

**MARIEMONT ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
NOVEMBER 29, 2022**

Mayor Brown called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Present were Mayor Brown, Mr. Ayer, Mr. Bentley, Mr. Kintner, Dr. Lewis, and Mr. Lockhart. Building/Zoning Official Rod Holloway was also present.

Mr. Ayer moved, seconded by Mr. Kintner, to accept the minutes as written for the August 15, 2022 meeting and the October 11, 2022 meeting. On roll call; five ayes, no nays (Mr. Bentley abstained).

An application was submitted from the Mariemont Preservation Foundation (MPF) located at 3919 Plainville Rd, Mariemont, OH 45227 to construct a structure over the Family Statuary Sculpture located at 6601 Wooster Pike.

Findings of the Building Department:

Statuary Park is defined as a Landmark per 151.075 (F)(24)(d)(g) Dale Park with statuary, northwest corner of Plainville Road and Wooster Pike and thus part of the Historical District code.

§ 151.075 HISTORIC DISTRICT

(H)(1) *Limitations on issuance of building and demolition permits.* No construction, reconstruction, alteration demolition, or removal of any structure or significant exterior architectural feature, including painting and staining, and including signage, thereof to any listed landmark structure or any other building within a historic district shall be undertaken prior to obtaining a certificate of appropriateness from the Architectural Review Board (see §§ [151.021\(E\)](#) and [151.025](#)) and a permit from the Building Commissioner, if appropriate.

(H)(2) *Regulations governing site modifications: Standards for review: design requirements for certificate of appropriateness.* The Architectural Review Board, in deciding whether to issue a certificate of appropriateness, shall determine that the application under consideration promotes, preserves, and enhances the distinctive historical integrity of the landmark structure as set forth in division (F) above, as well as the historical village character of the community and would not be at variance with existing structures within that portion of the district in which the structure is or is proposed to be located. In conducting its review the Board shall make examination and give consideration to the elements of the application including, but not necessarily limited to:

(d) Consideration shall be given to the method of removal or alteration of any original materials, hardware, signage, or architectural features and the method of construction or repair, so as to avoid damage to original materials, hardware, design, and architectural features.

(e) Consideration shall be given to the use of the property, so as to maintain as nearly as possible the use of the property as originally intended

(h) Buildings shall have exterior material of painted wood, material that simulates painted wood, brick, stucco, stones, or stone masonry and take into consideration texture, color, and compatibility among various elements of the structure. The exterior color of all landmark structures shall be guided by the Village Historic Color Guidelines

(j) Exterior detail and relationships shall take into consideration compatibility and appropriateness of design and details, including all projecting and receding elements of the exterior, including, but not limited to, porches, overhangs, and the horizontal or vertical expression which is conveyed by these elements. Signage shall also consider the above

(p) Historical integrity of all landmark and historic sites shall be maintained according to the original architect's design, town plan, concepts, and philosophy of Mary M. Emery, John Nolen, and the Mariemont Company. Any act or process that results in any change to an archaeological feature shall require a certificate of appropriateness.

Mr. Holloway stated that the ARB members had received the renderings via email. He wanted to clarify if MPF, today, was expecting a certificate of appropriateness as a result of today's discussion, or rather just to get input on the renderings to date and whether or not there is any input from this group that would be a hinderance in getting a certificate of appropriateness. Gail McBride, member of MPF, said that they do need the input of the group if there are changes that need to be made but the design presented is the design they would like to go forward with and she thought they would be closer to approval than not. Mayor Brown was under the impression that they were looking at where they were in the design.

Janet Setchell, MPF member, provided a brief history of the Family Statuary. She explained that it was sculpted by French artist Lucien Alliot circa 1925. Ms. McBride shared more on the history of MPF and their relationship with these statues. The Statuary was cleaned this fall and although it certainly lost some of the finer details, MPF is impressed with just how many of the carved features are now visible. Their objective is to cover the Statuary now, in conjunction with Mariemont's 100-year anniversary, and therefore ensure that it is preserved for the next generations to enjoy. As they began to investigate the shelter option, the objective was to come up with a shelter design that would protect as well as showcase, but not overpower, the Family Statuary. Not knowing where to start they approached Bob Rich for advice and he, along with Cori Cassidy, of architectural firm A359, presented them with a wide selection of possible design options. They worked together and now have a design that is traditionally classic and they feel not only suits the Dale Park setting but is also compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Within the shelter design the statues are strategically placed to sit between the columns creating a natural backdrop. The new shelter will enhance the Statuary and create an anchor to any future Dale Park renovations. The materials of the new structure are durable and in keeping with the existing statuary. The primary material of the both the structure and adjacent seat wall is natural limestone. Pavers and concrete walkways complete the ground plan adjacent to the structure for safe and level access.

Ms. Cassidy went over some of the specifics of the design. She pointed out that the piece will remain fully intact, including the base. They will be using like materials by using limestone in the columns and a limestone seat wall. At its tightest point the width is about 4'2" which keeps it fully ADA compatible, allowing a wheelchair to fit through. They also will work to develop a level ground field so that it is ADA compatible so that the base area and sidewalk will all be new with the pavers to allow for a more generous viewing area. They gave much attention to the spacing of the columns and worked with a structural consultant to determine sizing that would allow the Statuary to shine through between the structure and to allow the changing landscape to be visible throughout the seasons. She proposes that the center path be removed, per the original design of the area, to create a more generous lawn and the arching sidewalks be flanked with new trees while the two large existing trees remain. They took into consideration the various ways that passersby would be viewing the area, both on foot and via cars from the streets.

They took great care in choosing the materials to work with the existing structure and matching the limestone. To properly cover the statue they need to be about 12'6" inside and about 42 feet across. The

material is foothills limestone slab which is a great match to the Statuary. The columns are developed in two large pieces with a 3" wide center detail. The roof structure is made out of steel but coated with a stucco and a membrane roof with a metal piece in the front. The roof will slope back, allowing the water to drain off the back and not splash onto the structure. No gutter or downspout is necessary for the roof. A porous material on the ground, like gravel, would receive the water off the roof. The distance from the face of the Statuary to the front lip of the overhead structure is 32 inches. Mr. Rich explained that they need to be careful that it isn't so large that it overwhelms the statues but still provides protection from the elements. The freeze/thaw and long-term water or organic material being on the statue is the biggest threat and an occasional windy rain is not going to degrade the condition as substantially, which makes the size of the overhead adequate.

Ms. Cassidy discussed the materials for the roof. The bottom side is stucco. There is a rubber membrane that is light gray in color, similar to the limestone, on the top. Based on their studies, the top of the structure is at elevation that it will not be visible from a sidewalk. Mr. Rich said the membrane material is a conventional roofing material and has a longer lifespan than asphalt.

Dr. Lewis was concerned about the structure not having a back wall and Ms. Cassidy explained that the overhang over the back and the curve of the overhang provides enough protection, making the back wall unnecessary. Mr. Rich pointed out that winter winds and rain mostly come from the west and the north and that is where the deeper coverage is over the statue. The more shallow coverage is to the east. The current proposed design allows the Statuary to be viewed in its entirety from all over the park.

Mr. Bentley pointed out that the Statuary was designed, conceived, and executed as a site sculpture which needs sunlight and shadow to bring it to life. He wondered about the lighting in the design. Ms. Cassidy said it would be lit in the evening by two spots located at the edge of the seat wall and two 34" bollards that sit behind the seat wall that can light the front. Those lights would hit each of the sculptures and then they could up light the ceiling to provide an ambient light to the entire Statuary. Mr. Bentley was concerned that shadows would be blown away and would like to see it lit from above, like the sun. Mr. Rich said it is a classic light treatment and the roof of the structure should not be dark but that it should be a comfortable light. In-ground lights were considered but can be difficult to maintain. Lights in the ceiling had been considered as well but they looked too contemporary in contrast to the Art Deco style of the Statuary.

Dr. Lewis asked if the design maintained an educational component. It does not but Ms. Cassidy said placards could be added and an inlay panel will provide some information about the Statuary and Mary Emery. Ms. Setchell said they want to incorporate an educational aspect within the park, either right there in the Statuary or somewhere else in the park.

Mr. Ayer was curious about the seat wall and how they envisioned it being used. Ms. Cassidy explained that the design creates more of a gathering space with the seating wall and the sidewalks connecting to neighborhoods and the schools. The seat wall is not a directional seat bench which allows for people to sit and watch kids running around in the park or sit and face the Statuary. The decision to make the seat walls straight, rather than curved, was intentional and allows for families to stretch out and not encroach in the space of other park visitors. To curve the seat walls would also raise the cost considerably. Mr. Ayer asked about the material used for the pavers. Ms. Cassidy provided him with a sample. It is a traditional paver made of clay that would sit on a sand base. The color ties back to the brick of the adjacent school and contrasts to the granite base.

Mayor Brown noted that Mr. Kintner had to leave the meeting early which leaves only three members in attendance who could participate in a vote. He proposed that at the next meeting the ARB would vote on the design when they have a full quorum and would not require another presentation. If any members want

to request some additional drawings or materials, they have the interim span to do that. They agreed to schedule a second meeting to hold a vote within two weeks.

The meeting adjourned at 7:48 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mr. Brad Lockhart
Secretary