

# Canal Winchester

*Town Hall  
10 North High Street  
Canal Winchester, OH 43110*



## Meeting Minutes

**April 25, 2022**

**7:00 PM**

## Landmarks Commission

*Pete Lynch - Chairman  
David Craycraft - Vice-Chairman  
Rich Dobda - Secretary  
Roger White  
Jamoya Cox  
Dr. Scott Kelly  
Whit Wardell*

Call To Order

*Time In: 7:00pm*

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)

**A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by David Craycraft that Rich Dobda be excused from the meeting.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 6** – Dave Craycraft, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Dr. Scott Kelly, Jamoya Cox & Whit Wardell

**Excused: 1** – Rich Dobda

Approval of Minutes

March 28, 2022 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

**A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly, that the March 28, 2022 Minutes be approved.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 6** – Dave Craycraft, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Dr. Scott Kelly, Jamoya Cox & Whit Wardell

Pending Applications**CA-22-007**

Property Owner: David & Melissa Gabriel

Applicant: David & Melissa Gabriel

Location: 40 North Trine Street

Request: Covering over rear deck

Mr. Moore presented the application for David & Melissa Gabriel for property located at 40 North Trine Street. The applicant is requesting approval to construct a covered deck on the rear of the subject property. Staff shared photographs of the existing deck with the commission and noted that the plans are to remove the pergola and construct a shed style roof that will extend to the end of the deck. The plans note the roof will have a black corrugated metal roof to match another roof section on the home.

The commission talked with the applicant about how the new covered porch roof will connect to the existing home to ensure there is enough head height under the deck along with pitch from the house. The applicant notes that the plans show the existing asphalt shingle roof on the rear of the home will be redone to accommodate the porch roof.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the new metal roof will match the previous project that was approved. The applicant affirmed.

The commission asked the applicant what they planned on using for the infill materials for the sides of the roof. The plans note a vertical panel system pattern for the material but the existing siding is horizontal. The applicant noted that he thought the plans were to do a matching vinyl siding in those locations so it matched the house. They have even found paint samples that match if necessary. The commission discussed the siding materials and noted that a horizontal vinyl siding would be the preferred option to match the rest of the home. The applicant noted that would be fine, but he is unsure now if the initial intent was for siding to match or paneling.

Mr. Craycraft asked how far out the porch will extend. The applicant noted it will go beyond the deck approximately 1 foot.

The commission asked what material the ceiling of the porch roof will be. Staff notes the application shows it will be a white solid soffit. The commission discussed that they do not think it matters in this application if it is vinyl or aluminum, but a soffit is preferred over an open design.

Mr. Lynch noted that since the paneling material is not noted on the application, if they want to do paneling he would want more details. If it's a matching vinyl then they know what they are getting. As long as it matches it should be fine in this application.

The commission looked at photographs of the existing home siding for reference.

Mr. Craycraft spoke his concern if the new vinyl siding did not match in color to the existing home it will look obvious. The applicant notes they have paint swatches to something that will match.

Mr. Lynch asked the commission how they felt if the new siding was vertical to match the front porch area or horizontal to match the majority of the home. Dr. Kelly and Mr. White noted that they prefer the horizontal siding.

The commission asked how the posts for the porch will be finished if it was just paint. Staff notes the application says they will be wrapped in a Boral trim painted black to match.

**A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Peter Lynch that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-007 be approved with the following conditions:**

- 1) The sides of the new overhang be horizontal siding to match the house.**
- 2) The new horizontal siding match the color of the rest of the home.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 6** – Dave Craycraft, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Dr. Scott Kelly, Jamoya Cox & Whit Wardell

**CA-22-008**

Property Owner: Johnnie Woodrow  
Applicant: Johnnie Woodrow  
Location: 116 West Columbus Street  
Request: New aluminum fence

Mr. Moore presented the application for Johnnie Woodrow for property located at 116 West Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting reconsideration to an aluminum fence design for the property. Previously, in November 2021 the applicant applied for a 4 foot aluminum fence to replace a white picket fence along the front of the home and to enclose the rear yard. The Landmarks Commission reviewed the application during the November agenda and voted to deny the application as presented as it did not have a historic look to the fence. Staff noted that the applicant was not able to attend the November meeting so he was unsure on why the fence design was not approved as he has seen another similar fence in the Old Town area.

Mr. Woodrow discussed that he already purchased the fence. The style that he chose is already in the community on West Mound Street and West Waterloo Street. The home on Mound Street is in the Historic District and the Waterloo Street home and his is in the preservation district.

Mr. Woodrow noted that he does not want to do anything that detracts from the neighborhood and feels that this fence design is a crisp look that looks clean. Landscaping could be added if necessary to soften the fence. The applicant notes that the commission likes the open spear head look like what is at the swimming pool. The applicant is asking that they reconsider the application for the details being discussed this evening.

Mr. Craycraft noted that he is not specifically aware of the home on Mound Street but last year another property owner on East Columbus applied for the same fence design and it was not approved either.

Mr. Woodrow noted that he is not here to get other properties in trouble for not going to the Landmarks Commission, but he did want to point out that those fences are out there and are attached to really nice homes.

Mr. Lynch noted to the applicant that during the November application for the same fence, the commission voted 6-0 to deny it as presented. Mainly, this was due to the other applications for the same fence design. The conclusion of those other discussions is that the fence being requested does not resemble a traditional wrought iron fence. Its not a bad looking fence, but Mr. Lynch noted he will hold to his original decision based on this design for this property. A metal fence will need to have finials to put that style of design in.

Mr. Craycraft affirmed that he does not dislike the fence, it just does not have a wrought iron look that is traditional.

A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by David Craycraft that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-008 be approved as presented.

**The motion failed by the following vote:**

**No: 6** – Dave Craycraft, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Dr. Scott Kelly, Jamoya Cox & Whit Wardell

**CA-22-009**

Property Owner: Hope United Methodist Church  
Applicant: Bill Yaple  
Location: 83 East Columbus Street  
Request: Remove Slate Roof

Mr. Moore presented the application for Hope United Methodist Church for property located at 83 East Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting approval to remove the slate roof from the church. Staff discussed that the subject building was constructed in 1886 and is noted to be the first Church in Canal Winchester. It has had several additions over the years including the front portico and rear school building.

The applicant is seeking approval to remove the original slate roof from the entire building. The property currently features four roof sections with slate, including the main chapel, steeple and front portico that was added in 1915. The applicant has not indicated in the application what material they would like to replace the roof with but has provided physical examples of asphalt shingles, standing seam metal and a simulated slate.

Superior Roof Systems did a review of the condition of the existing roof in July of 2021 and the report has been provided for the commissions review. The report shows drone imagery that shows the extent of the roof condition, noting areas of softening slate, slipped tiles and broken pieces. In the report you can see the bottom 7-8 rows of the roof were replaced with a synthetic slate material in 2012.

Jackie Marion introduced herself to the commission and stated she has been a member of Hope United Methodist Church since 1954. Hope United Methodist Church is an integral part of the community. Heavily involved in human services and during COVID they hosted community events to give them a home when other facilities were closed. The congregation for the church is small, around 40 families. The church has enough money to sustain itself and pay for the minister. However, there is not enough money for a big surprise down the road to keep the church running down the road. Maintenance on the old church is consistent and updates need to be made annually. The church is asking to install

something different for the roofing instead of a real slate roof. The history of the church is important but keeping the church active is extremely important.

Jill Amos spoke to the commission as a member of the church, not a council member. The church is requesting to replace the roof before any damage takes place from the existing roof failing in the future.

Bill Yapple spoke to the commission saying he has been a member of the church for a long time. Mr. Yapple stated that he spent 35 years in the construction field and he is tasked with maintenance with the church. A report has been provided from a roofer who they know and trust. Mr. Yapple discussed that he has been in this situation before when the slate was removed from the roof on the old school building on Washington Street in 1980.

Mr. Yapple stated that they have pricing done on a slate roof repair, metal roof, synthetic slate and asphalt shingles. Repairing the roof would cost \$30,000 - \$35,000 and if tiles start to break it could be upwards of \$40,000 just to repair it. In the future it will need more repairs to keep up with the age. The slate is soft with the algae and washing it off will break the slate.

Mr. Yapple discusses that the top of the steeple looks like it has been struck by lightning. The drone was the only way to find this damage on the exterior but the interior is unknown. The finial will be attempted to be repaired but if it can not be, it is unclear what would go back. Maybe a spear or something elaborate. The diamond pattern on the tower would be made new.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant what the diamond pattern is made from. The applicant noted that it is a sheet metal that is raised 4" or so and looks to be hand formed. Mr. Craycraft asked if it was used for ventilation. The applicant noted it looks to be just for a design feature.

Mr. Lynch asked if the existing diamond features could be reused. The applicant stated they are unsure, it would depend on the rust. Lynch stated they break up the tower and is a nice feature. The applicant noted that they could put something back to try and match.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if you can see inside the steeple from the bell tower. The applicant noted that the hatch into the bell tower is seized shut and the only way inside is through the vents on the exterior.

Mr. Craycraft noted that it is important for roofs to be vented. The applicant notes that the main roof has vents on either side and the steeple is vented in the bell tower area. Mr. Lynch noted that if the diamond details need redone it might be helpful to add venting in those areas. Mrs. Amos noted that would be easy to do. My. Yapple stated that is a good idea.

My. Lynch asked if there are any signs of the roof leaking now. The applicant noted that there are no signs of the roof leaking now. The soffit was leaking

about 15 years ago but that was repaired with the synthetic slate job on the bottom rows of the main roof. The repair was only done at that time because they could not afford the entire roof at the time. Mr. Lynch asked what the existing synthetic slate is on the roof. The applicant stated he could not remember the brand but it had like a 40 year warranty. It was installed in 2008 or 2010.

Mr. White asked staff if the synthetic slate on the roof went before Landmarks Commission at that time. Staff indicated that it did not.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if the roofer indicated what type of slate is on the roof now. The applicant indicated he has no idea, but the guess is it was an inexpensive slate at the time, based on the thickness on it.

Mr. Lynch asked if the roofer quotes show the deconstruction cost to remove the old slate. The applicant indicated he does not have that information but he does know it will take a lift to do the project.

Mr. Lynch commented to the commission that he has worked with Superior Roofs personally and they know what they are doing so this report is most likely accurate and can be trusted. Mr. Yapple said he is the only quote he got on this project because he does good work.

Mr. Lynch notes that he recommends that the church gets a second opinion on costs because there may be better pricing out there than this. Since there are no immediate leaks they have time to look at quotes. Mr. Yapple noted that they are looking to get this as a 2022 project not 2023 project.

Mr. Lynch comments to the applicant and the commission that this is the most historic street in town with the most historic church in town. Getting a like for like slate looking material on the roof in his opinion is important. This is not recommending real slate.

Mrs. Amos asked the commission if they could provide suggestions for contractors to quote the work.

Staff asked the applicant what the price was for the synthetic slate was in 2010.

Mr. Lynch notes that the synthetic slate generally has a 40 year warranty but the product will probably far outlast the warranty, in his opinion. Mr. Yapple voiced his concerns on synthetic slate as it is the most expensive option and will limit other project funding.

The Landmarks Commission noted they would help put together a list of contractors to reach out to for quoting the work.

Mr. Lynch notes that there is another product called CEDUR that is a synthetic cedar shake material that is a good product that is more cost effective. It may be

another option and Mr. Lynch notes that he has samples in his truck if the applicant wants to see them. A quote he got on that material is much more competitive. The applicants asked some questions about that product to Mr. Lynch on installation and costs.

Mrs. Amos discussed that it is encouraging that the commission would consider alternative products to natural slate. Mr. Lynch noted that the importance in this application is the like for like character. Synthetics are probably the optimal choice. It is not clear how standing seam will look for this building, mainly the steeple.

Mrs. Amos noted that the synthetic cedar product images show a steeple done and it looks nice.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if they want to table the application to get a few more quotes on different products. The applicant noted that they have not ordered any material yet or scheduled the project. Staff noted to the applicant the May Landmarks Agenda schedule. The applicant thinks the project will take 4 months to complete.

Mr. Lynch noted that if they were willing to go with synthetic slate the application would most likely get approved this meeting.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if they need to do the steeple at this time as it looks to be in the best shape, aside from some new paint. The applicant commented that the roofer thinks the diamond patterns in the steeple need to be replaced.

Mr. Lynch noted that they could always source what synthetic slate was used previously and get quotes to finish the roof with the same material. However, there are dozens of other products out there. Mr. Yaple commented that the guy who installed the existing synthetic rows is no longer roofing and he does not have a record of what was previously installed.

The commission talked about the fish scale pattern that is in several rows on the existing roof now. Mr. Lynch notes from his experience there is no cost difference in fish scale shingles vs square. If they are getting pricing, they should explore both.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the shingles are the same color or different. Mrs. Amos responded saying that they are the same color.

The commission discussed that a two-color shingle install may look better than a single color.

The applicants took a brief recess to discuss their options.



Mrs. Amos returned from the discussion saying that they are comfortable moving forward with approval for a synthetic slate material this evening. They are going to go out and shop install quotes to try and reduce cost. If they make any changes, they will come back for new approval.

Dr. Kelly asked the applicant if they were going with a grey color. The applicant was unsure. Mr. Lynch notes if they go with anything other than the grey color discussed this evening they should bring in samples and quotes for review.

**A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-009 be approved with the following conditions:**

- 1. The replacement roofing material approved is a synthetic slate by Ecostar;**
- 2. The approved color is Federal Gray.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 6** – Dave Craycraft, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Dr. Scott Kelly, Jamoya Cox & Whit Wardell

#### Old Business

Staff discussed the City Hall open house event and its turn-out of visitors. Anyone on the commission that did not make the event can still stop over for a tour of the facility.

Staff provided an update on exterior items for City Hall that are still to be completed like the signage, parking and painting.

#### New Business

Staff noted that they are looking for a representative from the Landmarks Commission to be on the Steering Committee for the Comprehensive Plan. Details on what the plan is and the involvement of the steering committee were shared with the commission. Staff asked for a representative to be nominated by the end of the week.

The commission asked about repercussions for people who do work without Landmarks approval. Staff noted that they can send them violation notices and require them to get approval after the fact or if the project is not approved by the commission then the applicant would need to correct those items accordingly.

#### Adjournment

*Time Out: 8:43pm*

**A motion was made by David Craycraft and seconded by Roger White, that this meeting be adjourned.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 6** – Dave Craycraft, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Dr. Scott Kelly, Jamoya Cox & Whit Wardell

---

Date

---

Landmarks Chairman