

A regular meeting of the Troy Planning Commission was held in Council Chambers, City Hall on Wednesday, February 12, 2025 at 3:30 p.m. with Chairman James McGarry presiding. ATTENDING: Members – McGarry, Oda, Westmeyer, Erlich, Wolke, and Titterington; Development Staff – Eidemiller, Bruner and Burgei; and Development Director Davis.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Upon motion of Mr. Titterington, seconded by Mrs. Ehrlich, the minutes of the Jan. 22, 2025, meeting were approved by unanimous voice vote.

HISTORIC DISTRICT APPLICATION. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS. 15 S. MARKET STREET. REVIEW OF PAINTED STOREFRONT; OWNER/APPLICANT – TECUMSEH OF OHIO LLC, BETH KERBER.

Mr. Eidemiller commented that the applicant is not proceeding with any additional request for the Commission; so the Commission is to review the “lagoon” color; staff is providing the Commission with paint color swatches, an analysis is included with the staff report, and the report is:

“BACKGROUND:

The applicant and owner, Tecumseh of Troy LLC, is requesting the Planning Commission to review a painted storefront at the property located at 15 S. Market Street. The Ohio Historic Inventory form (OHI) describes this building as a three-story commercial building with three (3) or more bays. Contributing features include the size and placement within the plane of the commercial streetscape. Previous alterations were to cover the original characteristics of the building until the owner removed all of the metal that was hiding the original characteristics. At the June 12, 2024 Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission approved the request for the adjacent storefront to be painted Sherwin Williams SW 6480 Lagoon. During painting, the contractor accidentally painted both storefronts at 13 and 15 S. Market Street. This is what led to this request.

PROPOSAL:

Alteration #1: 15 S. Market Street storefront painted SW 6480 Lagoon.

Before



After



STAFF ANALYSIS: (Staff analysis can be seen below in red following each section):

Design Manual: 2.6 Paint Colors states: “Paint colors varied through history, not only with fashions, but also because of available materials. These colors often tie the architectural elements and details of a building together. If possible, research the history of the building and discover its original colors, particularly in the case of Victorian style structures which were often not white but a variety of colors and shades.

- A. A concentration of similar colors on the same block should be avoided. **There are no similar colors on this same block except the next door building.**
- B. Historically unpainted surfaces should not be painted. Historically painted surfaces should remain painted. **The storefront was previously painted.**
- C. Simpler buildings should have a simple color scheme. More ornate structures, such as larger Queen Anne styles, may incorporate three or more colors. **Two colors meet this requirement.**
- D. Matte, flat, or semi-gloss paint should be used. Avoid high gloss paint. **High-gloss paint is being avoided.**
- E. In all circumstances, avoid bright and obtrusive colors, such as neon or day-glow hues. **The colors are not bright or obtrusive.**

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that if the color of the storefront is darker to match the upper window trim of the paint colors that exist, it would be more aesthetically pleasing however, the proposed color does comply with Section 2.6 of the Design Manual as outlined above.”

Staff passed around a color swatch of “SW 6480 lagoon”; and indicated some level of preference as to the color painted would be up to the Commission, with staff stating it would look better if painted to match the upper dark green trim.

Mr. Titterington stated there seemed to be some contradiction in the staff report as the report noted there would be some concentration of colors if the painted color is approved, and asked for clarification. Mr. Eidemiller stated there would be some concentration if this color is approved, with the concentration being with the adjacent building, which has the same owner, but is a separate building. He noted that the painting should not look like one storefront, but should look like two storefronts.

In response to Mr. Titterington for more clarification as to paint swatches and what was approved, Mr. Davis stated that the swatch of Lagoon was the approved color for 13; it was accidentally painted onto 15 S. Market; when the swatch is held against the building it looks more like the color that is now the second floor trim of 15; in the 6-24-2024 Commission packet the colors look similar.

Mr. Titterington stated that it seems that both buildings were not painted as represented as lagoon, but painted what looks like teal. Mr. Davis stated the application was for painting a blue color and the trim of the north building painted lagoon.

Mr. Tittering asked if everything on both buildings with the exception of the window trim on the south building was painted the wrong color. Mr. Davis stated “we think so”. Mr. Eidemiller stated the only paint swatch provided to staff was identified as “SW 6480 lagoon”.

Mayor Oda commented that the color swatch is not what is on the building.

Mr. Eidemiller stated he cannot verify that the color swatch was the actual color painted, but it does not look like it.

Mr. Titterington commented that the swatch color was what was approved, and the issue may now be that the owner may now have to repaint both buildings to get rid of the blue. He commented that another question is did the Commission approve the yellow/blue colors, as he does not recall seeing that combination.

Mr. Eidemiller stated he has the initial application, but it was noted that the blue in the packet does not appear what was painted; however, staff commented that what was in the packet was a xerox copy of a xerox copy and would not show the shade on the swatch. Mr. Titterington commented that is why the actual color swatch must be provided at the meeting to be viewed by the Commission.

Mr. Davis and Mr. Eidemiller commented that staff compared the color swatch to the paint on the building on the second floor of 13 S. Market and it appears to match the color in the approved application, and when they compared the lagoon swatch to the paint on the first floor of both buildings, the actual paint looks like a lighter blue than the swatch. Mr. Davis stated that he thinks the building was painted a different color swatch than the lagoon swatch.

Mrs. Ehrlich commented that the lagoon swatch looks like the trim paint on the second building (15 S. Market), which she thinks is very nice.

Mr. Westmeyer concurred that the swatch being viewed is darker than the colors actually painted; but he concurs that the yellow does seem to match what was approved.

Mr. Titterington commented that it still appears the blue on both buildings is not what was approved.

It was noted that the applicant was not in attendance, with Mr. Titterington commenting that it has been difficult to get an application or an appearance by the applicant over several months.

The Mayor stated her concern is that there are two separate buildings, and each should be painted different and the buildings should not have two matching upper floors. She stated she wants to see two buildings looking different. It was commented that the two buildings are not the same style or scale.

The Commission viewed the color swatch of the yellow color.

Mr. Westmeyer stated he was not okay with the southern building painted teal blue as it does not blend well with the second and third floor and questions that the teal color painted was approved and commented that he would not have approved the teal color that has been applied. He stated he is okay with the yellow or chartreuse color on the second floor of 13 S. Market Street, and he does not concur that the first floors of both buildings should be painted the same color.

Mrs. Ehrlich stated she does not believe the color painted is what she voted on as lagoon.

Staff commented that the paint company updates the color swatches every there months.

Regarding the color of the trim on the on the north building, Mrs. Ehrlich stated she believes that is what she approved for the building color. Staff stated that the trim paint was not part of the application as it was matching like for like as maintenance.

MOTION:

Mr. Westmeyer moved to deny the historic district application for the painting of the storefront at 15 S. Market Street, and asked staff to talk to the applicant about what appears to be an incorrect color on the first floor of 15 S. Market Street. Motion seconded by Mayor Oda.

DISCUSSION:

-In response to Mr. McGarry, it was stated that the applicant could appeal to the BZA.

-Mr. Titterington commented that the applicant could provide the Commission with a color that could be approved, with the Mayor stating that the approved color would then have to be used.

-Mr. Eidemiller noted that the applicant has some other required work to be completed.

-Mr. Wolke suggested the applicant be advised that the Commission would be amenable to the approved paint colors.

VOTE: **MOTION ADOPTED, UNANIMOUS ROLL CALL VOTE**

Staff commented that the applicant will receive an official denial.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:52 p.m. upon motion of Mr. Westmeyer, seconded by Mr. Titterington, and approved by unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

_____Chairman

_____Secretary