

# Canal Winchester

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



## Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 22, 2019

7:00 PM

## Landmarks Commission

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

Call To Order

*Time In: 6:58pm*

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)Approval of Minutes

March 25, 2019 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

**A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Jamoya Cox that the March 25, 2019 Minutes be approved.**

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

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

**Abstain: 1** – Whit Wardell

Pending Applications**CA-19-013**

Property Owner: Byron Wilson

Applicant: Dave Craycraft

Location: 62 East Mound Street

Request: Master Bedroom Addition and Family Room Extension

Mr. Moore presented the application for Byron Wilson for property located at 62 East Mound Street. The applicant is requesting approval to construct two additions onto the existing home. The first is an addition to the west side of the home for a master bedroom closet. This portion of the application does not note the proposed roof or window details but states that it will have yellow vinyl siding to match the existing. The second addition proposed is a family room extension at the rear of the house. The rear addition will relocate the existing windows and will have the same yellow vinyl siding and matching rubber roof.

Mr. Lynch asked staff what the front roof material will be. Staff indicated the application does not show the proposed roof material. Mr. Craycraft noted that the front addition will have a metal roof.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if the existing metal roof on the home is painted that color. The property owner affirmed. Mr. Lynch asked the applicant how he planned on matching the new roof with the existing metal roof. Mr. Wilson stated that he will most likely paint the metal roof with the same Sherman Williams paint so that they match.

Mr. Lynch commented that both additions are proposed to have vinyl siding to match the rest of the home and asked if they have considered any different materials for the front addition. Mr. Wilson commented that they have discussed a board and batten material for the front but they want the building to look consistent as possible and less like an addition.

The applicant commented that the rendering has been updated and there will be no window on the west elevation of the closet. The existing window will be relocated to the front elevation of the home. Mr. Lynch asked the applicant to confirm that the front will have the window but the side will not. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked if there was anything they could do to match the metal roof without having to paint it or apply a coating. Mr. Wilson commented he originally wanted to do asphalt shingles to match the front porch but he is going to try and find a metal roof that has the same panel dimensions.

Mr. White asked if the front porch roof is in good shape. The applicant indicated that is a new asphalt roof.

Mr. Lynch asked the commission their thoughts on the front addition roof material. Dr. Kelly noted that he thinks matching the metal roof is the best option.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant when the home was covered in vinyl siding. The applicant indicated they are not sure but they can source a matching vinyl siding.

**A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by Peter Lynch that Certificate of Appropriateness Application #CA-19-013 be approved as presented.**

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

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

**Abstain: 1** – David Craycraft

**CA-19-014**

Property Owner: Mark Caulk

Applicant: Mark Caulk

Location: 40 East Waterloo Street

Request: Construct a pergola over existing deck, new detached shed and privacy fence.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Mark Caulk for property located at 40 East Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval to construct a pergola over the existing deck, add a detached shed to the rear yard and install a 6 foot tall wood privacy fence. Staff discussed the pergola location and noted that it will be painted white and is designed to retain the existing tree in the deck. The shed will match the proposed photograph and will be made of wood painted white with the decorative door and cupola on the top. The fence will match the style of the picture provided and will be painted white to match the other components of the application.

Staff discussed that as part of the application the existing 3 foot tall picket fence on the adjacent lot will be partially removed and replaced with the new privacy fence. The applicant has designed the replacement to go no closer to the street than the existing homes front porch.

Mr. White asked staff if the fence is to be painted white. Staff affirmed that the fence, shed and pergola will all be white.

Mr. Lynch asked staff what is shown on the drawing to the rear of the lot. Staff indicated that the drawing notes the location for a future detached garage.

Mr. Craycraft asked if there would be a gate on the rear fence line. The applicant affirmed and noted that the fence will not block the gravel parking area but will stop at the neighbor's fence line.

Mr. Lynch asked how far the fence will be behind the house. The applicant indicated about 16 feet and it will stop at the neighbor's fence line.

Dr. Kelly asked the applicant if they would consider having the fence stop at the deck and not go as close to the street. The applicant indicated that they would prefer to have it as close as code would allow. The neighbor's fence is in terrible shape so it will replace it.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant how far the fence will be behind the window on the west elevation. The applicant indicated it will be about three feet behind the window.

Mr. White commented the shed looks like it will be on the property line. The applicant indicated it will be 12 inches off the property line.

Mr. White asked the applicant if the existing deck has a tree growing through it. The applicant commented that he constructed the deck around the existing tree. Mr. White asked if the existing tree is going to remain. The applicant

affirmed and noted that the pergola is going to be in two sections on either side of the tree.

The commission commented that they think the project will look nice.

Mr. Lynch asked staff if the applicant would be able to have both the shed and the future garage. Staff commented that they have talked with the applicant already that they can only have one accessory structure so the shed will either need to disappear or get a variance for the garage in the future. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the rear property line goes all the way to the pavement. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked how much space is there from the rear of the home to the property line. The applicant indicated around 35 feet. Lynch commented that the fence will need to be modified in the future if there is a garage. The applicant affirmed.

Dr. Kelly noted that he is still concerned about the fence going towards the front of the home.

**A motion was made by Jamoya Cox, seconded by David Craycraft that application #CA-19-014 be approved as presented.**

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

**Yes: 7** - Peter Lynch, Roger White, Jamoya Cox, Rich Dobda, David Craycraft, Dr. Scott Kelly & Whit Wardell

**CA-19-015**

Property Owner: David & Melissa Gabriel  
Applicant: David & Melissa Gabriel  
Location: 40 North Trine Street  
Request: New front door and replace rear window.

Mr. Moore presented the application for David & Melissa Gabriel for property located at 40 North Trine Street. The applicant is requesting approval to install a new front door and to replace two windows on the rear of the home. Staff discussed the proposed front door will be a black fiberglass door with two panels, a six-grid window and dentil shelf. The application shows the hardware style and notes it to be black. The current door is a wood door and looks like it was damaged at one time as the handles have been moved up and a metal plate covers the old location.

Staff talked about the proposed window replacement to the rear of the building. The applicants received approval in 2017 to replace all the windows on the building with new black vinyl windows with SDL grids. The applicant however at the time did not replace the rear windows with the project and is requesting to put the same windows in to match.

Mr. Craycraft asked why the applicant is replacing the original door. Staff indicated that the applicant is not present to answer questions.

Staff noted the damage on the existing door.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the existing door is wood. Staff affirmed.

Mr. Lynch commented that the proposed door will have a wood texture to the fiberglass.

Mr. Craycraft asked what color the door will be. Staff indicated it will be black. The door on the screen shows the style being requested just a different color.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if the rear window replacement has already been approved. Staff noted that the applicant received approval to replace the windows in 2017. Due to the application expiring they needed to re-apply.

Mr. Lynch asked staff if they have a wider view of the front of the home. Staff flipped through the photographs for the commission.

**A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by David Craycraft that application #CA-19-015 be approved as presented.**

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

**Yes: 7** - Peter Lynch, Roger White, Jamoya Cox, Rich Dobda, David Craycraft, Dr. Scott Kelly & Whit Wardell

**CA-19-016**

Property Owner: 5 W Properties LLC  
Applicant: Signcom  
Location: 10 South High Street  
Request: Reface existing neon sign

Mr. Moore presented the application for Signcom for property located at 10 South High Street. The applicant is requesting approval to reface the existing neon pole sign for the new restaurant taking over the space. Staff discussed that the applicant is planning on keeping the sign the same color just redoing the

face of the sign with new neon to have the new brand name and logo. All of the proposed neon will be white to match what is being removed.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if the sign will look the same with the style of neon. Staff affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the green is changing. Staff noted that the rendering color is off. The sign body will remain the same color.

Mr. Lynch asked if the sign was keeping the green neon. Staff affirmed that the green neon band will stay.

**A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Rich Dobda that Certificate of Appropriateness Application #CA-19-016 be approved as presented.**

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

**Yes: 7** - Peter Lynch, Roger White, Jamoya Cox, Rich Dobda, David Craycraft, Dr. Scott Kelly & Whit Wardell

#### Tabled Applications

##### **CA-19-010**

Property Owner: City of Canal Winchester  
Applicant: Trine-Fairfield LLC  
Location: 18-26 West Waterloo Street  
Request: New Mixed Use Building

Mr. Moore introduced the application and discussed that the applicants have made changes to the proposed mixed use building's architecture and front patio design based on the feedback received from the commission and staff from the March Agenda. The applicants also received site development plan approval from P&Z Commission on April 8<sup>th</sup> with the understanding that the final architecture is still being reviewed by the Landmarks Commission.

Staff shared with the commission the update elevation drawings. The front of the building has been modified by adding Juliet balconies to the second and third floor windows based on feedback from the March meeting. The storefront glass has been simplified by reducing the number of grids, creating a more modern look and the patio area has gone through several changes from the column design to its landscaping and general layout.

Staff discussed the changes in the commercial storefront from the March agenda. The previous submittal had many grids within the glass and the applicant has since simplified the profiles for a more traditional look. Some of the examples for the aluminum storefront provided are Wendy's and

Cheesecake Factory. Staff discussed that they are concerned that the aluminum framing is going to give the storefront too much of a modern look and shared a rough example of how framing out the storefront would help bring back a historic context to the modern design.

The vinyl windows for the residential units has been provided for review. These windows will have a simulated divided light grid and are proposed in the bronze color. Juliet balconies have been added to several windows on the front elevation. The first floor will also feature several commercial windows that will mimic the residential window style above but are proposed to be an aluminum construction to match the main store front. Staff's only concern with these windows is they will not look like functional windows with the type of construction.

Mr. Cox asked staff to go back to the example showing the sample materials. Staff further discussed the storefront materials.

Staff discussed more details on the vinyl windows and the Juliet balconies. Staff noted that the rendering shows what looks like clear glass under the windows behind the Juliet balconies in the form of a transom. Based on the interior layout staff was unsure if that was a rendering error or not.

Lighting details and patio updates were shared with the commission. The patio has been modified per staff request to make the sidewalk wider and make the area look more commercial and less institutional. The column design has changed from 16" wide brick to a 6-8 inch aluminum. When looking at the patio across the entire front there is a 13 grade change from east to west. As you work your way down the building the far west end will be slightly higher and will have steps leading to the public walk. Staff noted that the entire patio will be ADA accessible.

Staff noted that Jill Amos on Council wanted it to be noted her concern after looking over the application and seeing the proposed privacy fence location. She is concerned that the fence is going to close to the street and will block the view of the new building and patio.

Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed the Site Development Plan application during the April Agenda and have recommended the Site Development Plan Application for approval. The main items P&Z discussed were architecture related and they understand that Landmarks is working to finalize the building design.

Staff is recommending that the application is approved this evening with the condition that the applicant returns at a later date with an updated design to the commercial storefront.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if you can walk from one storefront to another without getting back to the public walk. Staff affirmed that the patio is the ADA access for the front of the building.

Mr. Lynch asked if the ADA will limit potential patio layouts. Staff indicated that tables and chairs can be in the area, as long as there is 4 foot minimum clearance for accessibility. The applicant's architect affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft commented that the current patio design is much better than what was shown during the March meeting. Mr. Cox commented that it is more pedestrian friendly.

Mr. Cox commented that staff's comments on further altering the commercial storefront is a good idea. For a historic downtown being able to see through the windows is important.

Mr. White asked staff what questions P&Z had for the applicants. Staff noted that P&Z asked about the residential window material, parking and its configuration and access to the building.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicants about the commercial window details. The applicant's architect noted that they are meeting with staff later in the week to go over altering the commercial storefront. The initial thought is to use the aluminum storefront and to frame it out. The storefront door however would stay as an aluminum door with glass.

Mr. Lynch asked how many doors are on the building. The applicant indicated six on the front.

Staff discussed that the storefront changes they were showing were to be used as an example of how to alter the design to make it fit in better with the area and there are many local examples of how to trim the entryway out to make it look less suburban.

The applicant indicated that the sidelights on the double doors are being reviewed as being either paneling or window glass. The storefront design is something they are looking to progress over time.

Mr. Lynch commented that the changes to the Juliet balconies make the building look more residential in character but asked the applicant which style

they were going for as there are two referenced in the application. The applicant indicated they are going with the square style. There are windows shown in the rendering behind the Juliet balconies to resemble a full door but they are going to explore paneling based on comments from staff.

The commission commented on the residential windows and that they look like they have been adjusted to interior layouts. The applicant affirmed.

The commission asked staff to go over the comments about the privacy fence. Staff indicated that there were concerns that the fence being 6 foot tall and going within 11 feet of the street, it would block the visibility of the new building and patio. Staff commented that the perspective rendering does not show the privacy fence on it. Mr. Lynch discussed that they could explore not having a fence go all the way to the street or have the fence step down as it gets closer to the street.

The applicant indicated that the fence was shown on the plans there to keep people from cutting through the neighbor's property and trespassing as they work their way to the street.

The Commission discussed options for altering the fence height and possible material changes. The applicant commented that possibly starting the fence at around 3 foot in height and stepping it up to 6 foot in the rear might be a good option. Mr. Lynch asked Mr. Weiser if he was comfortable with the design changes to the fencing. Mr. Weiser affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if the 8 inch posts for the patio railing will match the sample photographs. The applicant stated they will look the same but they are most likely going with a 6 inch post vs the 8 inch. Lynch asked what the material for the posts would be. Staff indicated that the information on the cut sheet says aluminum. The applicant commented that they are using the same manufacture for the railings, fencing and balconies so the color matches.

Mr. Lynch discussed that what staff is after this evening is an overall project approval with future amendments to the commercial storefront. Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if that would slow down the applicants. Staff noted that with an overall site plan approval the applicants can submit for engineering review.

The Commission discussed with the applicant the proposed conditions of approval with the storefront modifications and the changes to the fencing design.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if they have discussed all of their concerns. Staff affirmed and asked the commission to clarify for the applicant if the fence needs to be approved at a later meeting or as long as it steps down so the patio is visible.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the fence will be painted. Staff noted it does not say on the application. Mr. Lynch added the design is fine but the 1x on the top should be a 2x cap or it will curl.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if they want to discuss future changes to the storefront to help them with alterations. The applicant commented that would be helpful.

Mr. White discussed that staff's concept drawing was a little heavy handed with too much trim.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant what the width of the tubelite windows would be. The applicant indicated they are typically 2 inches wide. If they are trimmed out it would be with a 2x4 or 2x6.

Mr. Lynch commented that he is torn on the door design. The door shown in the rendering staff put together is too heavy and makes the façade look heavy. While a traditional looking door is nice, in this instance putting in a door with more glass will open up the storefront.

Mr. Craycraft commented that the applicant did note they are going to look at the door design because what is shown may be a custom door with more cost. The applicant affirmed that they are showing a "medium" style aluminum door with a 4 inch wide casing and it may be a custom design. Mr. White said he is not opposed to the proposed medium aluminum door design.

Mr. Lynch commented that paneling and pushing the windows further apart to add more trim is a good design but thinks that the doors proposed are going to look right. Trimming out the storefront areas would soften the space, however staffs rendering is a little heavy.

Mr. Lynch asked staff if they need to discuss anything specific with the first floor two-over-two windows. Staff noted that it could be looked at when they revisit the commercial storefront design.

**A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by David Craycraft that application #CA-19-010 be approved with the following conditions:**

- 1. The eastern wood fence start at approximate 3 foot in height towards the street and transition up to a maximum of 6 foot in height.**

- 2. The ground floor commercial façade facing West Waterloo Street be further reviewed by the Landmarks Commission prior to construction.
- 3. The transom windows on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors behind the Juliet balconies be modified into paneling components rather than glass.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Peter Lynch, Roger White, Jamoya Cox, Rich Dobda, David Craycraft, Dr. Scott Kelly & Whit Wardell

Old Business

Mr. Moore touched base that the property owner at 18 East Columbus Street is going to be on the May agenda to apply for a new Certificate of Appropriateness for changes to the western façade.

New Business

Staff commented that all of the flyers for the Old Town District designations have been passed out to property owners.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff about current code enforcement in the Old Town and about a property on West Columbus Street. Staff responded saying that they hope the property owner will take action this year after receiving a notice on the door.

Adjournment

*Time Out: 8:26pm*

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

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

Yes: 7 - Peter Lynch, Roger White, Jamoya Cox, Rich Dobda, David Craycraft, Dr. Scott Kelly & Whit Wardell

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Landmarks Chairman