

Canal Winchester

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



Meeting Minutes

October 24, 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 Whit Wardell, that Rich Dobda and Peter Lynch be excused from the meeting.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Jamoya Cox, Roger White, David Craycraft, Dr. Scott Kelly & Whit Wardell

Excused: 2 – Pete Lynch and Rich Dobda

Approval of Minutes

September 26, 2022 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by David Craycraft, that the September 26, 2022 Minutes be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Jamoya Cox, Roger White, David Craycraft, Dr. Scott Kelly & Whit Wardell

October 13, 2022 Landmarks Commission Special Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Dr. Scott Kelly, seconded by Whit Wardell, that the October 13, 2022 Minutes be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Jamoya Cox, Roger White, David Craycraft, Dr. Scott Kelly & Whit Wardell

Tabled Applications**CA-22-001 UPDATE**

Property Owner: Jerry McCann & Erika Tucker
Applicant: David Craycraft
Location: 36 West Mound Street
Request: Paint Color Approval for rear addition

Mr. Moore presented the application for Jerry McCann and Erica Tucker for 36 West Mound Street. Staff briefly discussed that this application was tabled during the October 13 Special Meeting to go over paint color approvals for the home addition that was approved back in February. The applicant has picked out two new addition colors and existing trim color for the commissions review.

Staff shared that the new proposed siding color is a Sherwin Williams 'Alabaster' #7008 and the trim color would be the Sherwin Williams 'Front Porch' 7651. The

front door would be painted Sherwin Williams 'Tricorn Black' #6258 to match the new windows and soffit trim.

Erika Tucker discussed with the commission that they would like to modify the application slightly from what is in the packet. They have decided to simplify the project a bit and have the entire addition be painted the 'Alabaster' color. The trim on the main home would also be 'Alabaster' with exception to the trim immediately around the windows which would be 'Tricorn Black' to tie into the black windows. The front door will remain the Tricorn Black as initially proposed.

Dr. Kelly asked the applicant what color the gable end of the front porch would be painted. The applicant indicated that would also be the 'Alabaster' color.

Mr. Craycraft asked about the limestone sills and headers. The applicant stated that those would be painted 'Alabaster' as well because they do not have the ability to strip the paint that is on them now.

A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-001 update for the paint color be approved as presented for the Sherwin Williams Alabaster #7008.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 – Jamoya Cox, Roger White, Dr. Scott Kelly & Whit Wardell

Abstain: 1 – David Craycraft

CA-22-036

Property Owner: Donna Fisher
Applicant: Donna Fisher
Location: 47 West Mound Street
Request: New aluminum fence

Mr. Moore presented the application for Donna Fischer for property located at 47 West Mound Street. The applicant is requesting approval to add onto the existing 4 foot aluminum fence along the front of the property. Staff discussed that this application was tabled during the September agenda due to no applicant present for discussion.

Staff did note that in 2004 when the fence was approved initially, it was discussed that it match the style of the fence around the village swimming pool. Staff did double check and the fence around the pool now is the same as in 2003.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the 2004 application was to construct a fence along the entire frontage as proposed this evening. Staff indicated that the fence location is the same.

Mr. Craycraft notes that the fence that is installed does not match the fence around the pool.

Mr. White asked if they are able to match up the fence style with what is existing or if they are doing a full replacement. The applicant stated that Capitol Fence is matching up with what is existing.

Dr. Kelly asked staff about this fence and what was not approved recently next door. Staff indicated that the other fence was 5 foot tall and had a double horizontal rail on the top. This fence is similar to another fence that was approved on West Waterloo Street a few doors west from Dairy Queen a few years back.

Mr. Craycraft noted he has no problems with the fence design as presented.

Mr. White asked if it is going to turn the corner to tie into the adjacent wood fence. The applicant affirmed that it will be at an angle to avoid the existing tree.

A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by Jamoya Cox that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-036 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Jamoya Cox, Roger White, David Craycraft, Dr. Scott Kelly & Whit Wardell

CA-22-037

Property Owner: Bon Venturas Inc
Applicant: Walt McEnery
Location: 30 Liberty Street
Request: Building Remodel

Mr. Moore presented the application for Shawn Bogenrife representing the project at 30 Liberty Street building renovation. Staff discussed that this application was discussed in September and the commission provided the projects contractor with feedback on the design, only approving painting of the existing exterior façade brick and trim around the building. The applicant is here this evening to go over the changes that were made to each elevation with the commission for further feedback.

Staff presented the north elevation to the commission noting the changes to the patio railing design based on feedback from last months meeting. The applicant has also provided more details on the storefront system that they are looking to install on this elevation with install depth and color. Details for the signage have

not been provided but the applicant is showing a concept for a porcelain enameled steel sign with a silk-screen logo.

Looking at the east elevation the applicant has provided an update for the patio railing to match the front railing, without the mesh system. The vertical metal band to break the paint division is now shown. A detail for the 2" relief on the entrance is provided, however the applicant does not provide any details for how the brick is going to tie into the existing on the building. On this elevation the applicant has also provided additional details for the signage showing an intent for overhead lighting and some sizes but those details for the light fixtures or how the signage would be mounted to the building have not been provided.

For the south elevation, the applicant has provided more information for the walk-up window and how the awning will project out from overhead with a light underneath.

The applicant has provided details for the dumpster screen as a cedar wood fence design but the scale and size of the enclosure is not clear on the plan set.

The applicant has provided details for the light fixtures they plan on using on the four elevations. The majority is the half moon fixture that has 8 across the building and two of the wall packs that put off more light on the front and back of the building.

Shawn Bogenrife introduced himself to the commission and passed around samples of the wire mesh material and building trim and color samples for review.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the wire mesh would be installed on railing that is at ground elevation. Mr. Bogenrife stated that any railing that is on the north side will have the mesh so they all match. Mr. Craycraft asked if all of it would be painted black. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the dock railing is attached with a plate to the top or side of the concrete or if they are going to core drill the dock. The applicant indicated drilling was the intent. Mr. Craycraft spoke his concerns of drilling the core in the concrete because over time with freeze and thaw the concrete ends up blowing out. The applicant stated that a plate may be okay, they will just need to review the engineering for it.

Dr. Kelly asked where the second LED wall pack is located on the building. The applicant indicated that there is one facing the parking to the rear and one facing the parking in the front.

Mr. White stated he feels they are focusing on the walk-up window being a big part of the business. Mr. Bogenrife stated that during Covid pandemic, services like doordash helped keep restaurants viable. The window is to allow for online ordering services to pick up the food. Mr. White asked if customers would be able to walk up to the window and place an order. The applicant stated that is not the intention but the reason it is there is for online order pickup.

Mr. Craycraft added that he does not want to see someone pull up in the drive isle, get out to wait for the food at the window. Dr. Kelly affirmed.

Mr. White noted that he has personally seen places that have added these services start to take them away and make you go inside to get your food. Having a takeout window may not be necessary and when the comment was brought up that this is used primarily for food delivery services, that may add additional traffic of people coming and going at all times. This then becomes a vehicle predominate feature, not a walk up pedestrian feature.

Mr. Craycraft added that there is no parking in this area, the window is in the drive isle. This could create a line of cars waiting to use the window and people can not leave the parking lot. Mr. White commented that this essentially is creating a drive-thru when they are not permitted. Mr. Craycraft affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft informed the applicant he would like to see other options if this walk-up order service is necessary for the business.

Staff asked the applicant if they could clarify some of the existing building items on the north elevation like the dock bumpers and gate lift and how those will interact with the proposed changes. The applicant stated the dock leveler would remain but the bumpers could be removed. The gate lift would still be functional.

Staff asked how the lift would be functional if there is railing directly in front of it. The applicant noted they could install a removable section in the railing.

Staff asked the applicant if they could clarify on the existing window sills and if they were to be painted. The applicant affirmed it would be painted the trim color including the window itself. The applicant also noted they will be installing interior windows to meet energy code requirements. The building owner wants to keep the industrial look that they could. Mr. Craycraft interior storms are a good idea to keep the look of the original windows.

Staff mentioned to the applicant that last month it was mentioned the existing hand rails were to be replaced on the east elevation. The updated rendering

shows they are to remain. The applicant stated that there are only two existing rails and it would seem reasonable to replace them, and will check with his client. Mr. White noted that a railing that matches the north elevation would be the most appropriate.

Staff asked the applicant to provide more clarity on the existing concrete approach on the east elevation on if it will be removed/remain and how that will work with the proposed patio. Mr. Bogenrife stated that they are working on budget items now but the city expressed interest in on street parallel spaces on the east elevation. Staff noted that the site plan does not show any changes in this location. The applicant noted that he will work with the client on further details for this area.

Staff noted to the applicant that there are no details provided for dimensions of the patio, any furniture or lighting. It was noted last month string lights would be idea but details have not been submitted. Mr. Bogenrife noted that the intent is the patio would not go out any further than the sidewalk on either side of the curb cut. This would be approximately 16.5 feet from the building and a little over 28 feet in width.

Mr. Craycraft asked if there is a need for a dedicated fire lane. Staff indicated that this building has access on all four sides currently but there will be a fire department connection that would likely be on the east side of the building. Plans for that have not been provided for review.

Dr. Kelly noted that he also would like to see brick samples for the veneer used to create the storefront entry. The applicant noted he could provide that for review.

Mr. Cox asked staff if there are any concerns with parking for the proposed building users. Staff stated that this site is located in an overlay that does not require any parking to be provided. However, there is a public parking lot directly to the north of this site and the applicant is looking at leasing parking from the church to the south side of the site.

Mr. Craycraft and Mr. White discussed the transition plate between paint colors and asked the applicant what color it would be. The applicant stated they planned on a milled finish aluminum. Mr. Wardell asked what scale the plate would be. The applicant stated they planned on using 6 inches.

Mr. White told the applicant that last month the paint colors were approved with the emergency to paint the building and it has not been started yet. The applicant stated they were waiting to get on the contractors schedule.

Mr. Craycraft stated that there are still items that need to be clarified before the full set of plans can be approved. Mr. White affirmed asking the applicant if there are any thing that need to be approved quickly to keep the project moving forward. The applicant stated that the paint was the most urgent thing. Next big items would be railing and doors.

Dr. Kelly stated he would like to have more information on how the railing is going to be attached to the raised docks and what will happen to the lift gate before they approve that piece. The applicant stated the intent is the lift gate will remain. Attaching the railing could be done with plates and can you get the anchorage tight. Mr. Craycraft stated that the anchor screws need to be far enough away from the edge. The plates could also be attached to the sides of the dock. Coring a hole and inserting the post has the highest rate of failure.

Mr. Craycraft stated from a safety aspect, the dock leveler is directly in front of the retail space and could be a trip hazard if it is not perfectly level with the concrete slab. It should be explored to remove it and fill it in.

Mr. White confirmed that the patio railing design is the same as the dock area just without the mesh. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft and Mr. White noted they like the mesh product after seeing a sample.

Staff asked the commission if there was any additional information needed for the north retail entry.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if it would be the same style as the east restaurant entry door. The applicant affirmed only it would be a bronze single door at 4.25 – 4.5 inches in diameter. Craycraft noted the big difference between the two entrances as shown is the restaurant side has the big picture window over the door. The applicant stated that this entry has a transom as well it is just broken down into three smaller pieces. The other door is 12 foot tall for the restaurant, you do not want a 12 foot tall retail entry door.

The commission discussed the expansion joint product to create the delineation of paint separation on the eastern wall and noted what is proposed is a good option and is less invasive than other options.

Dr. Kelly asked if the width of that expansion joint was determined. The applicant stated it would be 6 inches in width.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if the louvers replacing the southeast windows are non-functional. The applicant indicated that right now, there are two walk in

coolers behind that wall that will have condensers. If its possible, those condensers could vent partially through the louvers.

Mr. Craycraft asked if there are any condensate lines that come through the wall or if they will be using a floor drain. The applicant indicated they would use a floor drain in this application.

Staff asked the commission if there is any general feedback for signage on the east elevation to relay to the applicant. Mr. Bogenrife stated that the thought was to have logo's only for the restaurant tenants and based on the age of the building it would be cool to simulate a stamped steel old sign design. They are still planning on how to do that in an economical way and the intention is to print on a sign blank.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the sign will stand off the face of the building. The applicant indicated not much. Craycraft asked how they would be applied. The applicant stated one thought is a cleat but they still need to figure out how to get from concept to production. A sign fabricator needs to be engaged before details are presented to the commission.

Mr. White asked the applicant to clarify that the logo's will not have any lettering. The applicant affirmed.

The commission discussed if the signage meets the ordinance for quantity on the building. Staff indicated that the signage presented is unique in that there are multiple tenants in this space and each tenant is allowed to have their own sign. The naming of the building is also a branding effort but the space has multiple functions so it could be interpreted to meet code.

Staff asked if there were any last thoughts on the pick-up window on the south elevation.

Mr. White asked the applicant that since the walk-up window involves modifying the building by cutting in the opening, is this something that can be retrofitted at a later date. The applicant indicated he would need to talk to the building owner about that approach and also offered the thought if there is a way to relocate the window to elsewhere on the building. Mr. White responded saying he may be more comfortable if it was relocated to another part of the building but would need to see it first.

Mr. Bogenrife noted that through the pandemic the facilities that had pick-up delivery service survived better than locations that did not so that is a priority for this location. The specifics for how this gets executed could be up for discussion.

Mr. Craycraft stated that while looking at the site plan it looks like cars will park in this parking drive isle to wait for their order. There are homes in this area and headlights could be left on. The context of the neighborhood is important. Mr. White agrees that there could potentially be cars stacked up in this area waiting for their takeout and the constant activity of vehicles quickly coming and going needs to take into context of this neighborhood.

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Jamoya Cox that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-037 be tabled for the applicant to submit further information on the project.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Jamoya Cox, Roger White, David Craycraft, Dr. Scott Kelly & Whit Wardell

CA-22-038

Property Owner: Kathy Vasko
Applicant: Scott Dughman – Window Nation
Location: 65 West Columbus Street
Request: New Vinyl Windows

Mr. Moore presented the application for Window Nation for property located at 65 West Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting to install new vinyl windows on the second story of the home. This application was tabled during last months meeting due to no applicant present to answer questions about the proposed window and how it was going to be installed.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the applicant was present for tonight's discussion.

Mr. Vasko approached the podium and noted that he is the husband of the property owner. The applicant does not appear to be here this evening but he can try and answer any questions the commission may have.

Mr. Craycraft noted that one thing they want to verify is the windows match what is being removed and what is existing on the first floor. The plans also note that they are going to be trimmed out in an aluminum wrap. The other item was relating to the shutters on the front elevation and if they were going to stay.

Mr. Vasko stated that the windows on the front of the home are original and about 100 years old. There is a sizable addition to the rear in 1993 that has wood windows as well that match the front. In order to go more maintenance free they are looking at vinyl windows for the second floor.

Mr. Vasko stated that when he purchased the windows he was told that they would not be wrapping the exterior wood trim as that was something he did not want. After talking with staff he was notified the application said it was going to

wrap the exterior in foil and he reaffirmed to the company that he did not want it.

Mr. Vasko commented that he was told a representative was supposed to be here to communicate with the commission directly but so far that has not happened.

Mr. Vasko went on to state that the application shows the faux grid between the glass and it was his understanding that they were going to install something that had more dimension to it on the exterior of the glass to match the windows on the home already. However, with the windows on the second floor and the location of the windows it would be hard to see that the grids were internal anyway. Flexibility on this would be appreciated but as an owner they are pushing for external grids.

Mr. Vasko stated he is not sure where that leaves this application since the window company is not here to make any formal agreements. Mr. White noted they could approve the windows with conditions for the grids and no exterior wrap.

A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by David Craycraft that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-038 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. The windows be a 3/1 external grid pattern to mimic the windows being replaced.**
- 2. The aluminum coil wrap indicated on the application is not approved.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Jamoya Cox, Roger White, David Craycraft, Dr. Scott Kelly & Whit Wardell

Pending Applications

CA-22-039

Property Owner: 4 E. Waterloo LLC
Applicant: Kristin Harlander – Square Canvas LLC
Location: 10 East Waterloo Street
Request: New Wall Sign

Mr. Moore presented the application for Kristin Harlander for property located at 10 East Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval for a new wall sign on the front elevation on the building. The sign will be a new vinyl graphic that is 48 sq. ft. installed on the existing 28 foot black metal sign band on the building.

Staff did note that this sign has seven colors on it and the Old Town Guidelines recommends only three colors.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if its just the logo being applied to the existing sign band. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft noted that the colors on the sign is part of the brand logo. Mr. White stated he wants the discussion this evening to be specific on if the sign is approved with this many colors than why.

The applicant discussed the business with the commission noting that it used to be a 100% mobile business but now she is looking to set up her own space to offer art classes, parties and events. Mrs. Harlander noted she is able to make the logo grayscale if desired or remove some of the paint splatters to reduce the colors.

Dr. Kelly noted that in this instance the applicant is trying to display what the business is with the number of colors representing the paint splatter. This makes it a bit different.

Jeff Baker, owner of the facility spoke to the commission and noted that the applicant is only looking to take up 1/3rd of the total sign band. The logo has these colors in it and it will help catch your eye to find the location.

A motion was made by Whit Wardell, seconded by Dr. Kelly to approve Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-039 as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Jamoya Cox, Roger White, David Craycraft, Dr. Scott Kelly & Whit Wardell

CA-22-040

Property Owner: MOBO Holdings LLC
Applicant: Meg Fruth & Laurianne Scott
Location: 48 East Waterloo Street
Request: Signage and Paver Patio

Mr. Moore presented the application for Meg Fruth for 48 East Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval for a stamped concrete patio design and wall signage on the building.

Staff discussed that during the July meeting the applicant received approval to replace the existing concrete patio and walkway with a brick paver to match what is off the front porch. The applicant is looking to now have a stamped concrete design in a herringbone pattern. The example photo submitted looks like the concrete is dyed and not a standard color. That is something the applicant should clarify for the commission what they plan to do.

The second part of the application is for a hanging sign on the front porch of the building. The sign is shown to hang from a bracket on the center column of the porch with either a standard bracket or one that has integrated lighting. The applicant is requesting approval for either option along with an option for a standard flat panel sign or a dimensional relief cut sign at 24" x 36".

The commission and applicant talk about the two sign options and the applicant stated that they are leaning for the vinyl graphic on the metal panel to match what is in the area. Staff noted that if it is a composite material for the relief cut to just make sure it is a wood composite material and not PVC.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant about the different mount options. The applicant stated that they would like to have the lit option if permitted because they occasionally will be open during hours when it gets dark earlier. Craycraft asked how far the lights stick off the post and the applicant indicated she believed only a few inches. The other option would be to have up-lighting.

Mr. Craycraft asked how far the sign bracket itself sticks out. The applicant indicated it would be not much more than the 36" of the sign width.

Mrs. Fruth noted that there are actually two signs being proposed, the second on the detached garage to the rear.

Staff reminded the commission that a business can have two signs if they have rear parking or rear entrance. In this case there is a detached building that faces the alley to the rear.

The applicant discusses that the second sign is shown to be projecting on the north wall of the converted garage but it may make more sense to be flat on the wall.

Mr. White suggested moving the sign to the east side of the building by the window so you can see it from the parking area.

The commission talked about the placement and orientation for the sign on the detached building with the applicant. The applicant and commission determined the sign being wall mounted facing the parking would make the most sense.

The applicant noted that they are looking to do stamped concrete in-lieu-of pavers for budget reasons but to match the intent on the design.

Dr. Kelly asked if they would be brick paver colored. The applicant affirmed that it will be colored red and not blue like the picture.

Mr. Wardell asked if the contractor was adding a shake color to the top of the concrete for color. The applicant indicated she was not sure.

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-040 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. The sign on the accessory building be flat to the wall and either on the east or north elevation.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Jamoya Cox, Roger White, David Craycraft, Dr. Scott Kelly & Whit Wardell

Old Business

Staff noted to the commission that the approvals for the Waterloo Two project had all of the exterior elements being white and the building owner is looking to keep the metal awning supports as natural wood to be clear coated to match the dumpster enclosure behind it. It is a minor change but something the commission should discuss and let staff know if it is an acceptable change or not.

Staff updated the commission on the Clinton Street home under construction.

New Business

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if they have had any feedback from the Landmarks Property Notification Letters that were sent out. Staff indicated that they have received several calls from people wanting to know more about why they got the letter so they are being delivered.

Mr. White asked if any letters have been returned or people not reached. Staff indicated that they have had not had any returned but there should be a low undeliverable rate because we just sent out other notifications recently and had few returns.

Adjournment

Time Out: 9:00pm

A motion was made by David Craycraft and seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly, that this meeting be adjourned.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Jamoya Cox, Roger White, David Craycraft, Dr. Scott Kelly & Whit Wardell

Date

Landmarks Chairman