

Canal Winchester

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



Meeting Minutes

Monday, August 28, 2017

7:00 PM

Landmarks Commission

*Joe Abbott – Chairman
Patrick Lynch – Vice Chairman
Ronnie Woodrow – Secretary
David Craycraft
Pete Lynch
Bob Wood II
Roger White*

Call To Order

Time In: 7:00pm

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)Approval of Minutes

July 24, 2017 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Patrick Lynch, seconded by Peter Lynch, that the July 24, 2017 Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Bob Wood II & David Craycraft

Abstain: 1 – Ronnie Woodrow

Applications**CA-17-027**

Property Owner: David & Melissa Gabriel

Applicant: David & Melissa Gabriel

Location: 40 North Trine Street

Request: New vinyl windows

Mr. Moore presented the application for David & Melissa Gabriel located at 40 North Trine Street. The applicant is requesting approval to replace the original wood windows and aluminum storm windows with new white vinyl windows. Staff presented a brief history of the property to the commission and shared photographs supplied by the applicant of the windows they are looking to install. The new windows will be a six over one grid pattern and will feature the internal grid mullions.

Staff also informed the commission that a neighbor informed the city that the property owners have removed a chimney on the house when they were doing the interior renovations and wanted to make the Landmarks Commission aware of it. Staff shared pictures of the chimney that was removed with the commission.

Mr. White asked staff who contacted the city about the chimney. Staff informed it was an adjacent neighbor.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if the existing storms are aluminum. The applicant affirmed. Craycraft asked if the storms would be removed with the new windows. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked if the new windows would be trimmed with wood trim. Patrick Lynch explains that the commission does not prefer vinyl windows but when older homes have aluminum storms a good compromise is to remove the

storm window and expose the original wood trim or replace with a new wood trim around the window. The applicant stated they are more than willing to have a wood trim around the window.

Mr. Patrick Lynch suggested having the wood trim project out past the J-Mold on the vinyl siding to give it a more historic look and profile. The applicant affirmed they would do that.

The applicant asked the commission if they need the wood trim color approved. The commission indicated they did not.

Mr. Abbott commented that removing the aluminum around the window will be a big help.

Mr. Patrick Lynch commented Cedar or a composite wood trim is a preferred wood trim material.

Mr. White asked the applicant how the chimney was removed and the metal roof was addressed. The applicant indicated that the chimney leaked and they placed a new matching roof panel up where the chimney was. The applicants indicated they did not know they needed approval to remove the chimney.

Mr. White discussed with the applicant products that help remove algae on metal roofs.

Mr. Patrick Lynch confirmed with the applicant that the windows will be a six over one with grids on the exterior. The applicant indicated that they applied for grids in between the panes of glass but they would be glad to switch to exterior grids.

Mr. White confirmed with the applicant that the existing chimney served no purpose.

A motion was made by Member Roger White, seconded by Member David Craycraft, that this Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with conditions that the applicant use six over one windows with external grid mullions and wood trim around the windows.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Bob Wood II, David Craycraft & Ronnie Woodrow.

CA-17-028

Property Owner: David & Melissa Gabriel
Applicant: David & Melissa Gabriel
Location: 40 North Trine Street
Request: New 5' Cedar Fence

Mr. Moore presented the application for David and Melissa Gabriel for property located at 40 North Trine Street. The applicant is requesting approval to remove the old wire fence on the property to construct a new 5' cedar fence in the rear yard. Staff shared with the commission a photograph of the fence being removed and indicated the location for the proposed fence.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked staff if there are any zoning restrictions for fences in that area. Staff indicated that the max height for a rear yard fence is 6 feet, but landmarks has the ability to restrict that further.

Mr. White asked the applicant if the fence extends past the front building line. The applicant indicated it will stop at the rear building line.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked if there are going to be any gates on the fence and the applicant affirmed and noted the locations.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked the applicant if the fence will have pressure treated posts and rails. The applicant affirmed.

The applicant indicated they would like the fence to be painted white. Mr. Patrick Lynch indicated that paint does not hold up well on cedar and they might want to use a solid stain instead of paint.

A motion was made by Member Patrick Lynch, seconded by Member Bob Wood II, that this Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Bob Wood II, David Craycraft & Ronnie Woodrow.

CA-17-029

Property Owner: Annette Ebert
Applicant: Andy Howard – JSB Home Solutions
Location: 77 West Columbus Street
Request: New wood deck.

Mr. Moore presented the application for property owner Annette Ebert, represented by Andy Howard, for property located at 77 West Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting approval to install a new wood deck in place of the

existing wood deck. Staff shared with the commission photographs of the existing deck with the commission and the drawings for the new deck. The new deck is going to be designed to be slightly larger than the previous and will sit roughly 16" off of the ground, compared to the existing at 8". The applicant is requesting this to eliminate several concrete steps and to create a larger more usable area. The deck is being proposed with a composite TimberTech material to hold up to weathering. Staff indicated they were unclear if the sides of the deck would be the TimberTech or just the top decking.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked the applicant if the TimberTech is being used for the fascia or band board. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. White asked if a railing is necessary. Staff indicated a railing is only required after 30" in height. Mr. Woodrow and Patrick Lynch commented it would look better without a railing.

The applicant indicated that the cellar doors are going to be replaced with the project as well. The current cellar door leaks and that is why it is being replaced.

Mr. Abbott asked if the new cellar door will open into the deck. The applicant indicated the cellar doors will be raised with new deck and the siding will be flashed into the cellar doors.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the deck will have a solid band board at the bottom so there is no gap between the deck and the ground. The applicant affirmed.

A motion was made by Member Bob Wood II, seconded by Patrick Lynch that this Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Bob Wood II, David Craycraft & Ronnie Woodrow.

CA-17-030

Property Owner: Eric Campbell

Applicant: Eric Campbell

Location: 153 Washington Street

Request: Renovation to existing home and new addition.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Eric Campbell for property located at 153 Washington Street. The applicant is requesting only preliminary approval for the project this evening as they need to go before Planning and Zoning Commission to request a variance to encroach the side yard setback and a

second variance to reconstruct a front porch which encroaches the established build to line of the property. If the variances get approved for the project, the applicant is going to come back to Landmarks with more information on the other elevations and building materials for review.

With the request this evening the applicant would like to remove the existing 1 story addition to the rear of the home to construct a larger two story addition in its place. Staff presented a brief history of the property to the commission, sharing a photograph of what the home looked like with what appears to be original front porch and side porch.

As staff discussed the history of the project, photographs were shared showing the front porch that was removed in 2016. This porch was removed by the previous property owner by request of the city as it was a safety hazard. Due to the porch being removed for more than 12 months, the applicant has to apply for a variance to put a new one back on the building.

Mr. Moore discussed the condition of the building and noted that in several locations the brick has been painted. It is unknown weather this paint was for aesthetic reasons or a quick "fix" due to lack in maintenance. The current property owner has attempted to remove the paint to restore the original brick with little success. Staff shared photographs of the areas where the brick was cleaned. Staff noted that the slate roof on the home appears to be original as well. Staff shared several photographs noting the existing conditions of the home.

With the addition the applicant is looking to increase the livable space inside of the home. The first floor addition will replace what is being removed and will add a two car garage on the south side of the home. The second floor will be a new master bedroom. With the garage addition to the south, the applicant will relocate the driveway to the south side of the property. The plan is to remove the gravel from the north side of the property with this addition so there are not two driveways. Staff presented the rendering for what the applicant is looking to achieve with the commission and noted that the applicant will provide more information to the board for review after P&Z approval.

The applicant is proposing to replace the windows with new Anderson Simulated Divided Light windows in a Bronze color to match the proposed windows in the addition. The exterior brick is proposed to be painted white to match the board and batten addition. The new garage door will have windows in the top pane and be a carriage style door. The new front porch is 1' shorter than the existing but will feature a dormer on the south end to highlight the front door.

The variance the applicant is requesting is to encroach the 5' side yard setback to install the addition which will sit 2.8' away from the property line. The new front porch will be roughly 8' from the sidewalk.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked how far away the addition will be from the home to the south. Staff indicated roughly 18'.

Staff indicated that the garage being proposed is forward facing due to the limited lot width. The applicant looked at doing a side load garage but due to the width of the lot and the severe grade change at the rear of the lot the applicant could not get the swing into the space to work effectively.

Mr. Moore indicated that he knows several commission members have been inside of the property and if they have any comments on insight to the current condition of the building that would be good info for the rest of the board to know.

Mr. Woodrow stated he had the building in contract previously. The biggest issue is the location of the current driveway and the conflict with existing gas and electric utilities. The driveway needs to be moved to the other side of the property to have a usable driveway.

Mr. Abbott commented that this proposal is the only thing they can image to get the property to work. Mr. Woodrow affirmed stating that to get any more rear yard you would have to construct a very tall retaining wall and fill that area, which would be quite expensive.

Staff stated that due to the applicant not being present this evening to discuss, the main idea of going before Landmarks this soon was to get a recommendation for the variance requests based on feedback on the design.

Mr. Patrick Lynch stated he likes the elevations provide. The additions roof lines being slightly lower than the existing home is a positive design.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked staff what the applicant plans on doing with the existing gravel driveway. Staff stated that to their knowledge, the applicant is going to rake the gravel over and plant new grass to reestablish that side yard, while leaving some gravel so the adjacent property has a wider more workable driveway. Mr. Patrick Lynch asked if the curb cut would be modified with the driveway being narrowed. Staff indicated they would have to check.

Mr. Peter Lynch asked Woodrow and Abbott what the condition the foundation is in. Mr. Woodrow stated it appears to be in good shape and the rear addition is the only section that is failing. The roof also appears to be in good shape.

Mr. Woodrow discussed the design of the addition and stated that if he was designing it he would try to tuck in a side load garage and have the addition be a different shape to hide the garage door.

Mr. Abbott stated he knew a previous owner and they wanted to tear down the entire house due to its condition but when he was informed by the city it could not be demolished he sold it.

Mr. Moore indicated that the applicant informed staff that the basement does hold moisture a little and they were going to redo the foundation walls to seal it off or install a drain tile around the foundation to kick the water away.

Mr. Woodrow stated that there is also a cistern underground next to the house where the addition is going.

Mr. Craycraft asked how much rear yard is usable. Staff indicated that where the door was to the old barn is the furthest the current grade goes, then it drops off severely into the floodplain.

Mr. Woodrow commented that if you wanted to achieve a side load garage you would lose all usable yard space because the driveway would take up the rest of the property.

Mr. Peter Lynch asked if there are any houses on that stretch that have a forward facing garage. Mr. Abbott commented there are few houses with off street parking.

Mr. Woodrow stated he walked away from the property due to the driveway. With no usable driveway and no on street parking it did not make any sense.

Staff pulled up google maps and moved down the street to look at adjacent properties. It was noted that there are several houses with detached forward facing garages along the street but none attached.

Mr. White asked staff if the applicant would but willing to not construct a garage but more 1st floor living space. Staff indicated that they did not think the applicant would be willing to do so because the other alternative would be to have a car port under the second floor addition.

The commission discussed the car port option with a side load garage behind it. It was discussed that there would not be enough room to have a turn around to leave the driveway with the limited lot constraints.

Mr. Abbott stated that what they are working with the design looks nice.

Mr. White asked staff about the proposed garage door. Staff indicated it will be a carriage door style with glass in the top row.

Mr. Peter Lynch asked about the option to have to single doors rather than a double door for the garage. The commission discussed the option but determined that there is not enough width to the lot to add the additional framing.

Mr. Peter Lynch asked if there are any concerns removing the rear addition. The commission members stated that they have no concerns removing the rear addition.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if the applicant was going to come back to Landmarks after the variance hearing. Staff affirmed.

A motion was made by Member Patrick Lynch, seconded by Peter Lynch that the Variance Request for the side yard setback and encroaching the front established build-to line be approved to match the footprint proposal dated 7/21/17. It was noted that the variance for the front porch would create a porch that was a usable size and the side yard setback variance would allow a front load garage.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Bob Wood II, David Craycraft & Ronnie Woodrow.

CA-17-031

Property Owner: Fassalto LLC

Applicant: Austin Caulk

Location: 32 East Waterloo Street

Request: Install new vinyl siding and vinyl windows.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Austin Caulk for property located at 32 East Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval to install new 4" Dutch lap vinyl siding and vinyl windows on the building. Staff discussed the application with the commission and noted that in January of 2017 the applicant received approval to remove the aluminum siding on the building to expose the original wood siding and repair/paint where necessary.

Since the January approval, the applicant has removed the aluminum siding and has found that the condition of the wood siding is worse than expected and is requesting to cover it up with vinyl siding. Staff shared photographs with the

commission on the existing condition of the home and the proposed vinyl siding. Staff also discussed that the applicant is looking to install new vinyl windows. With the new windows the applicant would like to install new trim around the windows.

Mr. Abbott asked staff if the removal of the aluminum siding was to expose and repair the wood siding. Staff affirmed. Mr. Abbott stated that is why he voted in favor to remove the aluminum.

Mr. Caulk stated that was the intention but once the aluminum was removed there were unforeseen problems underneath. The trim on the windows was cut flush to wrap the aluminum easier.

Mr. Patrick Lynch confirmed with the applicant that the wood windows are proposed to be removed to install new vinyl windows. The applicant affirmed and stated it made more sense to do the windows and siding the same time.

Mr. Patrick Lynch stated that the commission approved vinyl windows on a case by case basis but he cannot recall in the Historic District installing vinyl siding. The major concern is that if the commission approves vinyl siding tonight, then there are a lot of houses that will want to follow suite. It is especially hard when there are a lot of properties that have taken the time to expose to covered up wood or recreate it with a hardi-board material. At least with vinyl windows you can correct inefficient problems and remove bad storm windows and replace the wood trim.

Mr. Caulk stated that the estimates of 15K for the wood siding repair is a lot for what he paid for the property and what he will get in rents.

Mr. Abbott stated that he does not think the existing wood is in that bad of shape. Mr. Patrick Lynch affirmed and states it really needs a paint job.

Mr. Patrick Lynch stated he owns the business down the street and they took the vinyl off and repaired the wood underneath. After a paint job it looks really good. Eventually, all the vinyl siding will be removed to expose the wood. Mr. Patrick Lynch stated he knew well in advance that after removing the vinyl it would be allowed to go back up and if the wood underneath needed replaced that is what he would be doing.

Mr. Caulk stated the concern is the wood siding will need perpetual maintenance. Mr. Abbott stated that is why the questioned removing the aluminum in the first place.

Mr. Caulk stated his intention from the start was to make the house look more historic. The applicant added that he has flipped houses in German Village and they are always historically accurate. Changing the existing 3" wood Dutch lap to a 4" vinyl Dutch lap is more historic than the 7" aluminum siding. Mr. Patrick Lynch agrees but not in a vinyl material. Allowing vinyl would not be fair to those who have invested lots of money into their homes to a siding that is required by the Historic Guidelines.

Mr. Abbott stated he needs to see more information on the vinyl windows before making a decision. Mr. Woodrow affirms.

Mr. Peter Lynch asked about the railing on the fire escape. The applicant indicated it replaced what was there.

Mr. Abbott asked staff how to vote on the application being two parts. Staff indicated that the application can be broken into Item A for the windows and Item B for the vinyl siding to make two separate motions.

Mr. Abbott asked the commission to discuss the windows proposed.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked the applicant what the windows proposed are. The applicant indicated they are one over one windows.

Staff indicated that the porch windows are not being replaced with this request. Staff further clarified that they could not find a cut sheet of what windows the applicant was directly applying for.

Mr. Abbott stated the commission needs more information to approve new windows.

A motion was made by Member Patrick Lynch, seconded by Member Peter Lynch to table Item A for the vinyl windows in order for the application to supply additional details for review.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Bob Wood II, David Craycraft & Ronnie Woodrow.

A motion was made by Member Patrick Lynch, seconded by Member Peter Lynch to approve Item B for the vinyl siding as presented.

The motion failed by the following vote:

No: Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Bob Wood II, David Craycraft & Ronnie Woodrow.

Old Business

Staff shared photographs of current large renovation projects with the commission.

New Business

Adjournment

Time Out: 8:23pm

A motion was made by Patrick Lynch, seconded by David Craycraft, that this Meeting be adjourned. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 7 – Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Bob Wood II, Peter Lynch, David Craycraft, Peter Lynch, Ronnie Woodrow

Date

Joe Abbott, Landmarks Chairman