



**Historical Review Commission
Regular Meeting**

Agenda

**August 13, 2026
4:00 PM**

VIDEO BROADCASTING & RECORDING

Meeting videos are broadcast live and published on YouTube.com
<https://www.youtube.com/@cityofmountvernon3369>

CALL TO ORDER

MINUTES APPROVAL

Historical Review Commission Minutes October 9, 2025

HRC ITEMS

2026-HRC-01: 10-18 N Main ST and 6 E Chestnut ST COA for Interim Redevelopment

ADJOURN



MOUNT VERNON

HISTORICAL REVIEW COMMISSION

MINUTES • OCTOBER 9, 2025

Regular Meeting

Council Chambers

4:00 PM

40 Public Square, Mount Vernon, OH 43050

I. VIDEO BROADCASTING & RECORDING

The meeting videos are broadcast live and published on YouTube.com
<https://www.youtube.com/@cityofmountvernon3369>

II. CALL TO ORDER

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Tanner Salyers	Safety Service Director	Excused
Jason West	Alt. Member	Present
Anne Ellsworth	Member	Present
Eric Diehl	Alt. Member	Excused
Lacey Filkins	Member	Present
Todd Hawkins	Member	Present
Sibley Poland	Member	Present
Matthew T. Starr	Mayor, Chairman	Excused
Austin Swallow	Member	Present

Others in attendance: City Development Services Manager, Lacie Blankenhorn; City Law Director, P. Rob. Broeren; Gary Yashnyk; Don Wheat; James Mahan; Susan Ramser; Brittany Lin; Deborah Riedmiller; Sarah Wagner; Valin Schillaci; Cheryl Splain; Cindy Sperry; Shari Rummel; Duke Wagoner; et als

III. MINUTES APPROVAL

1. Historical Review Commission - Special Meeting - Nov 21, 2024 4:00 PM

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Todd Hawkins, Member
SECONDER:	Lacey Filkins, Member
AYES:	West, Ellsworth, Filkins, Hawkins, Poland, Swallow
EXCUSED:	Salyers, Diehl, Starr

IV. HRC-ITEM NUMBERS

1. 2025-HRC-01 Certificate of Appropriateness to Raze Structures at 10-18 N Main ST and 6 E Chestnut ST

Blankenhorn introduced the case

Wheat (sworn in) of Pizzuti Solutions, owner representative for the City, asked for the HRC's approval related to the demolition of the 3 buildings at the corner of North Main Street and East Chestnut Street. This is the planned location of an expanded municipal court justice center. The City is currently working to move the existing functions out of City Hall to a location on South Main Street. The City Hall building at 40 Public Square will then be occupied temporarily by the Courts and court related functions. The plan is to use the space north of 40 Public Square to create a modern court space that can't be created inside of existing structures. The new construction will be connected to 40 Public Square. 40 Public Square will then be used to provide office support functions. Wheat said the condition of the buildings has been assessed. As is the case with many

historic buildings, the construction will not allow us to create the space that is needed in a new building. The historic buildings used wood framing in the floor systems that don't allow the spans that are needed to create a modern courtroom space with the widths that are needed. Secure transport of detainees is another function that isn't feasible to create in an existing building. Components of the buildings have been evaluated. The City commits to salvaging any of the historical components of the façades, either for the incorporation into the addition to 40 Public Square for Municipal Court or for use in some other manner. The City recognizes there are some components of those façades that someone might have an interest in. In the process of coordinating the demolition, the City will salvage any of those components for potential reuse in Mount Vernon.

Hawkins asked Wheat if he is an architect or engineer. Wheat said he is servicing as the City's Owner's Representative and he is an architect. He has specialized training in Historic Preservation and adaptive use.

Hawkins asked what specific issues there are currently, structurally, with the buildings as they stand. Wheat said much of it is related to neglect. There have been a number of activities that have occurred in the buildings over the years. The building systems are really almost nonexistent in terms of what is needed for any kind of modern reuse. The mechanical systems, plumbing systems, and electrical systems would all have to be completely removed.

Hawkins asked if it is less of a safety hazard and more of an issue with what the space is wanted for, the courthouse would not fit the current structures. Wheat said they are viewed as functionally obsolete from the standpoint of being usable for any kind of an expanded justice center.

Broeren said there are also some safety issues. There is methamphetamine contamination in the red brick building facing East Chestnut Street. During the removal of one of the evicted tenants, two employees who came into contact with the methamphetamine and were forced to be hospitalized. Broeren stated there are significant safety issues in the buildings that have to be remediated no matter what.

Hawkins moved to address the buildings individually, stating the building along East Chestnut looks less historic than the other two. His understanding is that the two buildings fronting N Main Street are on the National Historic Registry, which makes him more sensitive toward. He asked if there is a scenario that would allow the building that only fronts East Chestnut Street to be removed along with the Plaza Building to create enough usable space for the justice center or do all of the buildings including those fronting North Main Street need to be demolished. Wheat said one of the challenges with the expanded justice center is the amount of square footage that is needed. If part of the buildings in the area north of City Hall were to remain, the remaining footprint of area left to work with would require a taller building. The City is sensitive to the density concerns that there might be with going taller.

Hawkins asked if there are rough plans that the City has. Wheat said there are some previous concepts. The City is currently working with the design team to evaluate the best way to set up all of the agencies and functions, both for the interim needs and for the long-term needs. One thing that has been studied is the traffic on the public square and the challenge when backing out of a parking space from a safety standpoint. One concept that is being considered is putting the public entrance along Chestnut Street with new parking at 5 North Gay Street.

Ellsworth asked Wheat to talk about the interim plan in more detail. Elaborate on the City offices moving to South Main Street, while municipal court relocates to 40 Public Square. Wheat said there is currently a fit study being worked on for what absolutely must be relocated to 40 Public Square in the interim period. Certainly, that will be the Municipal Court, probably the Clerk, and some components of the probation program. There may be some functions that will remain in 5 North Gay building on an interim basis. For example, some of the probation functions, until the new space is built. Then at that point, the court, the clerk, probably will be in the new space and 40 Public Square will be repurposed for mostly office support functions. Ellsworth said if she understands correctly, everything currently in 40 Public Square will be permanently moved out. Wheat said that is correct. Ellsworth asked what the new location is. Wheat said 236 S Main Street, the

COTC building.

Poland asked Wheat if there are renderings for the proposed replacement buildings. Wheat said there have been previous studies done. Those show something that would be historically appropriate and contextually compatible with other existing structures in downtown. There is not a current proposal to bring forward for approval in terms of any new construction.

Poland said she would have a hard time helping make a decision on razing the buildings when there isn't a clear plan of what they would be replaced with. Mirroring Hawkins remarks, Poland said the building facing Chestnut Street and even the red brick on the corner, she could see razing those two while trying to keep the Curtis building which she thinks looks the most distinctive and historic, not just because of the HB Curtis emblems but also because of the character of the building itself. Poland suggested a compromise to restore and keep the Curtis building, while razing the other two as requested.

Swallow asked Wheat to explain the process of the building being put on the National Historic Register and then demolished, how that works. Wheat said if the structure has an individual certification as a National Registered property - Broeren interjected and said they are not, they are part of the Historic District, but not individually registered. Wheat said they are probably listed as contributing buildings that contribute to the overall historic district. An individual entry would have a higher standard of justification to take such a building down, than if it is just in a district designation.

Ellsworth asked if there are other options for where the court could be located. She recalled a presentation about the buildings on the east side of the square, also talk about Heartland Commerce Park. She asked why this location is the ideal setup. Wheat said his understanding is there are several things that the City is trying to accomplish. One is to create an expanded justice center in what is considered the heart of the downtown, where the seat of justice should be, and where people would expect to have an important public building located, as well as the proximity to the County facilities, makes sense from an operational standpoint. Another observation Wheat provided is the reuse of 40 Public Square is helping to offset the requirement for an even larger new building. Financially it is in the City interest to try to reuse a building space like 40 Public Square, where possible. The specialized functions of the court make it impossible to retain any of the internal fabric of the buildings to the north of 40 Public Square. Typically, courtrooms need to be at least 35 feet wide. Historic buildings don't generally have that structural capability. Razing the buildings north of City Hall seems to be the most efficient way to meet the City's needs.

Swallow asked Wheat to explain his role as the owner's rep for the City. Wheat said Pizzuti Solutions basically works as a supplement to the City's staff, providing additional expertise in particular areas, for example developing a finance plan for all of the projects to work with bond counsel. They work throughout the whole course of the projects, from the very beginning planning, all the way through construction and occupancy of the facilities.

Broeren asked Wheat what the condition of the various buildings is right now. Wheat said he thinks in some cases they don't know the exact condition of everything, but generally the condition is poor and is in a degraded state. One of the investigations that during the course of demolition would have to be looked at, the adjacent buildings could be using each other for structural support. In the process of taking one down, could lead do a domine effect, whether wanted or not. The demolition would have to be carefully planned so that it is safe for the public. The new construction will most likely have a basement level similar to the basement level of 40 Public Square. That will require excavation. The excavation can't be done at this time without putting structural shoring in place to support East Chestnut Street. There would need to be a two-step process of taking the buildings down to grade, then come in and start the excavation and shoring process to cut down to the level needed.

Hawkins asked if there has been a cost benefit analysis done on the difference between a complete rehab to keep the historic versus a demo and rebuild. Wheat said they haven't done a complete analysis. From a

functional feasibility the only possible way to rehab the existing historic buildings would add an additional financial burden to the City's project budget.

Hawkins confirmed that a rehab would definitely cost more, though the additional amount is unknown. Wheat said it's probably somewhere in between Hawkins' example range of \$100,000 to \$10 million.

Ramser (sworn in) voiced concern that enough thought hasn't gone into this planning and that maybe there are other options. She asked if maintaining the facades was looked into while taking down the buildings behind them. She doesn't think it has been done in Mount Vernon. There are a couple of examples in Mount Vernon where buildings have been taken down and replacements built, The Grand hotel and Park National Bank. These new builds really altered the streetscape and the historic facades were lost. She thinks additional options should be explored and that the facades could be maintained. She cited the Woodward Opera house as an expensive project spanning a few decades. The building was completely rehabilitated including the basement being lowered.

Reidmiller (sworn in) emphasized maintaining historic facades. She questioned if enough thought and investigation has gone into other sites for a justice center. She disagrees that a justice center should be the heart of the downtown, but rather City Hall should be on the Square. She wants more thought on other locations for the justice center. She thinks walking a couple of blocks in a town this size is doable. Reidmiller said if the proposed location turns out to be the best then she thinks it is critical that the facades be maintained.

Wagner (sworn in) thinks it is a little weird to locate the judicial building in the middle of downtown due to the security and anti-bombing needs. She asked why the East Chestnut Street building and the Plaza building couldn't be razed and those spaces used, while keeping the North Main façade intact. Additionally she asked if the North Main Street façades are saved but the space is not large for the courtroom requirements, could the space be used for the office support and the courtroom be in 40 Public Square. She encouraged more thought on the locations and layout. She emphasized keeping the façades along North Main Street.

Swallow explained to the audience that the Mayor and Safety Service Director did not attend the meeting because they are recusing themselves from the vote. Swallow asked Blankenhorn, Broeren, and Wheat how long the planning process has been going on and if there have been public hearings. How many other sites were considered, do address the questions from the attendees.

Broeren said the process has been going on for several years. There was a series of public meetings, dubbed the listening tour, held to collect input about what was wanted. Originally the City acquired the Tauger building on the east side of the square, hoping to use that property for potentially building a new justice center. The functional lifespan of the Plaza building, where the court, clerk, probation, law director, and police are located, is less than a decade. Judge Thatcher said the court will be removed from the building sooner rather than later. Broeren said the City has a statutory responsibility to provide appropriate space for the court. The City has been looking at the needs of the City. The police department has to be housed appropriately, along with the Law Director's office and the court. The Plaza building is falling down. A significant amount of work has been done to shore up the building. Early planning efforts looked at Heartland Commerce Park. Recently a new tenant was announced for that campus. The space is industrial and should be used for that. The construction costs at HCP were significantly greater than what is required to rehab City Hall and add onto it. Cost becomes an issue. The buildings north of City Hall are in a significantly dilapidated condition. The Curtis building regularly loses pieces of the façade, landing on the sidewalk. The City has attempted to shore up and protect that, but it is a losing battle. Preserving that façade counters with what the City can afford and what they have to spend money on. The listening tour was held January through March of 2025 to collect public input. People were very unhappy with the potential of tearing down the Tauger building. The people attending the listening tour felt that the Tauger building had significantly more historic value than the buildings north of City Hall. That feedback heavily swayed the City's determination. When the COTC

building became available, the decision was made to move the administrative part of the City to South Main Street, keeping the court on the square. It has been a 2+ year process with renderings if the court replaced the Tauger building.

Ellsworth asked Broeren about the cost prohibitive that he mentioned with regard to razing the Tauger building. Broeren said there was a potentially an \$80 million price tag.

Ellsworth asked if there is any renovation that needs to be done to the COTC building for City administration to move into there. Is the cost to raze the buildings north of City Hall and build new known? Wheat said there is a budget amount in their cost scenarios. Moving to the COTC building made sense because the needed changes are relatively light. It's primarily making some adjustments in a couple areas and adding partitions to create private offices needed for the staff. It doesn't require a change of use. It doesn't trigger the need to comply with current codes. Economically it makes a tremendous amount of sense. Broeren added the COTC space is ADA compliant, where none of the City facilities are, with the firehouse on West Gambier Street being the exception. Building a new justice wing will become ADA compliant and changes will be made to 40 Public Square. None of the entrances to the façades on the subject buildings are ADA compliant. The planned changes would require them to be.

Wheat said if the façades are kept and the internal construction is not kept, then essentially a new structural steel framework would need to be built to support the façade components. They cannot stand up by themselves. That can be done, but there is a significant cost associated with that.

Hawkins said previously it was mentioned about keeping or salvaging some of the components for reuse; are there particular things in mind. Wheat said the keystones on the windows of the Curtis building, for example. Typically, the façade materials on buildings of this age, the upper components are all made out of some kind of zinc or another metal. Those could be salvaged and refitted in another location. The windows could be salvaged and repurposed somewhere. Everything else would have to be removed.

There were 2 emails received by the Development Services Manager concerning the hearing: the first from Vicki Fitzgerald of 206 East High Street - To the Historic Review Committee My experience has been that our City has been inconsistent in their treatment of Historic Buildings and has fallen short on ways to protect and preserve rather than demolish buildings in part because they have not set adequate policy to hold owners of Historic downtown buildings to account for maintaining the Historic Downtown District. I'm aware that the 10-18 N. Main Street buildings in question before the Historic Review Committee are in deteriorating condition due to a lack of maintenance by their previous owners; however, they are not necessarily in worse condition than our newer poorly built City Municipal Building which the City has continually propped up and poured money into to keep it standing. The City has allowed the demolition of buildings at 100 North Main St, The Curtis Office Building & 108 North Main Street, The Thompson Building the lots that both stood on are now parking lots. Unfortunately, this is often the fate of our City's History...the Historic buildings are reduced to parking lots with little thought about what has been lost not just in History but also in retail/office space and residential housing. The lots on which stood the old Knox County Jail, the First Baptist Church on High Street and the Wilda Worley Gothic Revival House on Chestnut Street also became parking lots. In my own Historic Neighborhood, a carriage house/garage was allowed to be torn down by the Historic Review Committee so that a \$30,000.00 (4) car parking pad could (be) poured in its place. I can only wonder what that same \$30,000 could have done to update the Carriage House which from my experience would have sufficiently restored it. My reason for bringing these points to the Historic Review Committee is that tearing down the buildings and leaving empty lots is just more of the same and prevents any opportunity for a private buyer to purchase and restore those buildings. The City has an unsafe Municipal Court Building that can be torn down to accommodate the expansion of the new Courthouse in the City Hall Building. If the Historic Review Committee is insistent on demolition, how long will those lots be allowed to be empty before construction begins to build on the lots or will the committee prevent them from becoming parking areas. If demolition is decided, there

needs to be preservation of the facade of the Henry Curtis building and some way to honor the history of Henry Curtis in our City. It appears to me that the Historic Review Committee lacks a set of standards by which they decide what efforts should be used by property owners to preserve the buildings/structures we have in our Historic Districts. I question whether the Members of the committee have the knowledge or actual experience regarding Historic restoration to provide this key component to the determination process. As a result, once a building is past what is deemed as repairable the Committee lacks any standards/codes for what should be built in its place and so defaults to demolition with a "go to" solution being a parking lot or vacant lot. Please do not rubber stamp this demolition without giving thought to the Historic significance of the Curtis building. The City has torn down so many Historic buildings in the last 25 years, history and structures you can't get back once they are gone. If you feel you must find for demolition there must be a strong definitive plan in place for incorporating existing architectural elements removed from the existing building you plan to destroy into any new build.

The second email was from Marcia V Adams of 1105 Martinsburg Road: To the Historic Review Board - The Pizzuti letter states that the buildings use will be for the Municipal Court, Law Directors Office, Clerk of Court's and Probation Department. I was under the impression that there was plenty of room for those offices in the current City building. The building directly behind the city building on Chestnut St. was going to be razed to be the annex for any future space needed. I am still passionate the Curtis building. It does need a LOT of work due to past owners not doing any kind of maintenance. There are fundraisers, grants, volunteer work that could be done to come up the funds. It is no less important than the Woodward building and can be restored and be a jewel in the city. Many other cities have been able to keep and restore almost every building in their downtowns and they are beautiful and full of history. Does Mount Vernon want to be known as the town that would rather tear down their history or live up to the honors this town has been given. PBS has highlighted our downtown. In 1965 Look Magazine named us an "All American City". 1994 Ohio Magazine names us "Ohio's Most Livable Community". Ohio Magazine has featured Mount Vernon as one of its "Best Hometowns" multiple times, 2017-2018 highlighting our downtown, most recently for the 2025-2026 issue. They also recognized Mount Vernon among the 5 great places to live, work and visit. Do you think the people who have come in the past to see our historic downtown and walk the historic neighborhoods will still come when all we have are parking lots and college buildings in our downtown? The Historic Review Board has to do their due diligence and save this and other buildings and homes for the future generations. Everyone should have to follow the rules and standards of the Historic Review Board and hold people accountable. I am grateful for the buildings being used by the colleges instead of sitting empty. We need to save our downtown and most importantly our Historic Buildings and Homes. If nothing tugs at your hearts and minds to save this building then at least save and restore the whole front of the Curtis building and build a new inside, foundation/basement.

Swallow noted the City Engineer was not in attendance. There was testimony about engineering concerns and the buildings not being possible to be restored in their current conditions. Broeren said that is his belief. Wheat said they are believed to be functionally obsolete.

Swallow asked Wheat about the comment about the Municipal (Plaza Building) and what will replace it once it is torn down. Wheat said the planning efforts have identified that building will be removed, along with the parking levels once everyone is relocated. Conceptually they are discussing two levels of parking, one at grade on Blackberry Alley and another level at grade on Gay and Chestnut Streets. The bottom level would be for staff and the top level would be for the public - off street parking related to the municipal court with a convenient proximity to the new main entrance for the justice center.

Ramser - said she is very concerned about the comments about the hardening, security, adaptations to be made to have a courtroom and associated spaces right off of the square. In this day of terrorist activity, is it a wise to put a building that will attract possible threats right on the Public Square.

Broeren said the Supreme Court has specific security standards that must be met by any building that is proposed as a courthouse. Depending on how long it has been there, certain standards do not have to be met. A new building would have to meet all of the new standards.

Swallow asked Broeren if he has any legal concerns. Broeren said this hearing is for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition and planning. In the end, there is a list of things that need to be taken into account. The City cannot require an owner, whether public or private, to continue to use a building in a certain way. The City is proposing to do something like The Grand, which was to take something that wasn't working on the space and make it fit within the historic nature of the buildings around it.

Hawkins asked if the request were to be approved, does it need to go to Council. Broeren said no.

Blankenhorn relayed from the City Engineer the mitigation steps that have taken place to date. There was an extensive photo shoot done. Some of the photos were provided as part of the application to the HRC. There are many more photos that could be use for historic research purposes. There was a 3D scan conducted of the buildings, including City Hall. The data is still being processed. A sampling showed the capability to do a virtual walk though of the buildings as they stood the day of the scan. That information could be provided to the local historical society for others to use for research purposes. Finally, there was a video that was included with the agenda packet, that was compiled, compiling some of the residents of the facilities and the downtown area.

Broeren said that included the oral history work that has been done to preserve the history of the buildings.

Blankenhorn added, this hearing is about the demolition of the structures. Any future plans for the properties would have to come back to the HRC to approved any design of a new building.

Ellsworth emphasized Poland's point earlier about not having the designs before a decision is made about razing the existing buildings. Blankenhorn said there aren't any designs to be reviewed.

Ellsworth asked if there was ever discussion about rebuilding on the current municipal building site - 5 North Gay. Broeren said there are several issues with that. The building at 5 North Gay was built after the parking garage. The City built the parking garage in the 60's. In the 70's a developer bought the airspace above the parking area and built the Plaza Building. It wasn't particularly well built. He doesn't believe it would be economically feasible to rebuild over the parking structure.

Ellsworth asked why the parking garage has to be kept. Broeren said surface lots are probably not the best use of land. By keeping a parking garage, we eliminate to take other land for parking, by keeping it a multi-level structure.

Poland asked what happens if there is a no vote against raising the buildings on North Main Street. What then becomes the fate of them. Broeren said he hasn't discussed exactly what the Mayor and Safety Service Director would plan to do.

Blankenhorn cited Code Section 1106.02d.1-2 The Historic Overlay District, specifically addressing preservation of property upon demolition of a structure. Number 1 says whenever a structure within the HO district is proposed to be demolished, an application for a COA (Certificate of Appropriateness) shall be filed with the ZEO (Zoning Enforcement Officer) as provided in this section 1103.05. In considering such application, the Historical Review Commission shall limit its inquiry to the proposal for grading, landscaping, and other design treatment of the property once the structure has been removed. Number 2 states nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the demolition of a structure whether public or private within the HO district. Blankenhorn said her interpretation of that say the HRC doesn't have the authority to stop a demolition, they can only rule on the plans for the future, after the demolition. In limiting your inquiry to the proposal for grading, landscaping, and other design treatment of the property, you may deny that at this moment to request or demand more information.

Ellsworth asked why there was a design revealed to replace the Tauger building, but none for the subject buildings and properties. Broeren said the original decision was to build on the Tauger site, 3+ years ago. The

decision to pivot and move City Hall out of 40 Public Square was made in approximately April of this year, after the listening tour concluded. Because of that the City is playing catch up. Prior to the mock ups that were revealed, there was extensive work done for needs assessments both by the City and the National Center for State Courts. The specific needs assessment needs to be applied to the new site utilizing City Hall and the parcels to the north.

Ellsworth clarified the section of Code that Blankenhorn read, saying the HRC could vote no and the City could still move forward with demolition or the HRC could ask for additional information before voting. Broeren said if the HRC denies the COA, the City would have to come back with a revamped proposal that includes the use and timing for what exactly would happen after the structures are razed.

Poland asked if the revised proposal would have to include a rendering of the new work. Broeren said the Commission could hold out for that. The HRC still has to vote on it.

Hawkins asked what happens if there isn't a motion. Broeren says the request dies. Hawkins asked if there is an advantage or disadvantage of having a no vote versus not having a vote. Broeren said if there is no vote taken that would be no decision one way or the other. The City could bring back the current proposal and force a vote on that. If the HRC votes to take up the motion and vote it down, the City would have to come back with additional information.

Poland thinks it is in the best interest of the City to put together renderings. Ellsworth added, also a cost analysis.

Swallow called for a motion. Filkins has recused herself from the vote.

Ellsworth made a motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Hawkins said more clarity is needed, especially with regard to the engineering and why the existing structures cannot be used. Renderings are also important.

Ellsworth wants more clarity on the costs.

Poland would like a cost analysis on maintaining the facades, at a minimum, of the Curtis building, or building it back to look identical, reusing the flagstones.

Hawkins clarified that a yes vote is a no vote.

RESULT:	ACCEPT AS MODIFIED [4 TO 1]
MOVER:	Anne Ellsworth, Member
SECONDER:	Sibley Poland, Member
AYES:	Ellsworth, Hawkins, Poland, Swallow
NAYS:	West
ABSTAIN:	Filkins
EXCUSED:	Salyers, Diehl, Starr

V. ADJOURN

1. Adjourn Motion

Ellsworth made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Hawkins seconded and the meeting was adjourned at 5:14 PM

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Anne Ellsworth, Member
SECONDER:	Todd Hawkins, Member
AYES:	West, Ellsworth, Filkins, Hawkins, Poland, Swallow
EXCUSED:	Salyers, Diehl, Starr



Item: 2026-HRC-01: 10-18 N Main ST and 6 E Chestnut ST COA for Interim Redevelopment

ITEM REPORT

To: Historical Review Commission

From: Tanner Salyers, Safety Service Director

Meeting Date: August 13, 2026

Department/Office: Historical Review Commission

Item Name: 2026-HRC-01: 10-18 N Main ST and 6 E Chestnut ST COA for Interim Redevelopment

Summary:

The 3 buildings located at 10-18 N Main ST and 6 E Chestnut ST have been condemned and slated for demolition. A consultant was hired to design a parking area for use by the Mount Vernon Municipal Court staff, which will be relocated to 40 Public Square. This interim redevelopment will be utilized for an indeterminate length of time. Preliminary designs for the remodel of 40 Public Square, to be used by the Municipal Court and Probation, include provisions to allow for future expansion to the north.

Recommended Action:

Per §1103.05(d)(4)D. The HRC may approve, approve with modifications, or deny the application. The HRC shall make every effort to work with the applicant to develop a proposal that the HRC can approve or approve with modifications.

In cases where the HRC has denied a COA, the HRC shall state the reasons for such disapproval in writing and transmit the written statement to the applicant together with any recommendation the HRC may have made for appropriate changes.

Attachments:

1.	2026.07.13 - Mount Vernon Pocket Park
----	---------------------------------------



E. Chestnut St.

N. Main St.

Mount Vernon Historical Pocket Park

Concept 1

Mount Vernon, Ohio / July 9, 2026

Mount Vernon
Build Here ~ Grow Here

PIZZUTI

EDGE



E. Chestnut St.

N. Main St.

Mount Vernon Historical Pocket Park

Concept 2

Mount Vernon, Ohio / July 9, 2026

Mount Vernon
Build Here ~ Grow Here

PIZZUTI

EDGE



E. Chestnut St.

N. Main St.

Mount Vernon Historical Pocket Park

Concept 3

Mount Vernon, Ohio / July 9, 2026

Mount Vernon
Build Here ~ Grow Here

PIZZUTI

EDGE



E. Chestnut St.

N. Main St.

CONCEPT 1

- Non-occupiable option.
- Subtly honors the history of Henry B. Curtis.
- Brick retaining wall with ornamental fencing atop surrounds the parking lot below to create a comfortable barrier from the fall height.
- Columns designed to match those around the Public Square with embedded reclaimed "H.B.C." stones from the existing building.
- Continuation of the streetscape experience along N. Main St. established by the City of Mount Vernon Municipal Courts to screen parking lot below.



E. Chestnut St.

N. Main St.

CONCEPT 2

- Occupiable option.
- Bold option that directs pedestrians up the stairs for an interactive moment with the statue of Henry B. Curtis.
- Seat wall along E. Chestnut St. to help transition grade.
- Brick retaining wall with ornamental fencing atop surrounds the parking lot below to create a comfortable barrier from the fall height.
- Columns designed to match those around the Public Square with embedded reclaimed "H.B.C." stones from the existing building.
- Continuation of the streetscape experience along N. Main St. established by the City of Mount Vernon Municipal Courts to screen parking lot below.



E. Chestnut St.

N. Main St.

CONCEPT 3

- Non-occupiable option.
- Pays homage to the existing architecture by reclaiming, restoring, and reusing the existing building columns.
- Displays a plaque explaining the historic significance of the man, the buildings, and the development of Mount Vernon, Ohio.
- Seat wall along E. Chestnut St. and N. Main St. to help transition the grade.
- Brick retaining wall with ornamental fencing atop surrounds the parking lot below to create a comfortable barrier from the fall height.
- Columns designed to match those around the Public Square with embedded reclaimed "H.B.C." stones from the existing building.
- Continuation of the streetscape experience along N. Main St. established by the City of Mount Vernon Municipal Courts to screen parking lot below.

Mount Vernon Historical Pocket Park

Concept Summaries

Mount Vernon, Ohio / July 9, 2026

Mount Vernon
Build Here ~ Grow Here

PIZZUTI

EDGE