

MARIEMONT ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
JULY 27, 2021

Mr. Wren called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Present were Mayor Brown, Dr. Lewis and Mr. Lockhart.

Mr. Lockhart moved, seconded by Mayor Brown to accept the minutes as written for the meeting March 9, 2021. On roll call; four ayes, no nays.

An application was submitted from Phil West, 6835 Stoningham Road, Cincinnati, Ohio 45230 to replace the original slate roof at 6621-6629 Murray Avenue with an Owens Corning architectural shingle roof. The current slate roof is damaged.

Findings of the Assistant Building Department Administrator: 6621-6629 Murray is in the Clinton MacKenzie group of buildings which is made up of the large apartment buildings at the corner of Murray and Beech along with 7 buildings surrounding it on both Murray and Beech. All these buildings still have the original slate roofs, most of which are still in good condition. Relevant to this request, Mariemont code states the following:

§151.075 Historic District

(F) (1) Landmarks: Clinton MacKenzie Buildings, 3902-3946 Beech Street, north of Chestnut, east side; 6611-6639 Murray Avenue, south side between Beech and Oak Street

(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 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:

(f) for buildings identified in division (F)(1) through (F)(12) above which are parts of complexes involving several buildings designed by the same architect to form a consistent, harmonious entity, exterior paint or stain colors for parts of the complex by the same architect irrespective of diversity of ownership shall be chosen with the approval of the Architectural Review Board, which reflect the character, style and materials of the buildings;

(i) Roof treatment shall be of the same type and form and the same or similar color and exterior material as found on the existing building or brought into conformity with division(H)(2)(f) above.

Handouts of the proposed shingles were distributed and pictures of the condition of the present shingles.

Mr. West indicated there are two leaks and ice damage. He has been in touch with the Durable Slate Company. The slate is very brittle, and they were not interested in buying the slate which cannot be matched. While driving around, he happened to find a house with shingles he liked. It is an Owens Corning shingle which was on the list provided by Ms. Beatty of the Building Department. He owns another building in the Village that had the slate shingles replaced with asphalt shingles in the past prior to his ownership. He assumes the Village has a permit record. His tenants are anxious to have the repairs fixed. He distributed pictures of roofs

of surrounding properties. The estimated cost to do the patch repair was over \$10,000. He has heard the cost to replace the slate roof is \$40,000-\$60,00 which is not in his budget (the building consists of 5 units). His concern is to spend money to repair when it could need additional repairs in the near future.

Mayor Brown said the issue is expecting owners to replace slate with slate in this day and age is an unrealistic expectation. ARB is faced with is trying to determine what is an appropriate replacement yet being sensitive to the economic constraints. Once selected, it will apply to the whole grouping with no variability.

Discussion ensued regarding alternatives to slate such as shingle roofing and reaching out to Spinnenweber Builders to see who they may have used in the past for slate roofs. Reservation was voiced by ARB that only one selection was shown. There was some agreement that in concept it may be unreasonable to require a full slate replacement. What is decided will be precedent going forward. Mr. West voiced concern that he struggles as a building owner to get answers from the Village in a timely fashion. It took six months to get windows approved in the past.

Mr. Wren said it is a historic building and considered significant and it is part of how the Village got its historic status – if we allow a significant amount of variance it starts to erode away the historic status. They rely on the applicant to do the research. Mr. West said if the Village is going to participate in historical matters, he finds the lack of information from the Village a struggle. Mr. Wren said the ARB's role is to determine if what is proposed is appropriate and how it impacts the historical character, not to serve as a design board.

Mr. Wren offered to meet with Mr. West's contractors to talk about a series of options. Mr. West asked if the ARB would allow another material besides slate. Mr. Wren said he does not believe the ARB would deny an applicant the ability to improve a situation in a sensitive manner while preserving the architectural integrity of the community.

In conclusion, the meeting ended with ARB members not having enough information to decide on the roof proposed. Mr. West will come back and present more options to the members of the ARB.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mr. John Bentley
Secretary