

Canal Winchester

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



Meeting Minutes

July 24th, 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 Roger White, seconded by David Craycraft, that Linda Boving and Rich Dobda be excused.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Approval of Minutes

June 26th, 2023 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Dr. Scott Kelly, seconded by Whit Wardell, that the June 26th, 2023 Minutes be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Pending Applications**CA-23-026**

Property Owner: Mary Hippler
Applicant: Michael Stauffer
Location: 77 West Columbus Street
Request: New Asphalt Shingle Roof

Mr. Moore presented the application for Mary Hippler's property located at 77 W Columbus Street. The applicant is seeking approval to replace the existing 3-tab orange asphalt shingle roof with a new GAF dimensional asphalt shingle in the color 'Charcoal' black. Staff noted that the home had recently been painted.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if there was a garage on the property that is also requesting a new roof. The applicant said there was not.

Mr. White questioned if the applicant would be retaining the current gutters and downspouts. Mr. Craycraft clarified that there would not be new gutters and downspouts, they just may be rehung. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if he would be removing all of the existing shingles. Mr. Stauffer affirmed that they would be removed down to the decking and replaced with a new ice and water shield or synthetic felt.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by David Craycraft that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-026 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-23-027

Property Owner: Michael & Carol DelGrosso

Applicant: Carol DelGrosso

Location: 132 West Columbus Street

Request: New Windows and Porch Addition

Mr. Moore presented the application for Michael & Carol DelGrosso's property located at 132 West Columbus Street. The applicant is seeking approval to alter the window locations and sizes on the kitchen addition to the rear of the home. The applicant is also looking to expand the decking area of the covered rear porch but leave the roof section unaltered. There are also proposed changes to the existing rear door and window. The proposed drawings show the 2 windows on the north elevation to be relocated. A pair of windows will be going in the approximate location of the far left window and the right window will be relocated to the corner and will be a double hung window to match the rest of the home. The rear porch expansion would extend wider to the north and the west. Sample photographs were provided of the proposed door and windows.

Mr. Craycraft is the architect for this project. He added that since the submission of the drawings presented, they would not be adding the shown railing as it is not required.

Dr. Kelly asked if there would be enough existing siding to cover the project or if new siding would need to be put on. The applicant informed the commission he hopes to have enough to repurpose or they would match it back with existing cedar shank. The color is to remain the same. Discussion ensued about the siding around the home and everyone's interest to keep it as cedar shank.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicants if it is their intention is to replace the windows with a true divided lite or a simulated divided lite and they affirmed. The applicants intend to match the new windows to the existing ones as close as possible.

Mr. Lynch asked if the header would be 1x8 on the larger windows. Mr. Craycraft confirmed. Mr. Lynch asked if the paint scheme would match the stone headers on the rest of the home or if they would be monotone. The applicant said it would most likely be monotone, but could match it if necessary.

Mr. Lynch asked for clarification on if the roof over the back of the patio was already encompassing the proposed expansion area. The applicants affirmed and because of the additional shade from the trees, there is no need to expand the roof.

Mr. White noted that the proposed patio extension seems to impede the access to the basement. Mr. Craycraft informed the commission that the steps only jut out to where it can without blocking the cellar doors.

Dr. Kelly asked the applicant what the decking material would be. Mr. Craycraft answered that it would be 1"x3" tongue and groove decking, either wood or composite.

Mr. Lynch inquired as to what the rear door was made of. The applicants confirmed that it was wood and would be stained.

There was further discussion regarding the windows and the commission stated that they would be fine as long as the windows were divided lite, whether that is true divided lite or simulated.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-027 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. The rear porch addition does not have the railing;**
- 2. the existing wood shake siding remain with any new siding to match;**
- 3. the windows have true divided lite or simulated divided lite grids;**
- 4. the windows be wood or aluminum clad with color matched to the existing windows;**
- 5. and the porch decking be a 1"x3" tongue and groove.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 – Peter Lynch, Dr. Scott Kelly, Roger White & Whit Wardell

Abstain: 1 – David Craycraft

CA-23-028

Property Owner: David & Allison Sayre

Applicant: David & Allison Sayre

Location: 33 West Columbus Street

Request: New Fence

The applicant is seeking approval to construct a new fence on the west property line. The plans note for two different fence styles and two different placement options.

Style option #1 was presented as a double-sided privacy fence six feet in height that tapers down to a three-foot semi private fence. This design features a decorative cap and horizontal rails. Style option #2 was presented as a single-sided six foot dog ear privacy fence that tapers down to a three-foot dog ear picket fence.

Location option #1 was presented as approximately 40 feet of 6 foot tall privacy fence that transitions down to an approximate 20 foot section of 3 foot tall

picket fence. Location option #2 was presented as not installing the fence where there are existing pine trees on the west side of the driveway. This would leave an approximate 18 foot gap between two sections of 6 foot tall fencing.

Mrs. Sayre informed the commission that she met with a contractor and they would be able to construct a continuous fence without having to segment it around the existing trees. She affirmed that it is her preference to not have to lose any of the existing landscaping.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if she had a preference on the 2 styles that were presented. She answered that her preference would be style option #2. Mr. Lynch also asked if any of her neighbors had a fence with a similar style and Mrs. Sayre answered that her neighbors at 27 W Columbus Street have a similar fence.

Staff informed the commission about all of the fencing for the properties surrounding the applicant's property.

Mr. Lynch asked for clarification regarding the transition area where the fence tapers down to 3 feet in height and if there would be breaks in the slats at that junction. Mrs. Sayre confirmed that there would be gaps in the slats once it tapered down to the shorter height.

Mr. Lynch expressed his opinion that the fence would look better if it didn't taper, but instead just had a gap from the 6 foot height to the 3 foot height. The applicant informed the commission that the primary reasoning for the fence was aesthetics and civil issues so she would prefer it to be continuous. The commission agreed that the shorter section would look better if it just abutted up against the taller section and had no taper.

Dr. Kelly asked if the nicer side of the fence would be facing the neighbor and the applicants affirmed. Dr. Kelly also asked if they would be painting or staining and Mrs. Sayre said they intend to stain it a natural color.

Mr. Craycraft expressed his opinion that he preferred style #1 aesthetically. The applicant agreed but was concerned about the cost of that option.

The applicant asked if she would need approval for maintenance on the existing fence on the other side of her property and the commission informed her that if the style was staying the same, she did not need separate approval.

Mr. Craycraft inquired as to if she would be using cedar or pressure treated wood and the applicant said she prefers cedar.

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Peter Lynch that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-028 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. The transition from the 6' fence to 3' fence be abutted, not sloped;**
- 2. the fence be sealed in a natural finish;**
- 3. if the applicant goes with fence option 1 as presented at the meeting, the fence on the eastern property line be updated to match;**

4. if the applicant goes with fence option 2 as presented at the meeting, the framing face internal to the yard.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-23-029

Property Owner: Tim Dye

Applicant: Tim Dye

Location: 23 West Oak Street

Request: New Roof and Exterior Doors

On July 7, 2023 the property owner was sent a Notice of Violation for exterior work done to the residential home without approval from the Landmarks Commission. The work consisted of a new metal roof, paint and exterior doors. The applicant has provided pictures of the home upon its purchase as well as details for the work completed.

The applicant installed an M-panel metal roofing system, a new front door, a solid man door on the east of the property and a rear door facing the alley.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if he did any work on the windows. Mr. Dye responded no work was done on the windows or shutters besides paint.

Mr. Lynch asked if there were any photos or details of the doors that were on the home prior to the work being done. The applicant did not have any additional photos of the home to share.

Staff informed the commission that there was a screen door on the front door previously which would skew any photos that may have been taken in the past. Staff also stated there was no door on the east side previously or it had seemed to be sided over and a door handle was not present. Staff did not have any prior pictures of the rear door.

The applicant affirmed that the door on the east had previously been boarded up. Mr. Craycraft asked if it was indeed a new door if it was just exposed after removing the old boards and the applicant informed the commission that there was only an opening there before so a new door was put in.

Mr. Lynch inquired as to the material of the doors. Mr. Dye answered that they are steel, insulated doors.

Dr. Kelly asked if the gutters were replaced. The applicant answered that they were only painted. Staff confirmed with the commission that they were and remain K-style gutters.

The commission asked staff if similar roofs had been approved before. Discussion ensued about the details on the M-panel roofing and its comparison to other metal roofs in the area. The commission found some pictures of the previous front door on the Auditor's website and discussion ensued about that previous door as well.

Mr. Lynch expressed concern that the roof did not have a standing seam as all other metal roofs in the area on residential homes do have a standing seam. The applicant said he chose the new roof because he believed it was the most similar to what was previously there.

Mr. White asked staff if a roof permit is required for roof replacements. Staff responded in the affirmative and informed the commission that 2 inspections are required. A roof permit was not pulled for this project.

Mr. Lynch acknowledged that the homeowner was unaware his home was in a historic district. He believes that if the commission were to approve a metal roof without a standing seam that it could set a precedence in the future for similar roofs to be approved and that is not something they are looking to do.

Discussion ensued about all the options for this project. The main concern is that there are currently visible fasteners on the roof.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-029 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. The existing M-Panel metal roof be replaced with a 12"-16" single lock true standing seam metal roof in the color black.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-23-030

Property Owner: Gregory John
Applicant: Gregory John
Location: 92 East Water
Request: Railing on rear porch and balcony

The applicant is seeking approval to install a railing at the rear porch and upper balcony on the home. The porch currently does not have a railing. The proposed railing for both the balcony and the porch will be constructed from wood at 36" tall. A total of four (4) new 4x4 posts are proposed to be set on the porch to span the railing at approximately 55". The applicant has noted that the railing will be painted white to match the trim on the home.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if he would be touching the structure of

the upper deck. The applicant replied that he would not and would only be adding a new railing. His wish is to make the porch safer for small children.

Mr. Craycraft clarified that the railings needed to be 4 inches apart and the applicant informed him he would be using a kit that properly spaces the railings.

Mr. Lynch asked how the posts would be attached to the concrete. Mr. John detailed the brackets he would be using to secure it. Discussion ensued about the possibility of wrapping the 4'x4' posts, however the proposed decorative caps would not fit if that was done.

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Peter Lynch that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-030 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

New Business

Mr. John brought up that the foundation stone on the front of his porch at 92 E Water Street needs to be totally replaced with all new block. He is seeking guidance from the commission on options for this replacement as he can't find options to match that are not completely custom. Mr. John is also seeking feedback regarding the possible removal of the decorative entry columns by the front steps.

Staff informed the commission that they don't believe the brick columns are original to the home.

Mr. John said the foundation around the whole home is beginning to deteriorate and will all need to be fixed. Mr. Lynch said he believes he will probably need to redo the entire front porch and stairs at the same time. The homeowner agreed.

Mr. Lynch suggested extending the front porch out instead of trying to tear the old pieces away and that would alleviate the need to jack up the porch while replacing the stone. He also recommended a sandstone veneer that would only require extending the concrete by a couple inches.

Mr. John thanked the commission for their recommendations.

Old Business

CA-23-019

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

Staff asked the commission if they would like to address this application. The applicants indicated they would be able to make it but are not present. Staff asked if it was in the best interest of the applicants to move forward without them present.

Discussion ensued about the options moving forward and if tabling or voting would be the best decision at tonight’s meeting.

A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by Whit Wardell to table Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-019 to August’s agenda.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 – Peter Lynch, Dr. Scott Kelly, Roger White & Whit Wardell

Abstain: 1 – David Craycraft

Adjournment

Time Out: 8:26 pm

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by David Craycraft, that this meeting be adjourned.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Date

Landmarks Chairman