

Canal Winchester

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



Meeting Minutes

Monday, July 24, 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 Roger White, seconded by Bob Wood II, that member Ronnie Woodrow be excused. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Excused: 1 – Ronnie Woodrow

Approval of Minutes

June 26, 2017 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Patrick Lynch, that the June 26, 2017 Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Bob Wood II

Abstain: 1 – David Craycraft

Applications**CA-17-023**

Property Owner: Brian & Ashley Vance

Applicant: Brian Vance

Location: 43 East Columbus Street

Request: New front porch.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Brian & Ashley Vance for property located at 43 East Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting approval to remove the existing front porch on the home to construct a full front porch that wraps around the west elevation. Staff presented a brief history of the home and shared with the commission photographs of the existing front porch. The existing porch extends 5' 3" towards the sidewalk and is 9' 5" wide. The new front porch will extend 8' towards the sidewalk and will span across the entire front of the building wrapping around the west elevation. Staff explained to the commission that the new front porch will need a variance from Planning and Zoning Commission due to it encroaching the build-to line.

Staff indicated that they were unsure what the detail of the porch will look like as there are only notes on the plans, but the roof is planned to be a metal roof. Staff deferred technical questions to the applicants architect Mr. Craycraft.

Mr. Craycraft commented that the decorative brackets that are on the existing front porch will probably not be installed in the new porch design. Since submitting the application, the property owners have changed their mind on having the decorative detail across the entire front of the house.

Mr. Vance commented that they do not want all of the decorative brackets on the posts due to it being a cost issue and a long-term maintenance problem. Square posts with the decorative top and bottom would look nice but the scrolling is over the top.

Mr. White asked the applicant when the porch was added to the building or if there was a different porch on the building in the past. Mr. Vance stated that he believes that this is the original porch since the home was converted from a log home and the addition was added.

Mr. Craycraft added that the original home was much smaller than the building now. Mr. Vance affirmed stating that if you are looking at the home, from the left side of the door over has the original basement below it. Based on the flood timbers of the second floor, you can see where the old roofing joist used to lay. It also appears that the second floor was also an addition at some point when it was converted from a log cabin.

Mr. Patrick Lynch stated that he has looked at the house previously and he does not think there used to be a front porch before the one that is on it now. Also, commenting that he likes the length and profile of the designed front porch.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked the applicant if it would be a standing seam metal roof. Mr. Vance stated that originally he would like to have a metal roof on the whole house, but after looking at the neighbors new metal roof on the garage he is going to propose a black standing seam room on the front porch portion only.

Mr. Vance also commented that he would like to discuss the original roof before he leaves.

Mr. Patrick Lynch wanted to clarify with the applicant that the metal roof is going to be a standing seam roof and not a wavy barn metal roof. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft stated that due to the pitch of the porch roof it would have to be metal.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked the applicant if there are gutters on the new porch. Mr. Vance stated that there are half round gutters on the house now. But the plan is to take the asbestos tile roof off now and replace the main house gutters when the roof is off. From a cost perspective, Mr. Vance proposed putting new half-round gutters on the front of the house, the porch and anything visible from the street but doing traditional gutters to the rear.

Mr. White asked the applicant if he is wanting to modify the original application to include more than just the porch. The applicant indicated that things with the current construction have changed in the past couple weeks. Right now, the insulation in the roof is ready to be blown in and Mr. Vance indicated that he would like to take the chance to remove the existing asbestos roof before doing the insulation so that he does not get the new insulation dirty. Additionally, the roof is starting to slip and is becoming a safety concern.

Mr. Vance stated that the roof is more urgent than the porch and the gutters and is willing to come back for the roof and gutters next month with more info but the roof he would like to get started on this week.

Mr. Vance passed around sample photographs of the roof he is wanting to install on the home.

Mr. Abbott asked the applicant if the old roof is coming completely off and the applicant affirmed.

Mr. White discussed the recent approval across the street where they approved a compositional asphalt roof with the metal roof caps and asked the applicant if he would install metal roof caps on the vent and the ridge. Mr. Vance indicated that he is not opposed to that but questioned what color the metal ridge should be. The commission discussed the ridge could be a grey or black.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked if the new porch would have a flat fascia to accommodate the half-round gutters. Mr. Craycraft indicated it could be a flat or angled fascia to keep the gutters in a workable direction. Mr. Craycraft added the porch design has not been finalized yet. Mr. Vance affirmed stating that the porch can happen after they are moved in.

Mr. Abbott asked the applicant if it was okay if they discussed the roof only and tabled the porch to a later date. Mr. Vance affirmed. Mr. Patrick Lynch added he would like to see more information on the final design of the porch.

Mr. Craycraft stated that when the porch is submitted for a building permit there will be a lot more details to its construction.

Mr. Vance asked if they could discuss the house gutters so it can be replaced with the new roof.

Mr. Abbott discussed the replacement for the half-round gutters on the front of the home and K style on the rear with the applicant.

Mr. Peter Lynch asked the commission if there were any problems with the modern gutters in the rear of the home.

Mr. White asked if there were more linear feet of gutter to the rear of the home than the front. Mr. Vance indicated that there is a little more due to the rear addition.

Mr. White asked what the cost difference is between the gutters. Mr. Peter Lynch stated 2-3 times more expensive.

Mr. Abbott asked if there were any more questions.

Mr. Peter Lynch wanted to affirm that the porch is being tabled. Mr. Vance affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft confirmed with staff that the porch needs to go to Planning and Zoning Commission still. Mr. Moore confirmed and stated that the porch design will need a variance since it is encroaching the established built-to line. Craycraft asked when can the applicant apply for the variance. Staff indicated they can apply as soon as Landmarks makes a recommendation for the variance to P&Z.

Mr. Craycraft asked what the variance meeting will entail. Staff indicated that the applicant will file for the request showing the new front porch and its increase in distance towards the street. Planning and Zoning Commission will not be reviewing the design of the porch so that will have to come back to Landmarks.

Mr. Vance wanted to confirm that the variance is the change in the depth of the porch. The commission affirmed.

A motion was made by Member Patrick Lynch, seconded by Member Peter Lynch, that the variance request be recommended to Planning and Zoning Commission for approval with the stipulation that the final architectural design of the porch be approved by the Landmarks Commission and that the roof on the main structure be replaced under emergency with the roof shingles that were submitted at the meeting for review, under the condition that the applicant use metal ridge caps to match the shutters and retain half-round gutters on the front of the home. Modern Gutters are to be granted only at the rear of the building that is not visible from the street.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Bob Wood II, Roger White, Peter Lynch

Abstain: 1 – David Craycraft

Mr. Vance asked the commission when he can take the old porch off. The new door that was installed cannot be trimmed completely out until the existing porch has been removed. Mr. Abbott commented that they should wait for the variance application to be approved. Mr. Peter Lynch commented that a demolition permit may be required.

Staff indicated that the issue with removing the existing porch without the variance being approved is either installing a shorter full front porch or putting the existing porch back on the building.

Mr. Abbott stated that he is in favor with once the variance is approved the existing porch can be removed prior to coming back to landmarks.

Mr. Vance stated that if the variance is not approved they will have to replace the porch regardless due to the existing porch being cockeyed.

Mr. Craycraft asked if there is part of the porch that can be removed to trim the door at this time. Mr. Vance stated that there is a gap above the door now that is tapered from 6" on one side to 1" on the other. Removing the porch would allow them to square up all of the wood siding on that wall.

Mr. Wood commented that there is not much difference to him if the porch has to temporarily be removed to finish the door trim anyway. Staff indicated that the commission needs to approve the removal of the existing porch prior to approving the new porch.

Mr. Patrick Lynch stated that they should issue the removal of the existing porch to clean up the new door and wall with the understanding that the new porch will go for approval and if denied or the old porch rebuilt.

Mr. Abbott confirmed with staff that the applicant could replace the existing porch if the variance request was not approved.

Staff suggested that the applicant should keep the decorative pieces to porch during the removal process so that they are saved.

Mr. Patrick Lynch added for the record that the existing porch can be removed to finish the door trim and that if the variance for the new larger porch is not approved the existing porch must be rebuilt.

CA-17-025

Property Owner: Donald Moody
Applicant: Donald Moody
Location: 20 South High Street
Request: New Exterior Paint Color

Mr. Moore presented the application for Donald Moody for property located at 20 South High Street. The property owner has painted the building BEHR "Pure Earth" a few weeks back without knowing that he needed approval from the Landmarks Commission. Staff informed the property owner of the approval process for paint in the historic district so the applicant has filed the application. Previously the building was white and now has been painted a light brown color.

Mr. Patrick Lynch commented that he thought the color looked different but was not sure.

Mr. White asked staff if the original color is behind the mural. Staff affirmed and stated that he told the applicant that the mural could be removed and a new one installed rather than trimming around it.

A motion was made by Member Roger White, seconded by Member David Craycraft, that this Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-17-026

Property Owner: Green Quarters, LLC
Applicant: Amanda Kitchen
Location: 15 East Waterloo Street
Request: New Hanging Sign

Mr. Moore presented the application for Amanda Kitchen for property located at 15 East Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting to hang a new sign from the existing bracket on the outside of the building. The new sign proposed is a flat sheet of aluminum that will be wrapped in vinyl stating the business name and web address. The proposed sign will be 32" x 24".

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

Old Business

Staff updated the commission on current projects going on in Old Town and stated that there have been many compliments recently on the larger residential rehabilitation projects.

Mr. White discussed the front porch at 109 East Columbus Street with the commission. The previous railing was painted white and the commission did not approve allowing the new railing to be left unpainted.

Staff indicated that he emailed the applicant after last months meeting and shared some photographs of darker blue and cream trim homes. Prior to the meeting the applicant indicated that she did not like white trim but agreed to do white because that is what the commission wanted. If the trim was painted a cream or tan color that might look like a better contrast and also achieve getting a darker more historic blue color on the home.

Staff also mentioned that there are several homes on Waterloo that are baby blue and white.

New Business

Peter Lynch stated that he has samples of a synthetic slate product that he would like to bring in some time to share with the commission members.

Adjournment

Time Out: 7:45pm

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

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

Date

Joe Abbott, Landmarks Chairman