

# Canal Winchester

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



## Meeting Minutes

**Monday, June 24, 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)

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

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

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

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

Approval of Minutes

May 28, 2019 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

**A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Peter Lynch that the May 28, 2019 Minutes be approved.**

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

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

**Abstain: 1** – Jamoya Cox

Pending Applications**CA-19-021**

Property Owner: Jim Havens  
Applicant: Jenny Baughman  
Location: 17 North High Street  
Request: Patio at rear of building.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Jenny Baughman for Romans Pizza located at 17 North High Street. The applicant is requesting approval to construct a temporary patio at the rear of the building. The applicant has indicated that the design is temporary in that there are no permanent modifications to the parking lot for the layout and that the patio can be moved at any time.

Staff discussed the applicant's construction method for the patio limits included taking bar table legs and attaching them to wooden square posts. The posts would then be freestanding and be linked together with a plastic chain to create the boundary limits. The applicant has indicated the limits of the patio to be 12 feet off the rear of the building and 25 feet wide. The applicant has indicated that they plan on using typical picnic tables as the seating within the patio. The

proposed patio would remove 1 parking space behind the building. Staff shared photographs of the rear of the building with the commission.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if there was room to the rear of the building to have the patio encroach the blacktop and allow for the adjacent building to have their parking spaces unrestricted. The applicant indicated that there is plenty of room. Staff noted that the three parking spaces behind Romans are relatively new, within the last 3 years. However, with that change you can no longer drive through that area between the two buildings to get to the next alley as that movement has been restricted further north. For someone to leave once they enter the space they would need to turn around.

Mrs. Baughman noted that vehicles would have the ability to move in the area to turn around. Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if the reduction of patio width from 16 feet to 12 feet helped with circulation. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Cox asked the applicant how many picnic tables would be in the patio space. The applicant stated if she went with that style of seating there would be about 4 picnic tables. However, she can do any type of seating.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the wood posts would be anchored to the pavement or freestanding. The applicant indicated the table leg base will be use to sturdy the wooden post above but they will not be anchored in any means. This is a temporary patio, not permanent.

Mr. White asked the applicant to elaborate more on the temporary nature. The applicant indicated it would be seasonal and weather dependent. However, if the patio works well and is a hit, the applicant indicated she would be back for a permanent design in the future.

Dr. Kelly asked the applicant if the plastic chain for the railing will be yellow or another color. The applicant indicated it could be yellow or black.

Mr. Wardell noted that the corner posts to the patio limits should have a reflective white stripe on them so they can be seen. The applicant indicated that she can do that.

Mr. White asked if the patrons of the business would be able to buy food and take it outside. The applicant stated that they would be waiting on tables outside.

Mr. Cox asked what the lighting is like to the rear of the building. The applicant indicated that there is one outside light above the door. If the sun becomes an

issue then they can add umbrellas for the tables and there was thought of adding some string lights for over the patio for evening hours.

Mr. White asked the applicant if she is required to get approval from the state liquor board to have alcohol on the patio. The applicant stated she confirmed with the state that she can have a temporary patio design and confirmed the chain height for the restricted access.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if something similar was approved at Wagon Wheel Wines. Mr. Lynch noted that the patio was installed prior to Landmarks Approval. Staff affirmed that the patio was installed without landmarks approval and the condition was the applicant needed to remove the patio at the end of the season, which has not been done. Staff has issued a notice of violation to the tenant of the building that the patio was to be removed and since has found out that she is moving from that location.

Mr. Lynch updated the commission members that a concern from the previous application was the sagging chain and people falling over.

Mr. Lynch asked staff if there are any other temporary patios in the city. Staff stated there are no temporary patios within the city.

Mr. White asked if the patio will have an egress opening. Staff affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked staff their thoughts on a temporary patio. Staff discussed the difficulty would be on the timing, monitoring and enforcement of something that is temporary in nature.

Mr. Lynch discussed his concern is this will have a domino effect in that next there is lighting that will be added and other changes. The applicant indicated she does not have issues coming back to Landmarks for lighting.

Mr. Craycraft confirmed with the applicant that the only outdoor light is above the door. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. White commented that string lights would require some mounting at the corners and that could be an issue with the temporary design. The applicant indicated she would need to think about how to do the lights.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant why she does not apply for a permanent patio design. The applicant indicated that he landlord has not reviewed to approve a permanent patio, only the temporary patio. Mrs. Baughman noted that she is unsure how the patio will work at the rear of the building from a customer

standpoint so she would like to do something temporary so if it doesn't work out there isn't much cost into it.

Mr. White commented he is opposed to anything temporary in nature. The applicant commented she would like a permanent patio. White added that policing a temporary patio and the fact that the limits of the patio can be moved is an issue. A permanent structure in that location is the ideal scenario. The applicant agreed and noted that if the patio is a success she wants a permanent design.

Mr. Craycraft commented he is concerned with the safety of a temporary design.

Mr. White asked if there could be a raised patio on the blacktop.

Staff commented that there a lot of utility meters in that location that would also be within the patio. The applicant indicated that she is going to cover the utilities.

Mr. Lynch commented that he would like to see an application for a permanent patio. The safety aspect and domino effect of additional improvements required are concerns. The applicant indicated she will have to run new plans for a permanent patio by the landlord.

Mr. Craycraft discussed altering the design with metal posts that are imbedded in the ground in sleeves.

Dr. Kelly noted that the patio should have railing around it instead of loose chain. Mr. Lynch affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked the commission if anyone has an issue with a more permanent structure. The commission noted that they prefer a more permanent structure.

**A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Roger White that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-19-021 be tabled so that the applicant can explore a more permanent patio design with steel posts with a solid railing.**

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

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

**CA-19-022**

Property Owner: Gregory & Deborah John  
Applicant: Gregory & Deborah John

Location: 92 East Waterloo Street  
Request: Modifications to existing 8x10 shed.

Staff presented the application for Greg and Deborah John for property located at 92 East Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval to do some modifications to the existing 8x10 shed. Staff discussed that the applicant is looking to repair the existing shed and while doing so would like to make the door a double door, relocate an existing window and install a new standing seam metal roof. Staff discussed that the new metal roof would look as close to the existing profile as possible but the applicant does not care what color the metal roof is.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if they are relocating the existing window. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if they are redoing the interior framing. The applicant indicated that they would repair any rot as necessary but the goal is not to change the look or style of the shed.

Mr. Craycraft asked what color is the current roof. The applicant indicated it is green but they can make the roof any color the commission wants.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if this project is maintenance. Staff indicated it is close to maintenance other than the metal roof will be an updated profile and they are enlarging the front door and relocating the window. There are enough subtle changes staff felt it needed to be reviewed.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if the roof on the house is slate. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the shed color will match. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked staff what brand the metal roof is. Staff indicated the applicant is proposing a Menards Pro Snap.

Mr. White commented that the metal roof could be green or black.

Dr. Kelly reviewed the photo of the slate roof on the house and noted that a slate grey metal on the metal roof would look nice.

Mr. Lynch affirmed that he liked the color options for the roof.

**A motion was made by Jamoya Cox, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness Application #CA-19-022 be approved with the following condition:**

**1. The new metal roof be either a similar color to the existing or match the color of the slate on the home.**

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

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

**CA-19-023**

Property Owner: Shane & Sarah Watkins

Applicant: Shane & Sarah Watkins

Location: 129 Washington Street

Request: New Garden Shed

Mr. Moore presented the application for Shane and Sarah Watkins for property located at 129 Washington Street. The applicant is requesting approval for a detached shed that was installed on the property in 2018. Staff discussed that the property owner received a notice of violation after a complaint was filed for the shed. Staff shared Franklin County Aerial Photography that shows the shed was new in 2018, replacing a previous shed from 2017. The new shed features metal siding and is tucked in the tree line on the north side of the lot. This structure is not visible from the street.

Mr. Craycraft asked for clarification on the scenario. Staff indicated that the property owner did not get approval for the shed in 2018. A neighbor filed a complaint against the property owner in regards to the shed material and location and during an inspection staff discovered the shed did not have landmarks approval so the applicant was informed that this process needed to happen to keep the shed.

Dr. Kelly asked staff if shed meets setbacks. Staff affirmed that the location does meet setbacks.

Mr. White asked the applicants when they purchased the property. The applicants responded end of 2017. White commented that he is concerned realtors don't advise of properties being located within the Old Town Area. The applicants commented that they were aware the property was within the Landmarks area but they did not think that applied to accessory buildings.

The commission asked staff if there are any metal detached buildings of that size in the Old Town Area. Staff commented that they are unaware of any other metal sheds at this scale.

A few members of the public discussed the application from their seats.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff about the Old Town Guidelines and what they say about buildings of this type. Staff noted that the guidelines do not have much deep discussion on accessory buildings of this scale.

Mr. Lynch commented that he thinks this application's circumstances are unfortunate in that it is a violation that brought this before them. The concern is allowing the structure to be there if it doesn't fit in, but allowing it because it is already there.

Sarah Watkins discussed that it was not their intention to put something on the property that detracted from the neighborhood. Mrs. Watkins discussed that they would be happy to plant bushes or arborvitae around the shed to help screen it.

Mr. Lynch commented that the out of sight, out of mind idea is not the best one. Lynch asked the applicant if they would consider replacing the siding with something more appropriate. Mr. Watkins discussed that the material he used does have a wood look to it and when they chose the metal it was due to it blending into the environment. The metal would have less maintenance than wood.

Mr. Lynch suggested a composite material for the siding if the wood siding is a concern.

Mr. White asked the applicant if the shed roof is metal. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. White commented that the glossy look to the metal is a concern.

Mr. Lynch discussed while the metal shed is out of sight for most people, the next application for a metal shed may not be. The difficulty is approving this one and how to justify that to the next applicant.

Mr. White commented that he would be comfortable with screening the shed or a change in material.

The commission discussed alteration options for the shed.

Dr. Kelly commented that the application should be tabled so the applicant can come back in a month with options. The commission agreed.

**A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Roger White that Application #CA-19-023 be tabled so the applicant can explore changing the exterior siding material.**

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

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

**CA-19-024**

Property Owner: RRCT LLC

Applicant: Todd Weiser

Location: 3-7 South High Street

Request: Returning building façade to early 1880's design, Phase II

Mr. Moore presented the application for Todd Weiser and Bob Wood for property located at 3-7 South High Street. The applicant is requesting approval for phase 2 of the front façade alterations for 3 – 7 South High Street. Staff discussed that phase 1 was completed earlier in the year and included the renovation for 3 South High Street storefront. The applicant is seeking to get started on phase 2 which will alter 5 – 7 South High, with future phase 3 to complete 7 South High at a later date.

Staff shared with the commission the applicant supplied renderings of the façade alteration. These alterations create a much smaller vestibule for 5 South High Street and add a metal roof on top, while moving the door for 7 South High into the center of the façade. This change is similar to what was done at 3 South High. The applicant however, does not wish to go with these plans this evening. After a discussion with staff, the applicant has another route in mind.

Staff shared several renderings on the façade design changes that work better with the existing interior layout of 7 South High Street. These changes would remove the mansard roof over the vestibule and create a flat roof system that will blend the two sides of the building together. With this layout the door orientation stays the same, reducing the overall cost. Phase 3 will replace the current windows at 7 South High with new windows to match Fantasy Cupcakes.

Mr. Craycraft asked Mr. Lynch if he is trying to mimic what was done to Fantasy Cupcakes. Mr. Lynch affirmed that it will be very similar. Craycraft asked the applicant if the current façade has the wood paneling, similar to what was removed on Fantasy. The applicant affirmed that phase 2 would include removing the wood paneling to do the necessary brick restoration under the windows.

Mr. Lynch added that doing the windows at 7 South High involves removing the drop ceiling in the space and doing much more work while a tenant is in that

space. Ultimately, the same windows will be across the entire store front but for the next two years the existing windows will be there. The existing window trim might be narrowed up as part of this project but it is hard to say at this time.

Mr. Craycraft asked about the door element and how far it sticks out from the façade. Mr. Lynch stated that the doors are recessed 4 – 6 inches.

Mr. White commented he likes the design staff put together more than the architects rendering. Mr. Lynch comments that this design is a compromise to keep the layout of 7 South High the same.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the internal gutter system will still be used. The applicant affirmed that the new façade will have an EPDM roof with internal drain.

**A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Jamoya Cox that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-19-024 be approved with staff concept rendering for Phase II.**

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

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

**Abstain: 1** – Peter Lynch

**CA-19-025**

Property Owner: Kathy Binner & Marc Vance  
Applicant: Kathy Binner & Marc Vance  
Location: 156 Washington Street  
Request: Enclose Side Porch

Mr. Moore presented the application for Kathy Binner and Marc Vance for property located at 156 Washington Street. The applicant is requesting approval to enclose the side porch on the south side of the home. Staff discussed that the applicant wishes to reuse the wood board and batten siding inside the porch for the exterior siding and plans on installing several vinyl windows on the south elevation and a few on the east elevation to match the existing home. The applicant also is wishing for the ability to relocate the metal railing from the side porch to the front porch.

Mr. Lynch asked what the current window trim is on the building. Mr. Vance noted that the window casing is an aluminum wrap.

Mr. Craycraft asked what type of material the new windows will be made from. The applicant indicated a vinyl to match the house. Craycraft asked if the window trim will also be the same. The applicant affirmed.

Mrs. Binner discussed that the existing home looks like an 1865 and 1965 mashup. The front of the house has a very different look from the rear addition. The side porch as a 1965 picture window in it that will be removed as part of this project. By enclosing the side porch and having the porch new windows match the proportions of the existing home it should help the home look more unison.

Mr. Vance discussed that the bed and breakfast theme is Carraway Guest House. The plan is to have a solid walnut conference table in the enclosed porch with a chandelier on top.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if the new windows will be taller than the existing home. The applicant indicated they will be the same ratio in height and width as the existing home.

Mrs. Binner stated that they have enough board and batten under the porch where they can relocate it to the new outside wall to keep the same material in the same finish.

The applicant and the commission discussed the changes that would take place on the interior of the new enclosed porch area.

Mr. White asked if the board and batten will stay the same finish and color. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked if the windows on the rear addition are wrapped in aluminum. The applicant affirmed. Staff noted that it looks like the windows have an aluminum wrap and then have a wood casing detail around them.

Mr. Lynch discussed with staff other aluminum wrap projects that have been turned down. Staff commented that the other homes did not have any aluminum wrap present and they wanted to add it. In this case the existing windows are wrapped and the applicant would like the several windows in the addition to match.

The applicant commented that they would also like to save the railing from the side porch and add it to the front porch in the future. Mr. White asked staff if they could add that information to tonight's approval. Staff affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked if there were any plans to paint the concrete block foundation under the side porch. The applicant commented that is not a bad idea with the original house foundation being a red brick.

**A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Roger White that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-19-025 be approved as presented, and include the ability to relocate the side porch railing to the front porch.**

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

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

**CA-19-026**

Property Owner: Stephanie & Jeremiah Lilley

Applicant: Stephanie & Jeremiah Lilley

Location: 63 North Trine Street

Request: 1. Replace existing slate, metal and asphalt shingle roof with new dimensional asphalt shingles.

2. Replace Aluminum siding with 4" vinyl siding.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Stephanie and Jeremiah Lilley for property located at 63 North Trine Street. The applicant is requesting approval for two items this evening. The first request is to remove the slate roof, metal roof on the rear addition and 3 tab asphalt shingles on the front porch for new dimensional asphalt shingles. The second request is to remove the aluminum siding and replace it with new vinyl siding.

Staff discussed the application with the commission sharing photographs of the existing slate roof. The applicant has noted that the slate had damage to it during a storm in March and there are several tiles that are missing and the home has extensive damage to the interior due to leaking. Staff shared with the commission photographs of the interior damage with the commission. With the replacement of the slate roof the applicant is looking to match the rear addition and front porch.

The second request from the applicant is to replace the existing aluminum siding with new 4" vinyl siding. The applicant has not supplied any details on the existing aluminum but staff believes that it is either a 6" or 8" wide siding. The applicant notes that they would like to install new grey vinyl siding from Royal Crest but did not mention if it would be a traditional lap siding profile or the dimensional Dutch lap profile.

Mr. Cox asked the applicant how long they have owned the property. Mrs. Lilley stated that she has owned the property since 2005. In March this year the roof had wind damage and a few slate tiles were blown off. Since 2005 the roof has been repaired twice. The first thought was to have a slate company come out and look at the roof but Able Roofing was not able to look at the roof until July. There was a tarp on the roof but the tarp will not stay in place.

The applicants further explained that the wood under the slate is rotten and the home is over 100 years old. Additionally the insurance company would only give them \$3,000 for the slate roof repair.

Mrs. Lilley discussed that they were unaware that this property was within the Landmarks Old Town District. So they refinanced the home to get money out to redo the property with a new roof and new siding. Currently the home is undergoing damage every week with the leaking.

Mr. Lilley commented that this property is a rental and the current tenant has buckets inside the home to catch the water.

Mrs. Lilley discussed that the day the contractor went to pull the permits to start work is when they were told the home is within the Landmarks Review area. The property owners stated they thought the home had to be on the national register to be a historic home.

Mr. White asked the applicant the current condition of the roof. The applicant stated it is deteriorating and there are pockets in the slate. They do not have a condition report on the roof due to the companies contacted not being able to come assess the roof until July.

Mr. White commented that the drone photographs provided appear to show the slate is in good condition other than some missing tiles. Mr. Lilley stated that the guy that came out to put the tarp on the roof stated he could make a repair to the slate but will not guarantee the work due to the wood underneath being rotten. The contractor inspected the roof from within the attic and made this assessment.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if all of the wood substrate under the slate is rotten. The applicant indicated they were going to have all of the wood replaced with the new roof. Mr. Lilley added a 16 foot by 9 foot section of the wood under the roof is rotten and needs replaced.

Mr. Lynch commented that the photographs show most of the slate damage is on the front of the home. The applicants stated that the front of the home is the master bedroom and right behind that is the bathroom. The roof is leaking down into the kitchen below.

Mr. White asked if the proposal will replace the metal roof. The applicant affirmed that all roof sections will match with new dimensional asphalt shingles.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicants if they have tried to contact any additional slate roof companies since June 11. The applicants stated that they contacted

Durable Slate and sent them a photograph of the home. Durable Slate looked at the image and said the slate was made down in Georgia and should last 100-115 years. Right now they are pushing 100 years on the roof. Mr. Lynch stated that they typically want a physical letter of the slate condition to review.

Mrs. Lilley discussed that if they repair the slate the roof is still leaking and the wood underneath is rotten. Without removing the slate the roof cannot be repaired.

Mr. Craycraft discussed with the property owner that the commission's objective is to keep slate when at all possible. Mr. Lynch added that they require a slate company report so they can see what type of slate it is and what the remaining life expectancy would be. The applicant commented that she understands that but she is concerned about the rotting wood under the slate.

Mr. Lynch asked Durable Slate came out to look at the home. The applicant stated that they did not come out they only sent them a photo of the slate. From the photo they were able to guess the slate came from Georgia and anything from that area had a lifespan of 100 to 115 years.

Mr. Lynch commented that he can relate to this personally because on his house there was a Pennsylvania black slate that had a maximum life of 120 years. However, they did supply a report from the slate company as required. Someone needs to come out to the house and look at the slate to produce a report.

The applicant noted that there is a tenant's bedroom that is currently leaking along with the bathroom. Staff asked the applicant if they have photographs of the damage in the attic. The applicant indicated they do not.

Mr. White commented maybe the commission can approve the new roof pending a letter showing the slate is at the end of its life and staff can administer that approval. Staff commented that they cannot make that determination on behalf of the commission.

Staff discussed that there are two items on this application. One for the roof and one for the siding. Mr. White discussed that those two items need to be separate discussions.

Mrs. Lilley discussed that the roof is more pressing than the siding. With the heavy rains right now there is concern on what is happening to the home. Mr. Lynch stated that typically a roof company will tarp the entire roof not just a section. The applicant stated they have been out twice to tarp the roof and there is nothing to anchor it to. The home is currently experiencing water issues

with the roof, missing gutters and they are concerned about foundation issues. The storm that damaged the roof was in March and it is not the end of June and it is still not fixed.

Mr. Lynch commented that this type of discussion on slate roofs happen every year. The applicant commented that the majority of the homes on Trine Street have asphalt shingle roofs. Mr. Lynch stated he can make a decision on the slate without a letter from a slate company.

Mr. Lilley asked about the rotten wood under the slate. Mr. Lynch stated there is no evidence provided of the rotting wood.

The applicant discussed that they will not be available for the meeting in July, which means they will have to wait two months until August. Staff commented that the commission has the ability to hold an Emergency Meeting and just has to set the date and time. The commission discussed timing on the Emergency Meeting to review updated information on the slate roof.

The commission discussed that Monday, July 8<sup>th</sup> at 6pm would be the date for the Emergency Landmarks Meeting to review the additional materials for the slate roof.

Mr. Lilley asked the commission what would happen if the slate company says there is 20 years left on the slate but to fix the wood underneath it all has to be removed. Mr. Lynch discussed the company needs to provide specific information on how much slate needs to be removed to do the repairs, and if it is the entire roof on both sides is rotten then that will go into the consideration on the application. Additionally, the timeframe and lifespan on the slate will also be reviewed.

Mrs. Lilley commented that she is trying to improve the property. The insurance company is claiming the slate is not worth covering from storm damage.

Staff asked the commission if they want to discuss the siding change portion of the application.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if they are looking to replace the aluminum siding with vinyl. The applicant affirmed. Lynch stated that the commission is not fond of new vinyl on homes and the applicant responded saying that they would keep the awful aluminum siding then.

Mr. Lilley commented that the corner pieces have been damaged from the storm and it cannot be reconnected. Not to mention that the other homes on Trine street have vinyl siding.

**A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by David Craycraft to table Certificate of Appropriateness application #CA-19-026.**

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

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

**CA-19-027**

Property Owner: Jason & Dawn Gunnoe

Applicant: Jason & Dawn Gunnoe

Location: 65 Franklin Street

Request: New Basement Windows. New 6 foot tall fence.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Jason & Dawn Gunnoe for property located at 65 Franklin Street. The applicant is requesting approval to replace the existing basement windows with new vinyl windows and to install a 6 foot tall shadowbox fence at the rear property line. Staff presented the supplied photographs of the existing basement windows and noted that they extensive damage and corrosion, prompting the replacement. Staff also discussed the fence design and location.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the existing basement windows are metal or wood. The applicant indicated that they have both metal and wood basement windows. At some time in the past the basement was expanded under the front porch for a coal and canning room and that addition has metal windows. The metal windows has the glass painted black. Most of the windows are rotten and do not open. The applicant explained when it rains water gets inside the basement.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if the rest of the windows are vinyl. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant how many basement windows are on the home. The applicant indicated that there are six. The applicant discussed that the windows do not have any slope to them so they collect water and it does not run off.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if they are only looking to have the fence on the rear property line for screening. The applicant stated the neighbors have an existing fence to the left and it is the same dog ear pine fence.

Mr. Lynch asked how the neighbor's fence is finished. The applicant stated that the fence is a similar color to the deck on their home.

Mr. White asked staff if the fence is within any established flood area. Staff indicated that they believe the flood area is further east than this property.

**A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by Peter Lynch that Certificate of Appropriateness Application #CA-19-027 be approved as presented.**

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

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

**CA-19-028**

Property Owner: Michele Ware  
Applicant: Jason Ware  
Location: 83 North High Street  
Request: New 6 foot tall fence

Mr. Moore presented the application for Jason and Michele Ware for property located at 83 North High Street. The applicant is requesting approval to remove the existing fence on the property and install a new 6 foot tall privacy fence. The new fence will enclose the rear yard and separate it from the rental property to the rear.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the existing fencing will come down. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked if the rental to the rear is on the same property. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant what the fence would be made from. The applicant indicated that they are anticipated pine. Craycraft asked if they were going to paint or stain the fence. The applicant stated after the fence conditions for a year they are going to stain it.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant what color they are going to stain the fence. The applicant stated they were not sure but are open to what is acceptable. It could be a white wash or a tan or brown stain.

The commission discussed their preferences on the fence color. The applicant stated she prefers a white wash on the fence but would prefer an either or approval.

**A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Whit Wardell that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-19-028 be approved with the following conditions:**

**1. The fence be stained a white wash or natural color.**

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

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

Old Business

New Business

The commission and staff discussed future vinyl siding and slate roof education and procedures for replacement.

Adjournment

*Time Out: 9:15pm*

**A motion was made by Peter Lynch and seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly, that this meeting be adjourned.**

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

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

---

Date

---

Landmarks Chairman