

# Canal Winchester

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



## Meeting Minutes

**Monday, November 25, 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: 7:00pm*

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)

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

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

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

Approval of Minutes

October 28, 2019 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

**A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by Dr. Kelly to approve the October 28, 2019 meeting minutes.**

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

**Yes: 5** – Dave Craycraft, Roger White, Dr. Scott Kelly, Rich Dobda & Whit Wardell

**Abstain: 1** – Jamoya Cox

Pending Applications**CA-19-039**

Property Owner: Todd Weiser

Applicant: Andrew Schrank

Location: 19 East Waterloo Street

Request: Install a exhaust vent in rear of building

Mr. Moore presented the application for Andrew Schrank for property located at 19 East Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval to install a new exhaust vent at the rear of the building. Staff discussed that the new tenant going in the space is a salon. The first floor they will be doing hair services and the second floor nail services. As part of the requirement for a nail salon the applicant must install a vent into the space to the outside air. The applicant is proposing a single round exhaust vent that will be located at the rear of the building, just above the second floor windows. The vent can either be black or beige to blend with the existing brick.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if the vent is the 4" or 6" spec'd in the plans. The applicant indicated the 6".

Dr. Kelly asked the applicant if there was a color preference they wanted the vent to be. Mr. Schrank indicated they like the beige color more than black but will do either.

Mr. White asked if the building owner has a color preference. The applicant indicated that he does not.

Mr. Craycraft commented that the vent will be a small element on the second elevation.

Mr. Craycraft asked how they planned on installing the vent. The applicant indicated they will drill a hole into the wall.

**A motion was made by Jamoya Cox, seconded by Whit Wardell that Certificate of Appropriateness Application #CA-19-039 be approved as presented.**

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

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

**CA-19-040**

Property Owner: C10 Investments LLC

Applicant: Richard Engen

Location: 90 Liberty Street

Request: Replace front door slabs with new concrete porch with metal rail.

Replace front doors. Remove grids from windows.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Richard Engen for property located at 90 Liberty Street. The applicant is seeking approval for the new front doors and metal rail that was installed around the front porch. The property owner has also removed the six-over-six grids that were internal to the windows.

Staff discussed that the applicant had done the work prior to receiving landmarks approval. A violation notice was sent and the applicant has since applied to receive approval for the changes. Photographs were shared to show the alterations that were performed.

Mr. Craycraft commented that the previous doors were solid and the new doors have windows.

Dr. Kelly asked the applicant why they removed the window grids. The applicant indicated they removed them to wash the windows. Dr. Kelly asked the applicant if they still have the grids, the applicant affirmed.

Mr. White asked the applicant how long they owned the property. The applicant indicated that they purchased it in March. White asked if they were aware it was within the Landmarks Boundary. The applicant indicated that he was not aware.

Mr. Engen noted that they removed the overgrown landscaping at the front of the house and they installed the metal rail for aesthetic purposes.

Mr. White asked if the paver stones for the step down to grade were loose or anchored down. The applicant indicated they are grouted and solid.

Mr. White asked what was there before the paver patio to the street. The applicant indicated it was a cinder block for a step and a 30" walk from the step to the street.

Dr. Kelly noted that he likes the new doors.

Mr. Craycraft asked the commission what they felt about the window grids being re-installed. The commission discussed that they would like to see the grids reinstalled to complete the look of the property.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant what material the metal railing is made from. The applicant indicated it is aluminum.

**A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Rich Dobda that Certificate of Appropriateness Application #CA-19-040 be approved with the condition that the applicant reinstall the six-over-six grids removed from the windows.**

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

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

**CA-19-041**

Property Owner: Ellen & Ben Merrill  
Applicant: Ellen & Ben Merrill  
Location: 159 Washington Street  
Request: New fencing

Mr. Moore presented the application for Ellen and Ben Merrill for property located at 159 Washington Street. The applicant is requesting approval for a new fence that was constructed in the yard. Staff noted that they had sent the property owner a violation notice for doing work prior to Landmarks Approval. The applicant had indicated upon submitting the application they were unaware fencing was reviewed by the commission.

Staff shared photographs of the fence that was constructed, noting it to be a wood farm style fence with a wire mesh backing. Based on the information provided staff notes it appears to be a 5 foot tall fence but the application did not specify its height.

Staff further discussed that the applicant would like to fence off the entirety of the rear yard. The fence style would change from what is already constructed to a 6' tall cattle style wire fence with temporary metal anchors that attach to the wire. Staff referenced photographs supplied in the application. It was noted that the property has a significant grade change from the house towards the rear property line and that the majority of the property is within the 1% annual flood zone determined by FEMA. Staff commented that fencing within the flood zone is typically not permitted due to the fence creating a barrier for moving water and debris. However, it is unclear at this time if the style of fencing would be permitted due to the unique installation method with the metal stakes.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if what was installed is within the floodplain. Staff indicated that section of fencing is out.

Mr. White asked the applicant if there would be some transition between the two fences given different styles and heights. The applicant indicated that the fence would transition at the corners of the current limits of fencing. Mrs. Merrill noted that the front section of fencing is 6 foot tall. Not the 5 foot as indicated in the staff presentation.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if the fencing height is within the guidelines. Staff affirmed that a residential fence behind a home can be 6 foot tall.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the fence style meets the floodplain guidelines for construction. Staff indicated that they need to do more research on if this style of fencing is permitted due to the post design. This fence may have the ability to be pushed over and break away during a flooding event.

Mr. Cox asked staff if there would be an issue with the stability of the fence during a flooding event. Staff commented that they believe it is designed to be a temporary fence so it can be removed and it may collapse under pressure. The fence the applicants constructed at the top of the hill would not be permitted due to the metal grids fastened to the wood posts would create a dam scenario with debris collecting on the fence during a flood event. Other fence styles that would be permitted would be a three rail or notch and beam fence without the wire mesh due to the fence style being very open.

Mr. White asked the applicant if the two fence styles are similar other than the wood frame. The applicant indicated that they are similar and they chose the metal post route for the rear of the property due to the ground consistently being wet to help the fence last longer and the wood resist rot.

Mr. Craycraft commented that you would not be able to see the cattle style fence from the street.

Mr. White asked if the wood would be painted or stained on the upper fence. The applicant indicated that they like the natural cedar.

The applicant indicated they have two large dogs so the fence is for them.

Mr. White asked staff if they need to get a fence permit from the city after the landmarks approval. Staff affirmed they will need a fence permit and a floodplain development permit. Staff indicated that they will need to verify the fence design meets the floodplain development permit requirements.

Staff commented that the Old Town Guidelines just note for fencing to avoid a non-traditional fence design.

Mr. White discussed his concern of setting a precedent for allowing the cattle style fencing within the district.

Mr. Cox asked the applicant if the rear section of fencing will be permanent or replaced with something different down the road. The applicant indicated that it is not intended to be permanent. They will maintain the fence as needed.

The commission discussed alternatives for dressing up the upper section of fencing by adding additional sections of horizontal or vertical wood to shield the metal in the fence. The discussion resulted in the consensus that adding more wood would create more of a visual barrier from the road and the current fence is very open and visible towards the rear yard.

Mr. White commented that he feels when the fence ages it will blend in and look more natural. The bright un-weathered cedar makes it stand out.

**A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by David Craycraft that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-19-041 be approved as presented.**

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

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

**CA-19-034**

Property Owner: RRCT LLC

Applicant: Todd Weiser

Location: 60 E Waterloo Street

Request: Remodel residential home into commercial property.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Todd Weiser for property located at 60 East Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval for the remodel of the residential home into a commercial business. Staff discussed that the applicant applied in September of 2019 with a conceptual drawing of the renovation for preliminary feedback from the commission on if the project is heading in the right direction. Staff went over many of those comments based on the original drawing with the commission.

The applicant has since modified those plans to articulate the changes the commission had noted. The drawings this evening are here for final approvals so the applicant can get the modifications submitted to the building department for approval and get started on the work. A summary of the changes were provided to the commission.

Mr. Cox told the applicant they like the design changes. Cox asked the applicant if they could get any windows on the east end of the garage. The applicant indicated the building is too close to the property line to have any windows.

Mr. Craycraft stated there is a note on the plans saying the existing siding was to be painted. Craycraft asked the applicant if the siding is aluminum or vinyl. Mr. Weiser commented that it is a mix.

Mr. Craycraft asked what the plans were if they could not paint the existing siding. Mr. Weiser stated that they plan on either using a paint or rhino shield type product on the existing façade.

Mr. Craycraft commented that the plans note the existing windows on the house are to remain but a wider trim will be added. The commission reviewed photographs on the home and noted that there is an existing trim around the windows. It was discussed that the design of the trim around the windows would stay the same as it is now.

Mr. White commented that he really likes the changes being proposed to the space.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the trim on the garage would be similar in width as the rest of the house. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the existing house has a band board around the base. Staff indicated that it does not feature a band board.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if the proposed porch will be over 30 inches from grade. Staff affirmed that it will be close.

Mr. Craycraft asked if there will be parking in the rear. The applicant indicated there will be parking. Craycraft noted that the site is lower than the alley so they may need to do some type of drainage. Mr. Weiser indicated that they are looking to do less than 2000 sq. ft. of impervious space.

Mr. Craycraft asked if there is any parking or site lighting in the rear yard. The applicant indicated that they do not plan on any.

Mr. Dobda asked if surrounding properties have retaining walls in the front yard. Staff indicated that this site is the only one with the raised front yard with the wall. Adjacent properties do not.

**A motion was made by Rich Dobda, seconded by Dr. Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-19-034 be approved as presented.**

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

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

#### Old Business

#### New Business

Staff discussed that 18 East Columbus Street inquired about replacing the windows on the building. Photographs of the front of the building were shared with the commission.

Staff discussed that they approved a four foot fence at 240 Highland Ave last week. The fence what was approved matches the fence across the alley at 224 Highland Ave which was approved by Landmarks several months back.

The commission discuss moving the December Landmarks Meeting from 12/23 to 12/18. Staff indicated they would notify the commission via email of the meeting date.

Mike Miller spoke to the commission in regards to a request to get approval to remove the slate roof on a property he was purchasing at 30-32 North Trine Street and install a new standing seam metal roof. The commission spoke to Mr. Miller in detail about what was needed for an application to remove a slate roof and guided the applicant on filing for the December meeting.

#### Adjournment

*Time Out: 8:28pm*

**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, Jamoya Cox, Roger White, Dr. Scott Kelly, Rich Dobda & Whit Wardell

---

Date

---

Landmarks Chairman