

Canal Winchester

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



Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 25, 2019

7:00 PM

Landmarks Commission

*Pete Lynch - Chairman
David Craycraft – Vice Chair
Roger White - Secretary
Jamoya Cox
Rich Dobda*

Call To Order

Time In: 6:55pm

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)

A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by Peter Lynch, that David Craycraft be excused. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 – Roger White, Peter Lynch, Jamoya Cox & Rich Dobda

Approval of Minutes

January 28, 2019 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Jamoya Cox, seconded by Roger White, that the January 28, 2019 Minutes be approved. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yes: 4 – Roger White, Peter Lynch, Jamoya Cox & Rich Dobda

Pending Applications**CA-19-003**

Property Owner: 4 E. Waterloo, LLC

Applicant: Erin Johnson

Location: 10 East Waterloo Street

Request: New Wall Sign

Staff presented the application for Erin Johnson for property located at 10 East Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval to replace the existing Sticks and Stones Warehouse sign on the building with a new sign for Harris & Lane Co. Staff discussed that the new sign will be the same size and material as the existing.

The commission discussed that the changes are so minor due to the color of the sign being the same they would have been comfortable with it not coming before them and they have no questions.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Rich Dobda that this Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 – Roger White, Peter Lynch, Jamoya Cox & Rich Dobda

CA-19-004

Property Owner: Laura Ballor

Applicant: James Leek

Location: 26 West Columbus Street

Request: Lean-to addition on existing detached garage.

Mr. Moore presented the application for James Leek for property located at 26 West Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting approval for a "lean-to" that was constructed to side of his detached garage at the rear of the property. Staff discussed that the property owner was notified he needed Landmarks Approvals and associated building permits for the structure. Staff discussed that the existing building is a 24x24 metal 2-car garage. The entire structure with the lean-to can be 720 sq. ft. to be code compliant and reduce a variance request. Staff noted that the addition can therefore be approximately 144 sq. ft.

Staff discussed that the structure currently has a rubber roof and shared photographs with the commission. Staff also noted that they discussed with the applicant screening the area underneath the roof from the alley with either extending the existing metal siding or creating a screen with cedar to match the fence material.

Mr. Lynch asked staff what are the exact dimensions of the lean-to that is currently on the building. Staff indicated they are unsure but by the photo it appears to be at least 24 feet in depth. The max size the lean-to can be to be in zoning compliance is 144 square feet, which will put the building at 720 square feet.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant what the dimensions are of the lean-to. The applicant indicated that the lean-to will run down the side of the building and stop at the weather head. Mr. Lynch noted that just by the photograph of the north side it looks like it is 12 feet wide.

The applicant noted that they are unsure of the exact property line as they do not have a survey of either property but his wife owns both properties.

Mr. White asked the applicant when the structure was constructed. The applicant indicated a while ago. Mr. Lynch asked for a more precise time frame. The applicant indicated last winter.

Mr. Lynch noted that he thinks that as a guess the existing building is 16 feet by 12 feet. The applicant affirmed as the weather head is eight feet in from the rear corner. The applicant noted he will make the structure under the max size allowable to avoid a variance process.

Mr. White asked about setbacks for the structure. Staff indicated the garage meets setbacks based on the information found in the file. The lean-to appears it would meet setbacks as well.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if he understands that the structure is essentially going to be a 12 x 12 and will need to get smaller. The applicant indicated that the yard side will get smaller.

Mr. White asked the applicant if the existing structure has a rubber roof on it. The applicant indicated there is a not finished rubber roof on it now but it will get finished.

Mr. Lynch discussed his concern with the commission on a rubber roof as an approved material. Mr. Leek indicated that he put the rubber roof on as a quick solution and asked the commission what they want. The commission discussed a metal roof to match the garage would be the ideal solution. The applicant affirmed that he will match the roof material.

Mr. Lynch asked if the garage roof is green. The applicant affirmed noting the siding color is a tan/peach.

Mr. Leek discussed with the commission his concerns with the alley height in relation to the garage floor and how rain moves back from the alley into the building and the gravel outside the building is compacted so it doesn't absorb as it should and creates a muddy mess. The commission discussed drainage ideas. Staff directed Mr. Leek to seek any drainage solutions with the construction services director and informed him he could provide his contact information after the meeting.

Mr. Lynch asked if staff's recommendation was closing in the alley side. Staff affirmed the goal is to screen the items in the area from view. Mr. Cox affirmed that the property owner needs to discuss how they are going to screen that area.

The applicant indicated that they have provide two options for screening. The first option is cedar to match the dog ear fence and the second is a metal siding to match the building. The applicant noted that the cedar would be easier but the metal would last longer.

Mr. Dobda noted that a metal siding extension would look much better than more cedar.

Mr. White commented that the top of the lean-to will not be visible. The applicant indicated that the only people that could see it would be people that look out the window.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if that is a six foot fence. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked if the screen wall could be brought 2 inches lower than the fence to help screen the area. The applicant affirmed. Mr. White commented that would also help with people looking into the space.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Roger White that the Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. The entire structure, including the lean-to be under 720 square feet.**
- 2. The roof on the addition match the garage.**
- 3. The screening material on the north side of the building facing the alley batch the garage and be a minimum 2 inches below the fence height.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 – Roger White, Peter Lynch, Jamoya Cox & Rich Dobda

Old Business

Staff discussed that based off emails received from several commission members a recap is being provided for 18 East Columbus Street. Staff discussed the original application noting how the work was done on the west elevation prior to any approvals from the commission. The commission compromised on several of the items as long as the appearance of the façade was altered to match the same profile as before the work took place. The applicant has since altered the façade for the second time. Pictures were shared with the commission.

Mr. Cox asked staff if the applicants had ever reached out in regards to the design of the façade. Staff indicated that they did not share what they were amending the façade to. Further explaining that based on the photo's they wrapped the stone rather than removing it and replacing it with something more appropriate, that is why the projection appears to be so far.

Staff discussed that they believe there may be a way to build out the top portion so the lines work better rather than doing a complete tear off and rebuild.

Mr. Dobda stated that after reading the minutes it seems the original take was to recreate Harvest Moon in terms of detail. Mr. White stated at the time that was the best way to describe what needed to be done. Staff affirmed noting that the photograph on the screen showing the detail of the old façade was not available during the meeting for a direct comparison like it is now.

Mr. Lynch noted that the current condition looks like a White Castle Drive-thru. Further stating that they did work without permission, Landmarks then gave them a chance to fix it which they chose not to.

Mr. White noted that aesthetically building out the top may make it worse than what is there now. Mr. Cox affirmed that he is unaware how to build it out further.

Mr. Lynch noted that the stone is up too high when they first did it that is why the proportions are off now. Mr. White commented that the stone did not even stick out that far to begin with and they must have used whatever lumber thickness without cutting it to shape. Mr. Lynch added there is 8 times more material on the wall than what should be on the façade.

Mr. Lynch noted that in his opinion the entire stone and the cover up needs to be torn off completely to recreate the old storefront as originally suggested.

Mr. White noted that the property owner needs to come back before Landmarks for review and to be told directly what needs to be done. Staff affirmed and noted that they will let the property owner know that the Certificate of Appropriateness has been revoked and they need to come before the commission to correct the issue. Staff further noted that there should have been a building permit to start with but one was never applied for.

Mr. Lynch discussed that if the applicant removed the "columns" on either side of the window down to the window sill, they could extend new cedar boards to the new sill height. This may allow to leave the rest and just add a piece of cedar down to the bottom to create a new window sill. So they do not need to tear everything off. They even could create panels out of the bottom portion if they were creative.

Mr. Cox asked for Mr. Lynch to describe the scenario again. Mr. Lynch approached the monitor and described the alteration.

Mr. Lynch also noted the entire façade entry needs to be painted to match the trim. Not White.

The commission also discussed that simple sign changes do not have to come to Landmarks for Approval. The only downside is the more people that come in the more the word gets out you have to go before Landmarks for approvals so people apply without doing things.

New Business

Adjournment

Time Out: 7:43pm

A motion was made by Roger White and seconded by Jamoya Cox, that this meeting be adjourned.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 – Roger White, Peter Lynch, Jamoya Cox & Rich Dobda

Date

Landmarks Chairman