

Canal Winchester

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



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, December 19, 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)

A motion was made by Member Patrick Lynch, seconded by Member Bob Wood II, that Member Roger White be excused. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Excused: 1 – Roger White

Approval of Minutes

November 27, 2017 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Member Bob Wood II, seconded by Member Patrick Lynch, that the November 27, 2017 Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Peter Lynch, Ronnie Woodrow, & Bob Wood II

Abstain: 1 – David Craycraft

Pending Applications**CA-17-049**

Property Owner: Harry Hannah

Applicant: Harry Hannah

Location: 17 East Columbus Street

Request: Demolish existing shed for future replacement.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Harry Hannah for property located at 17 East Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting approval to demolish the existing historic detached frame garage building to replace it with a new structure in the future. Staff presented the concept plans to the commission and noted that the applicant has ideas of what he would like to do but has not formally submitted anything for the commission to review.

Staff discussed that the only item of concern for the new project is that the applicant would like to stay under the 15 foot roof height to reduce the variance request. In doing so, the garage doors on the first floor will be shorter than normal. Staff is mainly concerned that this is an under sight and could make the future use of the garage limited and recommends that the applicant go through a variance process to construct something that is usable for the life of the property and not the current occupant. Staff presented supplied photographs of the current structure to the commission for review.

Staff presented the previous approval for this structure and noted that the property owner received approval in 2011 to install an addition to the south end of the structure. That project was never completed. Since that time the applicant stated removing the accessory building for a new one would be beneficial because he would like to make the new structure taller with a second floor.

Mr. Abbott discussed that this project is similar to the project he did at West Columbus Street where he constructed a new barn in the rear of the lot and he does not recall needing a variance for that project. Staff indicated that they are not sure and they will research that project.

Mr. Abbott asked staff about the variance that the house at the end of East Columbus received for that accessory structure. Staff discussed that variance with the commission.

Mr. Abbott affirmed with staff that applying for a height variance would be beneficial for the project. Keeping the height under 15 feet to avoid the variance causes the garage doors to be abnormal height and out of proportion and diminishes the value in the project.

Mr. Abbott commented that new construction needs to consider future use as well as present use.

Mr. Craycraft asked what the height of the garage down East Columbus Street is at. Staff indicated 19-20 feet tall.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked what the height of the structure is in the concept image the applicant provided. Staff indicated that the drawing is not dimensioned.

Mr. Craycraft commented that dormers on both sides of the building would make the ceiling much taller in the second floor.

Mr. Craycraft discussed some of the preliminary plans for the future structure.

Mr. Abbott asked staff what is being determined this meeting. Staff stated that the commission is considering just a demolition at this meeting. The issue with this application is there is the assumption that a new structure is going to be replaced by the applicant. Typically, a demo is approved by Landmarks with the replacement being approved.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked the applicant time frame to construct a new building. Mr. Hannah indicated as soon as possible.

Mr. Craycraft indicated he could not start on the architectural drawings until January.

Mr. Patrick Lynch indicated what is important is the structure is replaced with something new.

Staff cautioned the commission on approving the demo of the existing building with the idea of something replacing it. If the commission feels that the building not being there at all is fine, but if they are only approving the demo with a future replacement then the application should be tabled until a plan for a new structure is also approved. Mr. Patrick Lynch affirms.

Mr. Woodrow asked staff if the current building is a safety hazard. Staff indicated that they did not believe it was. Mr. Woodrow affirmed that if construction is not going to start until spring of 2018 then the application could be tabled to the January meeting and the timeline won't be affected.

Mr. Hannah stated that he does not want to wait and get the demolition accomplished.

Mr. Patrick Lynch stated that he agrees that waiting for full plans for the demo is a good thing. Patrick Lynch informed the applicant that if it were solely up to him, if the plans for the new structure match what the concept image is then there is no issue getting the plans approved in the future.

Mr. Hannah stated that both existing sheds need to be removed. They both have been on the property since it was purchased. At first an addition seemed to be the right route, but the condition is beyond that. Replacing the shed with a new one to match would cost less.

Mr. Hannah stated that this shed would act as a mud room to protect the inside of the house. It would also feature an outside playroom and bathroom. Since they have owned the property no vehicles have been parked in the existing structure. It was designed to fit the old Ford Model T trucks and nothing modern. Mr. Hannah discusses he did not understand the commissions discussion of the future resale value of the new structure. Staff indicated that the commission needs to consider future impacts of any new construction and the comment of sale value was made due to the thought that to avoid a variance the garage doors should be left shorter than standard height. This makes the future usability of the garage limited. Mr. Hannah stated that this structure will never be used as a garage. Staff indicated that future property owners may want it as a garage.

Staff informed Mr. Hannah that he should explore getting a height variance to exceed the 15' roof height and see if that is something the commission would support. The commission commented to Hannah that they think the height variance would benefit the design of the structure and recommend that he gets one if necessary.

Mr. Hannah discussed that the new structure would match the existing exactly.

Mr. Craycraft discussed the location of the new structure with the commission.

The commission discussed tabling the application so Mr. Craycraft can finish the architectural drawings and submit them for review. Mr. Hannah discussed he would like the demo permit approved at this meeting.

Mr. Patrick Lynch stated that there was a similar scenario at his property before he purchased it. The previous home owner wanted to remove a structure but was not able to get a permit until the plans for the replacement were approved by the Landmarks Commission. Mr. Hannah discussed his concerns with waiting.

A motion was made by Member Patrick Lynch, seconded by Member Ronnie Woodrow, that this Certificate of Appropriateness be tabled to the January meeting.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Peter Lynch, Ronnie Woodrow, & Bob Wood II

Abstain: 1 – David Craycraft

Old Business

Mr. Moore presented a recap of the 2017 year to the commission on the types and number of applications that were reviewed. Staff thanked the commission for the great effort they have put into the 2017 year serving on the board and hopes that the 2018 year is stronger than ever.

New Business

Adjournment

Time Out: 7:49pm

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

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

Date

Landmarks Chairman