

Canal Winchester

*City Hall
45 East Waterloo Street
Canal Winchester, OH 43110*



Meeting Agenda

June 26, 2023

7:00 PM

Landmarks Commission

*Pete Lynch – Chairman
David Craycraft – Vice-Chairman
Rich Dobda – Secretary
Roger White
Dr. Scott Kelly
Whit Wardell
Linda Boving*

Call To Order

Time In: 7:00pm

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Whit Wardell, that David Craycraft and Linda Boving be excused.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Rich Dobda, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Whit Wardell & Dr. Scott Kelly

Approval of Minutes

May 22, 2023 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Dr. Scott Kelly, seconded by Peter Lynch, that the May 22, 2023 Minutes be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Rich Dobda, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Whit Wardell & Dr. Scott Kelly

Pending Applications

**Member Linda Boving Joined the meeting at 7:01pm.*

CA-23-019

Property Owner: Brian & Ashley Vance
Applicant: Brian & Ashley Vance
Location: 43 East Columbus Street
Request: Front Porch Modifications

Mr. Moore presented the application for Brian & Ashley Vance for property located at 43 East Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting approval for the modifications that were made to the front porch on the home, that differ from the #CA-22-012 approval. Staff noted the changes to the porch details included the posts, skirting, roofline and corbel trim. It was also noted that the wood shutters were removed from the exterior of the home. The applicant provided additional photographs of the porch in the submittal for review.

Mr. Lynch asked staff if there are any additional details for the corbels and what they were supposed to look like. Staff noted there are not.

Mr. Vance passed around an additional photograph of the home to the commission.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if they have additional details for the corbels. Mr. Vance noted that the drawing submitted was the base for the project and there were never details provided for the corbels. Mr. Lynch noted that the corbels

shown in the drawing are relatively simple but helped tie into the history of the decorative corbels that were removed from the previous porch design.

Mrs. Boving asked the applicant why the shutters were removed from the home. Mr. Vance noted that shutters were removed when they painted the exterior of the home. This was unrelated to the front porch construction.

Mr. Lynch asked if the shutters were retained. The applicant noted they were beyond repair and were thrown out.

Dr. Kelly asked the applicant if he was aware that the changes to the design required the Landmark Commissions approval. The applicant noted that he was aware but at the time of removing the shutters the focus was getting the painting completed on the home. Dr. Kelly asked about the other changes that were made to the porch specifically. Mr. Vance noted that he considered the changes a field revision and did not want to stop construction.

Mr. Vance discussed that the corbels can be added. The gable in the front would have provided more attention on the foundation settlement and the leaning window above would be more pronounced. Additionally, they did not care for the gable in the design so it was removed.

Mr. White spoke concern about the lack of ventilation with the skirting design on the front porch. The applicant stated he does not think ventilation is necessary with the treated lumber and the decking is stained on all sides. The slats are a 1x3 material just as a solid design. The idea was to keep animals from living under the porch.

Mr. Lynch notes that traditionally for a skirt board there is a wood deck and the skirt tucks up underneath. Then the slats whether vertical or horizontal tuck behind the skirt board. What this design looks like is two 1x12" boards with batten strips on top. That is a totally different design that what was presented and approved. Even gaps at 1" apart will keep rodents out but what was installed has been layered incorrectly.

Mr. Vance noted that the previous porch was a brick base.

Mr. Lynch recalls that the discussion to remove the existing porch was centered around some of those design elements carrying over to the new porch design. The decorative porch moldings, corbels, and period accurate porch skirting were shown and now have been taken away from the design. What was constructed has transformed this home into a farmhouse and not something that fits the area. What is shown today is not something that Mr. Lynch would have voted to approve today.

Mr. Lynch agreed with the comment from Dr. Kelly that there was time to come back with the proposed changes prior to the work taking place. What was constructed is lacking detail that the porch that was removed had. In his

opinion, Lynch noted that those details are what gave the prior application the vote for approval. Every home has its own signature and the porch that was removed is a huge part of the homes signature. Without some of these additional details that were agreed upon, the home has taken on a whole different look.

Mr. Vance discusses that the porch that was removed was 5 feet in depth with a flat roof and was barely enough to keep the rain off your head. It was removed because it was a safety issue. Some of the revisions to the design were made on the fly and not months in advanced. Mr. Vance adds he does not remember the details from the meeting on why the porch was approved. Chairman Lynch notes that Mr. & Mrs. Vance did not attend the meeting in 2022 and the application was represented by the architect and fellow commission member Dave Craycraft.

Mr. Lynch states removing the porch in the first place was a big deal. The compromise to the new porch was in these details with the panel work on the posts, base and capital and corbels.

Dr. Kelly agreed with the comments from the Chairman and responds saying he would only approve what was presented back in 2022 and not the field changes.

Mr. Lynch discusses with the commission that the gable missing from the design is not an issue for him, as the previous porch did not have one. Mr. White agreed with that statement.

Mr. White notes that the two biggest concerns he has with the changes is the change in the skirt design and the shutters being removed.

Mr. Lynch asked staff if there are any photographs that show what the underside of the porch looks like. Staff noted there is a photo submitted by the applicant.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if they are able to add corbels back to the porch design. Mr. Vance states that he does not want to add corbels because they like the way the porch looks, but it is what it is.

Mrs. Boving asked the applicant if they intend on adding shutters back to the home. This home is one of the nicest on the street and the shutters add a lot of charm to the property. Mr. Vance responds saying he has no plans on putting shutters back on.

Mr. Vance stated that they get lots of compliments on the changes to the home and they are not going to add vinyl shutters to the home. Wood shutters would cost upwards of \$1,500 per window. Requiring shutters on this home is not reasonable.

Mr. Lynch responds by saying that the commission would not require shutters to be on the home if they had not been there before work had started. Mr. Vance states he understands that.

Mr. Dobda discussed with the applicant that he understands his point but this commission volunteers their own time to make sure that all of the homes in the historical district are kept to the same set of standards. Mr. Vance noted he would be more concerned that someone wanted to paint their home pink, however without the shutters the home looks fantastic.

Mrs. Vance stated that they removed the shutters to paint the home and when they took them off they saw the disrepair that they were in. Once the home was painted, they loved the way the house looked without them. Mrs. Vance noted they do not want to spend \$15,000 on new shutters when they like the way the home looks now and they do not want to put vinyl shutters up on the home.

Mr. Lynch discussed with the applicant that the time to make changes is before the work has been done.

Mr. Vance asked the commission what they are requiring for them to do, to skip to that part of the conversation.

Mr. Lynch noted that in his opinion, the only item that he feels can be changed is the gable end. Everything else needs to go back and match the plans.

Mr. Lynch discusses that the plans that were previously approved noted the wood siding, windows and shutters were to remain "as is". Mr. Vance noted that the shutters are not part of the porch project in his mind as that was a separate decision to remove them.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant what changes he is willing to make. In his opinion, the shutters in disrepair do not justify the removal and should be treated the same as a roof or other element of the home. Mr. & Mrs. Vance respond saying that shutters are not structural to the home and are not original shutters from the late 1800's, maybe the 1950's.

Mr. Lynch asked if the shutters were all the way around the home or just the front. Mrs. Vance stated that the whole home had shutters on it. Mr. Vance noted that the rear shutters were removed with a previous project six years ago. Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if they would be willing to add shutters back to only the front elevation and not the entire building.

Mr. Vance stated that he does not like the word willing because it sounds like they have a choice. Vance states he is a lifelong resident and has no problem compromising. Mr. Lynch stated they can either vote on what is presented this evening, which sounds like it will get denied and all of the changes will be required. Or talk about what changes are preferable from the applicant.

Mr. Vance stated that the decorative trim on the posts and corbels are easier to get done. Mr. Vance notes that he likes the skirting the way it is. Mr. Lynch states that he does not feel the board and batten design is accurate for the home, noting that nobody has said what was constructed looks bad it is just not what was presented and approved.

Mr. Vance stated he does not want to make a decision right now on what changes are going to be made and asked the commission to table the application to the July Agenda.

A motion was made by Linda Boving, seconded by Peter Lynch to Table Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-019 to the July agenda at the request of the applicant.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Rich Dobda, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Linda Boving, Whit Wardell & Dr. Scott Kelly

CA-23-022

Property Owner: Jim Vansickle
Applicant: Mae Fence
Location: 106 E Waterloo Street
Request: New Privacy Fence

Mr. Moore presented the application for Jim Vansickle for property located at 106 East Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval to construct a new privacy fence on the west property line of the home. Staff presented photographs of the proposed fence design and a plan to show the location to the commission.

Mr. Lynch confirmed with the applicant that they are changing the design of the fence from what is there now. The applicant affirmed stating the current fence is 24 years old and has started to bow and rot.

The applicant noted he wishes they send along a better photo of the proposed fence but it is a C35 style from their website.

Mr. Lynch asked if the fence has the dog ear top exposed like what is there now or it is flush with the top rail. The applicant noted he is confident it will be flush.

Dr. Kelly noted the finished side is faced inward on the current fence and asked the applicant if the finished side could face out with the new design. The applicant stated it would not bother him either way.

The commission tracked down the fence design on Mae Fence website and noted its design details and reference number C35 for the record.

Mr. Lynch asked if they were planning on painting it or leaving it natural. The applicant stated he intended on leaving it natural but if he were to finish it, it would be an almond or tan to match the trim. Mr. Lynch noted he can always come back if he decides to paint it later.

Mr. White voiced his concern about assuming the commission and the fence company is both talking about the same fence design for construction. Staff noted they can include a photo of the fence shared amongst the commission for clarity sake.

Mr. Lynch asked if they intended on the fence being cedar or pressure treated. The applicant stated pressure treated.

A motion was made by Rich Dobda, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-022 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1) The finished side of the fence face outward.**
- 2) The fence style Mae Fence C35 photo that was presented was the style approved.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Rich Dobda, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Linda Boving, Whit Wardell & Dr. Scott Kelly

CA-23-023

Property Owner: Cindy Kerr
Applicant: Newman Roofing LLC
Location: 119 Park Street
Request: New Asphalt Shingles

Mr. Moore presented the application for Cindy Kerr for property located at 119 Park Street. The applicant is requesting approval for a new asphalt shingle roof on the subject property. Staff noted this is one of the newer homes in this neighborhood, being constructed in 1988. The home currently has a 3-tab dark grey asphalt shingle the applicant is requesting to replace with a Cerntainted Landmark Pro, dimensional asphalt shingle in the color 'Weathered Wood'.

Mr. Lynch asked if they were replacing the roof on the detached garage to match. The applicant affirmed.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Roger White that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-023 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Rich Dobda, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Linda Boving, Whit Wardell & Dr. Scott Kelly

CA-23-025

Property Owner: Steve & Scindra Kolecki
Applicant: Steve & Scindra Kolecki
Location: 153 Washington Street
Request: New sliding glass door.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Steve & Scindra Kolecki for the property located at 153 Washington Street. The applicant is requesting approval for the new sliding glass door to be located on the rear of the garage. Staff shared photographs of the existing door and perspective drawings from the applicant showing where the door will be located on the rear of the home.

Mr. Lynch asked if the door will require step down. The applicant affirmed it will be 1 step and it will match the rest of the Trex decking.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-025 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Rich Dobda, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Linda Boving, Whit Wardell & Dr. Scott Kelly

Old Business

Staff discussed that the applicants on 116 East Columbus Street withdrew their application for the inground pool at this time and noted they were going to make some changes and come back in the future.

Mr. White notes that the fence replacement at 42 West Columbus looks very nice.

New Business

Mrs. Boving had some questions about a project at her property. Staff noted that those questions can be discussed after the meeting is over.

Adjournment

Time Out: 7:44pm

A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by Peter Lynch, that this meeting be adjourned.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Rich Dobda, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Linda Boving, Whit Wardell & Dr. Scott Kelly

Date

Landmarks Chairman