

Canal Winchester

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



Meeting Minutes

August 28th, 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 Mr.Craycraft, seconded by Mr. Wardell that Rich Dobda be excused.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Approval of Minutes

July 24th, 2023 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Lynch, seconded by Mr. White, that the July 24th, 2023 Minutes be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Pending Applications

The Agenda was amended to move application CA-23-019 to the end of the agenda for consideration since the applicant was not present.

CA-23-031

Property Owner: Jerry & Erika McCann
Applicant: David Craycraft
Location: 36 W Mound Street
Request: New 24'x30' 3 car garage

Mr. Craycraft removed himself from the dais and went to the podium to stand with the applicant to represent the application.

Mr. Haire described the application and reviewed the presentation outlining the proposal. Mr. Haire noted that there were no specification on windows, doors, or garage doors submitted with the application. The siding and roofing were noted to match the recent addition to the house.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if they could clarify their intent for the doors and windows.

Mr. Craycraft noted that the owner had not selected the doors, however their intent would be to match the house for the man door.

Mr. White noted the man door was a full lite door and they would likely not want to have that on the garage.

Mr. McCann confirmed that he did not want a full lite door on the garage and that he would like to return for a future meeting to review the garage doors. The windows will be the same as those used in the recent addition to the house.

A motion was made by Mr. Lynch, seconded by Mrs. Boving that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-031 be approved as with the following conditions.

1. **That the approval is for size and style including windows and siding materials specified.**
2. **The applicant will return to the commission for approval for the selection of all doors on the garage.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Peter Lynch, Dr. Scott Kelly, Roger White, Whit Wardell, Linda Boving

Abstain: 1 - David Craycraft

CA-23-032

Property Owner: Daniel Bailey
 Applicant: Daniel Bailey
 Location: 72 Park Street
 Request: New privacy fence

Mr. Haire described the application and reviewed the presentation outlining the proposal. This included the fence materials as well as the location, including the setback from the rear lot line to maintain the existing vegetation.

Mr. Lynch inquired about the location of the proposed gates.

Mr. Haire pointed out the gate locations and indicated that the gate between the garage and house would be the primary rear access.

The applicant was not present.

A motion was made by Mr. Craycraft, seconded by Mr. Lynch that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-032 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-23-033

Property Owner: John & Marshall Crabtree
 Applicant: John & Marshall Crabtree
 Location: 116 E Columbus Street
 Request: New Fence

Mr. Haire described the application and reviewed the presentation outlining the proposal. This included the existing fence locations as well as the proposed portions of the fence that are specified to be replaced.

Mrs. Crabtree stated that she would like to update the fencing to be the same style and height throughout the rear yard.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the fence would be stained a similar color to the existing fence in the photo and the example photos, and what color that was.

Mrs. Crabtree indicated the color was cedar, and she would like to stain all the fence that color.

Mr. Lynch asked if the picket fence that runs from the side of the house to the side lot line would be replaced.

Mr. Haire displayed a street view of the existing fence.

Mrs. Crabtree answered that this fence would remain and the new fence would start on the side lot line and would likely not be visible from the street.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the structure would be on the interior, and Mr. Lynch reminded him it was a shadowbox design.

A motion was made by Mr. Lynch, seconded by Mr. Craycraft that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-033 be approved with the following condition.

- 1. That the existing picket fence on the side of the house remain and the shadowbox fence starts on the side lot line.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-23-034

Property Owner: David Morris
Applicant: Pat Burks
Location: 35 W Mound Street
Request: Painting exterior of home

Mr. Haire described the application and reviewed the presentation outlining the proposal. This included reviewing photographs of the existing home and shed. He noted the applicant did not address in the application how the roof over the entry was would be treated, and did not indication if the shed would be painted to match.

Mr. Morris provided a paint sample of the proposed color of the home and passed it around for the commission's review. He indicated that he would paint the shed to match and would propose to paint the roof over the front entryway and darker shade of gray along with roof of the shed.

Mrs. Boving stated that a darker shade would be appropriate for the roof. She would prefer a charcoal color which would match the proposed paint color of Elemental Gray.

Mr. Lynch asked if the applicant had considered replacing the wood shakes on the entryway roof so that it did not need to be painted.

Mr. Morris stated that the roof has been painted as long as he has owned the home and that the shakes are in good repair. He would prefer to paint them the darker color that has been proposed.

A motion was made by Mr. Craycraft, seconded by Mr. White that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-034 be approved with the following conditions.

- 1. That the house and shed siding be painted Behr, Elemental Gray.**
- 2. That the wood shakes on the roof of the entryway and the roof of the shed be painted charcoal gray.**
- 3. That all trim be painted white.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-23-019

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

Mr. Haire described the application and described the history of the applications and appearances in front of the Landmarks Commission. He noted the outstanding issues that remained that did not comply with the approval of CA-22-012. He noted Mr. Vance's email and example photographs that were supplied to the commission for their consideration. These photographs show examples of porch post modifications that the applicant will consider. The applicant preferred to keep all other unapproved modifications as constructed.

Mr. Lynch asked if the applicant or representative was present. There were none. Mr. Haire noted that the applicant did provide notice that they were unable to attend the meeting.

Mr. Lynch passed out a packet of information to the committee and reviewed the information contained therein. Mr. Lynch pointed out the items that were not in compliance with Landmarks Commission's approval of CA-22-012 as noted on page 1. He did point out the center gable on the porch was not shown on this handout and in his opinion this aspect of the porch did not contribute to the historic character of the porch.

Mr. Wardell and Mrs. Boving agreed that the missing gable did not contribute and could be omitted from the porch.

The Commission then discussed the defining features of the porch that existed on the home and agreed that the decorative corbels were the defining feature.

Mr. Lynch reviewed his packet with page 3 showing the porch posts as originally approved (page 3), and a porch post that would include features from two that were proposed by the applicant. The original porch posts included corbels on the fronts and the sides. Mr. Lynch has sketched these in on the sides of the posts only similar to the applicant provided photograph number 3 with rocking chairs visible. Mr. Lynch also discussed simplifying the trim from what was originally approved to something more similar to the original porch posts. This would be most similar to the applicant provided photograph number 4, with the hydrangea flowers.

The commission conferred and determined that that would be an appropriate compromised for the porch posts and in line with the applicant's proposal.

Mr. Lynch then reviewed the porch skirting. He noted his concerns for the porch not allowing for air circulation as constructed. He stated his concerns with the style of construction not be historic and not in line with what was previously approved. He noted the original approval was for a historically accurate construction with wood slats, framed and recessed under the porch flooring. He asked Mr. Craycraft (the original architect for the porch), to confirm this was the intent of the original design. Mr. Craycraft confirmed. Mr. Lynch noted that on page 3 of his packet the porch design is shown as was approved. A similar example is shown on page 10 of his provided packet that shows the skirting being framed and recessed under the porch floor. He stated his desire to have the applicant remove the porch skirting and reinstall the skirting under the tongue and groove flooring, with the skirting to consist of 1-inch by 3-inch slats with a two-inch gap between slats.

Mr. Lynch then addressed page 6 of his distributed packet. It showed the shutters which were removed by the applicant, who stated the shutters were removed for painting and discarded. Mr. Lynch stated that these shutters were an important component of the historic character of the home and were a defining feature of this simple home. He reviewed all the components of the shutters which made them historic including the slats sloped towards the home when open, being a full wood shutter, having operable louvers with a 50/50 split, having the shutters be operable and when fully closed fitting completely within the window casing, and having traditional shutter hinges and shutter dogs (tiebacks). He reviewed pages 7, 8, 9 with details of historic shutter design.

Mrs. Boving agreed that the shutters being operable was and important component of the home and asked about drainage of the shutter slopes and moisture behind the shutters which would likely remain open the majority of the time.

Mr. Lynch indicated that when the mounting hardware is installed properly the shutters are angled back from the window casing to the siding to allow air flow behind the shutters.

A motion was made by Mr. Lynch, seconded by Dr. Kelley that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-019 be approved with the following conditions.

1. The center gable on the porch be omitted.
2. The decorative base and cap of the porch columns include trim as similar to the original as possible (example image four provided with hydrangea flowers)
3. The sides of the porch columns shall include decorative corbels similar to the original (example image three provided with rocking chairs).
4. The skirting installed be removed with new skirting installed under the tongue and groove flooring. The skirting shall consist of framed out 1 inch by 3-inch slats with a 2-inch gap between. (similar style to that approved with CA 22-012).
5. Shutters shall be installed on the front of the home "like for like", as they existed prior to removal. This includes louvered, wood shutters with jamb mounted shutter hinges that are mortised into the window casing, louvers that are angled towards the home when open, and shutter tie-backs to match the original as close as possible.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Peter Lynch, Dr. Scott Kelly, Roger White, Whit Wardell, Linda Boving

Abstain: 1 - David Craycraft

New Business

Mr. Tebben of 66 N. Trine Street appeared before the commission and thought that his application for window replacement would be on the agenda.

Mr. Haire state that he received photographs of the proposed windows to be replaced, but no application or specifications on the replacement windows proposed was provided. He may supply this information by September 11 to be placed on the September 25 agenda.

Old Business

Mr. Haire noted that the home at 23 West Oak St. which appeared at the last meeting with a roof replacement, has completed the replacement of the roof with the roof as approved in CA-23-029.

Adjournment

Time Out: 7:53pm

A motion was made by Mr. Wardell, seconded by Mr. Craycraft, that this meeting be adjourned.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Date

Landmarks Chairman