue that he can think of that got stretched out for quite some time.
* Diana - Said she actually talked to Dennis the day before and asked him if he was happy with his windows and he said yes and that he was glad that he did what he did.
* Rick - Asked Larry that if someone is denied a Certificate of Approval, that they should just give them a Certificate of Approval after they’ve been denied three (3) times.
* Larry - Stated that going back to what you people have been assigned to the public which it’s just advice and suggestions. Asked if three (3) meetings over three (3) months wasn’t enough advise and suggestions. Stated that he was suggesting that if in three (3) months they haven’t reached an agreement, give it to the Building Department to just issue a permit.
* Rick - He asked Larry that if someone doesn’t like the fact that they’ve denied them a certificate, that Bob should give them one anyway, rather than using the appeal process.
* Larry - Stated that after three (3) meetings, he thinks that’s how it should be done.
* Bob - Stated that they needed to go through these and get through it.
* Bob - #1 vote – Is the Committee interested in changing this specific ordinance as Larry suggested.
* Rick - Asked if there was a motion on item #1. There was no response.
* Bob - Stated that if there was no motion to vote on it, then they move on.
* Rick - #2 vote on 1434.04(a)(3)– Eliminate the council’s role in an appeal (notes from Rob Kairis, not the actual suggestion that Larry had stated), that three (3) denials of an application by the DRC, the application should be returned to the Chief Building Official for approval. No motion.

 - #3 vote 1434.10 – Exact language “In the event that any changes made on any historic property, designated list of property…”. This is the one that eliminates the violation of $100 per offense.

* Patrick - Made a motion to move it to a vote and change the wording so it doesn’t duplicate the Building Department’s fines so you can’t stack them. His exact words were “I’d like to just change the wording that we don’t duplicate Building Department’s fines.  You can’t stack them.”
* Eric - Seconded the motion.
* Rick - Asked if there was any discussion adding the language that they don’t duplicate the Building Department’s fines. No discussion. All in favor. No one opposed. Passed.

 - #4 vote – Would require that further changes to the guidelines established by the DRC be reviewed and approved by the city council. Asked if they wanted to have some discussion before the motion.

* Eric - Stated to have some discussion before the motion. He asked if it was protocol that council has authority over their commission.
* Bob - They will have to approve the guidelines.
* Eric - It’s already in place.
* Bob - That was for chapter 1434.
* Rick - The guidelines the DRC has control over that. The guidelines have to fall under the ordinance for the ordinance to establish it based on the preservation guidelines from the state. Asked if anyone wanted to make a motion on item #4. There was no motion for item #4. Council can do what they want because it’s their ordinance, but we have to follow the general guidelines that are in the ordinance.

**Public comment:**

 Larry stated that Rob Kairis would like to hear from any of the committee individually.

 Diana made a motion to adjourn. Diana Kane seconded the motion. Meeting was adjourned at 11:07 a.m.

Prepared by Julie Ring