

Canal Winchester

*City Hall
45 East Waterloo Street
Canal Winchester, OH 43110*



Meeting Minutes

August 22, 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 Roger White, seconded by David Craycraft, that Rich Dobda be excused from the meeting.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Excused: 1 – Rich Dobda

Approval of Minutes

July 25, 2022 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Peter Lynch, that the July 25, 2022 Minutes be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Pending Applications**CA-22-027**

Property Owner: RRCT LLC
Applicant: Oliver Holtsberry – DaNite Sign Co.
Location: 152 West Waterloo Street
Request: New Wall Sign

Mr. Moore presented the application for DaNite Sign Company for property located at 152 West Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval for a new 26.5 sq. ft. aluminum sign for NAPA on the east corner of the building by the entrance. Staff discussed that the sign is designed as a 2" deep aluminum pan with vinyl a graphic overlay.

Mr. Lynch asked if there was anyone present to represent this application. Staff noted to the chairman that he did not see the representative from the sign company in the audience.

Mr. Craycraft asked if this is the standard NAPA sign being requested. Staff indicated that it is not. The typical sign is a large cabinet box with internal illumination. This sign was designed to fit the space and landmarks specifications.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the sign is illuminated. Staff indicated that the sign is externally illuminated with the existing light fixtures above the signage panels.

Mr. Lynch spoke that his only concern with the design is the existing lighting may cause glare on the sign and adding some relief to the letters might help. Staff noted that the application does not state if the graphics are a matte finish or have any reflectivity.

The commission discussed a matte finish on the sign vs adding some raised lettering. Mr. Craycraft noted that he likes the sign that is proposed. Mr. White added he is not concerned about glare from traffic with the setback of the building.

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Roger White to approve Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-027 as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-22-028

Property Owner: UB4 LLC
Applicant: Joe Blankenship -Crimson Cup Coffee + Tea
Location: 108 North High Street
Request: Building Renovations

Mr. Moore presented the application for Joe Blankenship for property located at 108 North High Street. The applicant is requesting approval for some renovations to the existing industrial warehouse building. Staff discussed that the subject property was constructed in 1987 and has not been before the Landmarks Commission for approval.

The applicant is in the starting stages of a renovation project for the building and would like to replace two of the three dock doors on the front of the facility and have the far-left dock door be replaced with a taller 10' door. All of the docks would get new bumpers and cushions.

Staff discussed other maintenance type items will commence with the project that do not require landmarks approval such as painting the building white, replacing damaged gutters and siding and a new rubber roof.

The applicant is also seeking approval for a new 6' x 3' wall sign adjacent to the front door. The new sign will be constructed out of metal and is shown as non-illuminated.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the sign background will be white. The applicant noted that the sign background will be white with red letters. The sign will also have the address of the facility on it as the current address location is hard to read.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the new siding color is also white. The applicant affirmed. Mr. Craycraft discussed his concern with the sign getting lost if it matches the color of the siding. Mr. Lynch noted he thinks the white on white will work well given the large scale of the sign.

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Peter Lynch that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-028 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-22-029

Property Owner: Jim Barnett
Applicant: Bruce Rainier – Advanced Concepts, Inc.
Location: 18 East Columbus Street
Request: New 2nd floor windows

Mr. Moore presented the application for Bruce Rainier for property located at 18 East Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting approval to replace all seven windows in the second floor only with new vinyl replacements. Staff shared photographs of the building and windows with the commission and noted that the drawings do not note if the proposed two over two windows have internal grids or simulated divided light grids.

Staff did note that the applicant inquired about window replacement previously in January of 2020 and the commission did provide feedback on making all replacement windows consistent on the entire building. One component from the prior discussion was how to trim the windows out with the existing stucco.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if the new windows are going to be the same color as the existing windows. The applicant indicated that the new windows will be white vinyl. The sash will be removed and new fixture will fit in the existing area. All of the existing trim will remain the same.

Mr. White noted that the new windows will be white on the second floor and the first floor windows are a dark color. The applicant noted that is correct they are painted and the rear of the building has a few aluminum storm windows.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant to elaborate why the new windows will not match the existing color. The applicant discussed the difficulty in matching the existing paint with a new product.

Mr. Lynch discussed his concern that the building already has 4 different styles of windows. There were 4 one-over-one vinyl windows replaced on the west side of the building several years ago and 1 two-over-two vinyl window in the lower left corner of the front façade before that. When vinyl windows are used they should typically match the style of what is being replaced. In this case, the

majority of the original window style was a two-over-two divided lite window. The new windows should be at a minimum a simulated divided lite so there are grids on the eternal of the glass. The applicant noted that the proposed windows have the grid between the panes of glass.

Mr. Lynch asked if the arched window in the front is just the frame and not the glass. The applicant affirmed just the frame is arched and it will remain as-is.

Mr. Lynch asked if the existing trim color remains the same with the new white windows. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if they have looked into aluminum clad windows which have more color options that could match. The applicant indicated that they have not.

Mr. Lynch asked how many windows are proposed to be replaced. The applicant indicated 7 units, some are doubled.

The commission discussed how the new windows are white and the existing first floor windows are a dark gray color and the trim around the new vinyl windows will be the same gray color.

Mr. Lynch stated to the applicant that his opinion is any new vinyl window needs to be a simulated divided lite. Vinyl windows is a product that can be used if used correctly. The applicant noted that product is available he was unaware that it was going to be what was requested. The commission discussed and affirmed that an SDL window would be the most appropriate.

The commission discussed tabling the application so the applicant could provide more information. The applicant discussed his concerns with the lead times on getting windows manufactured, which at the moment is 6-8 weeks. The commission discussed that a condition of approval could be the SDL windows so the applicant can get going.

Mr. White discussed he is concerned with the white vinyl window contrasting with the trim and existing widow color on the first floor.

Staff asked the applicant what the exterior view would be on the second floor with the new windows. The applicant noted that the exterior frame and sill plate at the bottom would remain and the new window would be inserted from the inside. Staff does note for the commission that the east door on the second floor does have a white frame.

The commission discussed painting the window trim white so it matches the new windows. The applicant noted that could be done and he does not think the owner would mind. Mr. Lynch noted he thinks all of the trim needs to be painted white not just the second floor. The applicant affirmed. The commission noted that everything being uniform will be good.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Jamoya Cox to approve Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-029 with the following conditions:

- 1. Wincore vinyl windows must have SDL grids.**
- 2. The building trim (including the doors) be painted white to match the new windows.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-22-030

Property Owner: Teena Brown
Applicant: Michael Felkey
Location: 29 West Oak Street
Request: New Metal Roof

Mr. Moore presented the application for 29 West Oak Street. The applicant is requesting approval to install a new standing seam metal roof in 'Patina Green' on the subject property. The applicant has provided photographs of samples for the roof color and style for the commissions review.

The applicant indicated that the old roof will be removed and they will insulate and put new supports on the rafters to attach the new roofing.

Mr. White asked if the roof vents will remain. The applicant affirmed that one is for the kitchen and the other the bathroom.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the areas between the seams are flat and do not have ridges. Staff noted that they believe so based on the photographs that were provided in the application.

The applicant did note that the roof will have the snow break on it based on discussion with the commission and staff.

The commission discussed the color for the proposed roof.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Whit Wardell that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-030 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-22-031

Property Owner: Anthony Hughey

Applicant: Anthony Hughey

Location: 44 Washington Street

Request: 1. Enclose section of side porch for bathroom.

2. Close in breezeway between house and summer kitchen.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Anthony Hughey for property located at 44 Washington Street. The applicant is requesting approval for two projects at their subject property. The first is to enclose a section of the side porch for a bathroom addition on the first floor. The second project is to completely close in the breezeway between the house and the summer kitchen to the rear.

Staff presented plans provided by the applicant for the bathroom addition. The bathroom will enclose an approximate 6.5 foot by 9 foot area on the east side of the existing side porch. The applicant is showing that they are intending on reusing the existing asbestos siding if possible with the project and they would like to add a vinyl transom window on the north wall.

The second project is to close in the area between the house and the detached brick summer kitchen. The home is currently connected to the brick structure with a breezeway and the plans show to add a vinyl board and batten siding on either end and to install a window and door on the north wall. The applicant has provided two options for doors, one with an 8 panel divided lite doorway and the second for a 4 lite frosted panel doorway.

Mr. Hughey discussed that he does have a couple different options for siding material that were not included in the original application and passed them out to the commission for review.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the bathroom window would be trimmed out like the other windows on the home. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Hughey noted that he wanted to go with a board and batten design for the breezeway enclosure and has provided alternatives to the vinyl product if that is not favorable. One option is a cedar plywood that he could install baton strips to trim it out.

Mr. Craycraft looking at the additional siding material options provided by the applicant asks if the horizontal shake siding is the alternative product if the old asbestos cannot be reused. The applicant affirmed and noted that he is concerned it would be too brittle and tried to find something that was comparable. The main difference is the new material would not have the scalloped bottom.

Mr. White noted that he is concerned with trying to save asbestos siding on one side and then on the project to the rear the original proposal was for a vinyl material. Mr. Hughey responded saying that he was trying to finish out the board and batten design but has provided alternative products to the vinyl. Mr. Lynch added that he would rather see the smartside product rather than vinyl.

Mr. Lynch asked if the plan was to use smartside batons if they recommend that material. The applicant indicated he would use both.

Mr. Craycraft discussed that he likes the alternative product to the asbestos siding being presented. The applicant indicated that he found a second company that offers an identical product if that specific one is not available.

Mr. Lynch asked if the bathroom wall will be inline with the house or if it steps back. The applicant indicated it will be in-line. The current block steps back about a half of an inch and he wants the siding to overlap the block.

Mr. Lynch asked if they could salvage enough material for the exposed side would he be comfortable with the return being the newer material so it is not as visible. The applicant noted that he would be willing to do that if he could.

Mr. Lynch noted that he likes door option 1 with the 8 panel grid over option 2 with the frosted panels. Mr. Lynch asked if there was a door proposed for the south wall. The applicant noted that both north and south walls would match.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the door options match what is on the porch. The applicant indicated that they do not. One door is a full lite and the other is a ½ lite.

Mr. Lynch asked if all of the windows on the house are the same. The applicant noted that the 2nd floor on the front of the house has 6 over 6 vinyl windows, the first floor has one over one windows.

Mr. Hughey noted that his original intent with the vinyl product is that it comes pre insulated and the thought was to use that to avoid any pipes freezing in the laundry room. Mr. Lynch noted that his opinion is that since there is no vinyl siding to tie into, that would not be a product choice he would support. Smartside, Alora and James Hardi would be his preferred material list; or a true wood board and batten.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if the side porch will have any change in flooring materials. The applicant noted that the cellar door will get removed to allow for the plumbing to be tied in.

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly to approve Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-031 with the following conditions:

- 1. The new windows and doors be trimmed to match the rest of the house.**
- 2. The siding for the breezeway connection be the presented smartside product or something similar.**
- 3. The breezeway doors be the 8 panel SDL presented as 'Option 1'.**
- 4. If the asbestos siding cannot be reused for the bathroom addition, the alternative material presented at the meeting can be used.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-22-032

Property Owner: Home Chapel Canal Investment
Applicant: Canal Wigwam
Location: 4 South High Street
Request: Paint front façade

Mr. Moore presented the application for the Canal Wigwam for property located at 4 South High Street. The owner is seeking approval to paint the front vestibule and area under the storefront windows on the subject property. Staff presented the initial paint color being requested by the applicant which is a dark green called 'Yew Hedge' by Kilz. The applicant after testing the paint on a part of the building determined that the color does not look good with the Chase Bank next door and is now requesting 'Classic Bronze' by BEHR.

Mr. Cox asked staff to confirm that the area they wanted to paint is within the outlined area only. Staff affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if the initial thought behind the green paint choice was to tie it into the building to the right. The applicant noted that they wanted a paint color that worked with both buildings on either side. Chase Bank has a taupe color that did not mix well with the green.

Mr. Craycraft agreed with the applicant that the green may not have blended well. Mr. Lynch affirmed noting that the 'Classic Bronze' color is probably safer.

Mr. White recalls that the front vestibule was originally stained a dark brown years ago. The bronze color would mimic an older design style.

Mr. Lynch asked if the area under the window is a wood material. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked if the intent is to paint the entire projecting vestibule and just the two panels under the windows. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. White asked if the window trim was going to be painted to match as well. The applicant responded saying that they only planned on painting what is highlighted, not the sides of the wall around the storefront windows. Mr. White clarified that he was talking about the windows in the vestibule. The applicant affirmed they would match the rest of the new color.

The applicant noted that the sides of the vestibule have exposed brick that is unpainted.

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Roger White to approve Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-032 for the BEHR 'Classic Bronze' paint as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-22-033

Property Owner: Sean & Janet Johnson

Applicant: Sean Johnson

Location: 53 West Mound Street

Request: 1. New 5' Aluminum Fence

2. Paint garage trim

3. New rear porch decking

Mr. Moore presented the application for Sean & Janet Johnson for property located at 53 West Mound Street. The applicant is requesting approval for three different scopes of work for the subject property. The first is for a new 5' aluminum fence that was installed earlier this year on the west property line, the second is for painting the trim on the garage and the final request is for new decking on the rear porch.

Staff presented photographs of the 5' aluminum fence installed on the western property line and the prior wood picket fence that was replaced. The installed fence does have the "puppy pickets" installed on the lower third which includes some spiked pickets. Staff notified the commission that they were made aware of the fence after a complaint was filed to City Council.

The second request is to paint the trim on the detached garage BEHR 'Little Black Dress'. The current garage trim is a dark red color.

The third request is to replace the tongue and groove porch decking with an 8" wide composite deck board. The applicant did provide photographs of the existing damage on the porch railing but no information on what they are looking to do with that portion if its going to be a like-for-like replacement or change.

Mr. White asked the applicant if they have any plans to modify the other fencing around the yard like the side to the south abutting the alley. The applicant indicated that they did not have plans to change the other fencing. White asked if the fencing that was removed is the same that is on the east property line. The applicant affirmed. White asked what prompted the change. The applicant stated they got a new large dog and he was able to knock the fence over.

Mr. Craycraft discussed amongst the commission that this style of fence has been turned down several times in the recent past because of the top rail in the design. Ideally, the top of this fence should look like the bottom puppy picket. Mr. Lynch affirmed noting that this style of fence has been approved without the boxed top, which is not a traditional style. This fence is also aluminum, not iron.

Mr. Lynch asked staff if the height of the fence is an issue. Staff indicated that for this property it is not. Lynch asked staff to clarify and staff noted that this property has frontage on Mound, Elm and the alley and given the location of the house and garage to elm the fence is allowed to connect the house to the garage. Lynch asked if they were able to install a 6 foot privacy fence. Staff noted if the commission found that to be appropriate, yes.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if the fence along Elm is located in the right-of-way. Staff indicated that from what they can find, it would be located outside of the right-of-way. However, a survey would be able to be the only way to determine.

Mr. Johnson discussed that he was unaware the property was in the landmarks district since the home itself was not on the national register of historic places. They have received compliments on the fence design since it has been installed.

Mr. Lynch discussed that he does like the puppy picket at the bottom of the fence but does not like the box top on the fence. That top deign is non-traditional and has been denied multiple times by the commission in the last several years. Lynch stated that his recommendation would be to go back with another wooden fence like what was there before or even taller. Mrs. Johnson asked if he was referring to a taller puppy picket. Mr. Lynch clarified the whole fence getting switched out.

Mr. Johnson asked what the top of the fence is supposed to look like. Mr. Lynch stated that this is an aluminum fence panel. What is preferred is an older style iron fence or simple wood fence. With the aluminum, the commission has approved a fence design previously because it had exposed finials on the top, similar to a wrought iron fence.

Staff noted for the applicant there are different finial designs. The puppy panel at the bottom has a spear point tip design. Some finials are highly ornate and can come with a ball point tip.

Mr. Johnson asked if the top of the fence that is installed could be altered in anyway. Staff indicated that they are unaware of the fence installed could be altered or not. Mr. Lynch said it could be possible but that would be something their fence installer would need to take a look at.

Mr. White asked if they knew the brand name of the fence. The applicant noted it was included in the submittal. Mr. Craycraft suggested looking at what that brand offers to see if the fence can be modified or not.

Mr. Lynch discussed with the applicant that they approved a fence design that looked like a taller version of just the puppy panel at the bottom of the fence. Mrs. Johnson asked if every picket had a point. Mr. Lynch affirmed and stated that is one of many different styles.

Mr. Lynch asked staff if it was appropriate to table part of the discussion with the fence but talk about the rest with the applicant. Staff noted that would be appropriate.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the fence posts are in concrete footers. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. White discussed moving on to the other requests prior to making a vote to table the fence discussion.

Mr. Lynch noted the second request is to paint the trim on the garage BEHR 'Little Black Dress' but it does not look like the man door on the side gets painted. Mrs. Johnson said that the man door was recently replaced with what is there now and they planned on painting the door to match the trim.

Mrs. Johnson passed around a color sample of the proposed paint for the commission to review.

Mr. Lynch noted that the replacement door looks to be a shaker style with an SDL window.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant what the trim color is on the house. The applicant noted that she has also recently painted the red trim on the house black.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if the photo on the screen for trim color has been modified. The applicant affirmed that the red shutters are now black.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if this property needs approval for color changes. Staff affirmed that this property is in the original historic district which regulates paint color.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if the plan is to paint all of the trim on the building the 'Little Black Dress' color. The applicant stated that she was unsure at this time.

Mr. Craycraft stated that there is a house down the street from his that is black with white trim. Mr. Lynch discussed a very popular color right now is 'Mopboard Black' by Benjamin Moore.

Mr. Craycraft asked if they were unsure about the trim on the garage being painted black or something else. The applicant stated she wants all of the red trim on the garage black but is unsure if the front porch should be black.

Staff asked if the block on the garage will remain as is. The applicant stated it would absolutely remain.

The applicant noted that the third request is for the rear porch. They would also like to use black railing instead of what is there now. Staff noted that the only information that was provided for the rear porch was the 8" wide composite decking.

Mr. Johnson stated that the rear porch railing is very brittle and would fall down if you leaned on it. That is why they are looking to replace it.

Mr. Lynch discussed he is not concerned about the shutters and garage trim being painted black but does not think the porch railings should be black as well.

Mr. White asked the applicant if they are applying for different porch railings than what is on the rear now. The applicant stated the new railings proposed are metal to match the fence.

The applicant pulled up information on the railing and passed it out to the commission for comments.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if the applicant needs a building permit to change out the railing. Staff stated if its maintenance related then no. Mr. Craycraft spoke his concern with the height of the porch and the railing picket spacing meeting code compliance.

Dr. Kelly noted that this side porch is highly visible from the street.

Staff asked the applicant if the proposed porch railing had round or square spindles. The applicant noted that they match the fence.

Mr. Lynch commented that he is not comfortable voting on the porch railing without more information for review. Dr. Kelly affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft asked the commission if they had any further comments on the garage paint request. Mr. White and Dr. Kelly affirm.

Mr. Craycraft recapped that the current rear porch decking is wood and they are wanting an 8" composite board. Craycraft asked the applicant if there is a crawlspace under the rear porch. The applicant noted that he was unsure.

Dr. Kelly discusses with the applicant that the existing porch has a narrow board design and this new request is for a much wider 8" deck board, asking if they have looked into a narrow composite decking product that has more of a historic profile. The applicant indicated that they have not but they certainly can.

Mr. Lynch recommended to look into the product by AZEK and Aeratis for the narrow tongue and groove porch decking.

Mr. Craycraft elaborated that what they are looking for is a 3" wide tongue and groove decking.

Mr. Lynch noted that the original decking that was spec'd would allow for a lot of moisture to get under the porch.

Mrs. Johnson asked if both recommended products are wood. Mr. Lynch stated both are a composite material. They both have a wood grain texture finish and Aeratis can be painted without voiding the warranty. Because you can see the rear porch from the street it should be a more traditional product.

Mr. Lynch stated that for the railing on the porch, there needs to be more information presented for the new metal railing they are requesting. Ideally, a railing that looks like what is there now would be ideal. There are composite materials that may work but not steel. Mrs. Johnson asked if they could paint the rear porch railing black like the shutters. Mr. Lynch stated that they would need to put an application together that shows all the details of what they wanted to do with the porch railing.

Mr. Lynch noted that he would be comfortable approving a railing system replacement if it matches what is currently on the house now. It could be a wood or wood composite material. The applicant affirmed that would work well. Mr. Lynch stated not a vinyl or metal railing. The applicant affirmed.

The commission discussed voting on the agenda with the multiple requests.

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Peter Lynch that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-033 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. The Application item for the 5' aluminum fence tabled for future discussion. (Applicant to explore altering the design based on comments provided at the meeting).**
- 2. The BEHR "little black dress" trim approved for the detached garage and shutters on the home.**
- 3. The rear porch decking be an Azek or Aeratis 3" tongue and groove product.**
- 4. The rear porch railing approved to be replaced with a wood or wood composite material to match the likeness of the existing.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-22-034

Property Owner: Dean Acklin
Applicant: Koel Smith
Location: 55 Franklin Street
Request: New Privacy Gate for rear yard.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Dean Acklin for property located at 55 Franklin Street. The applicant is requesting approval to install a new wood privacy gate into the rear yard of the home. The proposed gate has two design options, one for an arched top and the second for a flat top. The gate is proposed to be made from 1x6 tongue and groove cedar or oak to be painted to

match the garage & house. The gate would feature decorative hardware to match the hardware on the garage.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant how tall the gates would be. The applicant stated 6 foot tall.

Mr. Lynch asked if the arched top was the preferred option by the owner. The owner stated that it is the preferred option.

Staff asked the applicant if both gate doors swing or just one side. The applicant stated both. Staff suggested adding a roller or caster to the gate door so it does not sag over time with the weight.

Mr. Lynch asked if the picked fence in the rear yard is still there. The applicant affirmed.

A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by Peter Lynch to approved application #CA-22-034 with the following condition:

1. The privacy gate have castors to aid in opening and closing.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-22-035

Property Owner: Dean Acklin

Applicant: Pat Ryan – Ryan Brothers Landscaping

Location: 55 Franklin Street

Request: New Grill Pavilion

Mr. Moore presented the application for Pat Ryan for property located at 55 Franklin Street. The applicant is requesting approval for a new 16'x18' detached pavilion and grilling station on the back patio. The pavilion design shows 8x8 posts and a shed type roof. Other details for the pavilion have not been provided for review.

Mr. Ryan noted the roof is a black standing seam metal and the posts are 6x6 wrapped in either cedar or pine and painted white. The ceiling of the structure will be a tongue and groove board painted white.

Mr. Ryan noted that there the pavilion is being located was previously a large tree that died. The tree will be removed and the bricks reworked with the decorative inlay in the center as shown.

Mr. Lynch asked if the roof was a true standing seam and the applicant affirmed.

The applicant stated they do not plan on having gutters at this time and plan on the roof shedding onto a river rock area. Another plan is to have a rain chain to allow the water to flow in a concentrated location. Mr. Ryan noted there is about a 10 foot elevation change from the patio to the back corner of the rear yard.

Mr. Craycraft asked how tall the roof is on the structure. The applicant stated it goes from 9 feet to 8.5 feet on the down end. Any taller you lose rain coverage.

Mr. Craycraft asked how deep the roof structure is. The applicant stated 13 inches with the 2x12 and the tongue and groove.

The commission noted that they think the project is going to look nice.

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-035 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Old Business

Staff updated the commission on a few projects in town.

New Business

Staff informed the commission about an initiative that City Council is looking to take by informing properties in Old Town once a year that they own a property within the Landmarks Review district boundaries to encourage compliance.

Adjournment

Time Out: 8:55pm

A motion was made by Peter Lynch and seconded by David Craycraft, that this meeting be adjourned.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Date

Landmarks Chairman