

Canal Winchester

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



Meeting Minutes

Monday, September 25, 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 Bob Wood II, seconded by Roger White, that members Ronnie Woodrow and David Craycraft be excused. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Excused: 2 – Ronnie Woodrow & David Craycraft

Approval of Minutes

August 28, 2017 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Patrick Lynch, seconded by Roger White, that the August 28, 2017 Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Pending Applications**CA-17-032**

Property Owner: A CPAS TEPEE LLC

Applicant: Robert Toledo

Location: 18 East Columbus Street

Request: New free standing sign.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Robert Toledo for property located at 18 East Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting approval for a new freestanding sign for the front of the property and a small identification sign near the entrance to the tenant space. Staff shared with the commission the rendering for the proposed signs and the requested locations. It was also noted that the applicant indicated to staff that the signage colors could change from the yellow, red, black and white to just red, black and white.

Mr. Abbott asked staff if the applicant is removing the current wall sign. Staff indicated that the current wall sign will remain on the building. Mr. Abbott asked if the building would have more signage then allowable. Staff indicated that the current tenants that are advertised on the existing sign will remain, only new tenant space is going to be leased out for the new business.

Mr. Wood asked if the applicant could add the new tenant to the existing wall sign to create a multi-tenant sign. Staff indicated that discussions with the applicant indicated they are more looking to attract people driving down the street to call the number that is on the sign is this is not a typical walk-in type business.

Mr. Patrick Lynch confirmed that the small sign is going by the rear entrance door and the freestanding sign is going in the front yard. Staff affirmed.

Mr. White asked if the applicant could have the sign shown on the inside of the window. Staff indicated that is typically not the preference of the commission to have window signs propped against the glass, so staff typically encourages applicants not to pursue that option. Additionally, the signage inside of a building requires a permit now so it can be regulated better.

Mr. Wood asked staff to clarify the sign colors comment from the presentation. Staff indicated that the applicant said there is some flexibility in the colors on the sign and that staff believes it is the yellow color that could be replaced with white if necessary.

Mr. Wood asked if the company is a franchise. Staff affirmed that this will be the administrative office and billing for this franchise owner.

Mr. Abbott asked staff if there are any variances needed for the sign. Staff stated there is not.

Mr. Patrick Lynch talked about the guidelines state three colors max for signage and what is proposed is four. Removing the yellow color would make it compliant.

Mr. Patrick Lynch confirmed with staff that the sign will meet setbacks. Staff affirmed. Mr. Patrick Lynch clarified his question and would like to know how close the sign would be to the sidewalk. Staff indicated the sign could be right against the sidewalk most likely. Mr. Patrick Lynch discussed the sign should be a minimum 2 feet away from the sidewalk, due to a safety concern.

Mr. Abbott asked if there is enough room from the sidewalk to the house to have the sign setback with a minimum distance of 2 feet from the sidewalk. Mr. Patrick Lynch commented that the sign should be moved to the east to be closer to the driveway.

Mr. White asked where customers for the business will enter the building. Staff indicated the business isn't a typical walk-in business it is a phone call type of business, which is why the sign has the phone number easy to read on the top.

A motion was made by Member Patrick Lynch, seconded by Member Peter Lynch, that the Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. Both signs have the yellow color removed and replaced with white.**

2. The freestanding sign be placed towards the driveway rather than centered in the front yard.
3. The freestanding sign be positioned so that the sign is no closer than 2 feet from the sidewalk.
4. The freestanding sign be modified from a PVC to a wood post.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-17-033

Property Owner: Jessica Ashworth

Applicant: Jessica Ashworth

Location: 28 East Oak Street

Request: New vinyl siding and removing chimney.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Jessica Ashworth for property located at 28 East Oak Street. The applicant is requesting approval to install new 4" vinyl siding over the existing asbestos siding, and to remove the existing chimney. Staff discussed the application and shared existing condition photographs with the commission. It was noted that to the rear of the building is an addition that was permitted for a new bathroom that is wood siding on the exterior. The applicant is requesting to cover the existing siding on the entire home with new 4" maroon siding. In the application it was mentioned that the request is to update and create a more modern looking home.

Staff discussed that the applicant stated the existing chimney is in poor condition and they are afraid of it falling over so they would like to remove it. The area where the chimney is located is planned to be filled with new vinyl siding to match the rest of the home. Photographs were shared of the current chimney condition. The applicant has proposed to keep all of the bricks from the chimney to use as landscaping items.

Mr. White asked staff how the existing roof and soffit was going to be repaired with the removal of the chimney. Staff indicated that the applicant did not mention the roof in the description for the chimney removal process.

Mr. White asked if the applicant is present to discuss the application. Staff indicated that the applicant is not at the meeting.

Mr. Patrick Lynch commented that the commission should wait until the applicant is present to discuss the application further.

A motion was made by Member Roger White, seconded by Member Patrick Lynch, that the Certificate of Appropriateness be tabled to the October meeting.

The motion carried by the following vote:**Yes: 5** - Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Peter Lynch, Roger White, & Bob Wood II**CA-17-034**

Property Owner: PLW Family Investors Ltd.

Applicant: Robert Wood II

Location: 35 North High Street

Request: New freestanding sign.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Bob Wood for property located at 35 North High Street. The applicant is requesting approval to replace the existing freestanding pole sign with a new decorative post and multi-tenant sign. The new sign post is going to be made of metal and is designed to look like a street light post. The new signage will display the same tenant information as before just with a new upgraded metal sign with vinyl graphics applied to the surface. The sign is to be placed in the same location as the existing sign.

Mr. Abbott asked the applicant if the sign is going back in the same location. Mr. Wood affirmed.

Mr. Wood stated that the rendering for the sign is slightly misleading and the colors will be more mute in tone and not as dark as shown on the print out.

Mr. Abbott commented that due to the sign replacing the existing sign there is no issue with the location.

A motion was made by Member Patrick Lynch, seconded by Member Peter Lynch, that this Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as presented.**The motion carried by the following vote:****Yes: 4** - Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Peter Lynch & Roger White**Abstain: 1** – Bob Wood II**CA-17-035**

Property Owner: Duckworth Family LP

Applicant: Daniel Duckworth

Location: 60 Elm Street

Request: Building updates. New paint, signage, entry features, etc.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Daniel Duckworth for property located at 60 Elm Street. The applicant is requesting approval to renovate the industrial complex with new paint, signage, building entry features and other items. Staff discussed an overview of the property with the commission and noted that there are 4 separate buildings on the site. Within those buildings the applicant

has broken them down into 4-8 leasable tenant spaces. Each of these spaces will be painted a series of grey tones and will feature red signage noting the building number. The main building will be modified from its current storefront by having the "front porch: removed and a more traditional storefront with glass added. The applicant is proposing that each tenant be allowed to install as many or few windows as they wish, as long as they follow the same theme. In addition the plan is for each tenant space to have the same 50 sq. ft. allotted area for signage over the entrance and all of the signs will be raised metal lettering illuminated by gooseneck lighting. Staff shared photographs of the current facilities and renderings for what it will look like after.

The applicant is also requesting to paint the existing barn like structure that sits away from the metal buildings. This building will feature the same signage on the building. The applicant would like to replace the dilapidated roof with new Timberline "Slate" asphalt shingles to match the theme of the rest of the park.

The final request the applicant has for the commission is to recommend approval for a monument sign they wish to construct at the facility entrance. This sign is designed at 25 sq. ft. in area and 7' 8" tall and will be installed 22 feet away from Oak Street. Staff indicated that this sign would need a variance from the Planning and Zoning Commission because it exceeds the maximum 15 sq. ft. and 6 foot in height for a multi-tenant sign in the Old Town Overlay. Staff commented that this sign was designed to resemble other signs in Canal Pointe and West Walnut Industrial park. In addition, the applicant has made a great effort to create a sign that closely complies with Landmarks Standards, starting out with a 125 sq. ft. sign and severely reducing down to 25 sq. ft. The size increase is simply to allow all potential 8 tenants space on the sign that is readable. The sign will feature the require landscaping at its base and will be externally illuminated with ground lighting.

Staff directed the applicant to design this complex as if it was a planned district, where the commission would be approving the overall concept for the 50 sq. ft. wall signage and potential storefront systems. This would allow the applicant to follow the plan before you and not have to go before Landmarks Commission with every tenant space being filled in the industrial park.

Mr. Moore stated that the applicant is really requesting approval for the signage plans, storefront system alterations and new shingles on the one building. The applicant requests any feedback that is necessary to ensure that the future growth of the industrial park works as smoothly as possible.

Mr. White commented that he really likes that they are redoing the entrance to the main building and removing the front porch. Mr. Patrick Lynch added that it is a vast improvement.

Mr. Patrick Lynch spoke to staff in regards to the monument sign and asked how this sign fits in terms of size to other industrial parks. Staff indicated that the sign is well below the size of other industrial park signs. Based on its 22 foot setback, it could be as large as 12 feet tall and 74 sq. ft. if it was not in the Old Town Overlay. The applicant designed the sign at this scale to get as close as possible to Landmarks requirements.

Brian Reynolds with Architecture Alliance spoke to the commission on behalf of the applicant. With the monument sign design, it was scaled down to take into account the surrounding residential neighborhood. The other challenges is that the buildings are set far back and are a large scale. A variance has been submitted for this sign, and the applicant feels this sign allows for visibility for the number of future tenants.

Mr. Patrick Lynch commented he does not want to set a precedent to allow all multi-tenant signs to go over the size regulations. Staff indicated that they feel this sign helps unify industrial districts and that the scale is mainly due to the number of large scale tenants within a complex you cannot see from the road.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked staff about the signage that numbers the buildings. Staff indicated that the Landmarks regulations for wall signage allows any scale of sign as long as it fits the building. This rewrite removed the maximum limit so the commission can have the flexibility for signage that feels appropriate to a buildings architecture.

Mr. Abbott asked the applicant to clarify the storefront windows. Mr. Reynolds stated that each tenant will have an aluminum storefront window system that will either be black or raw aluminum and they can install however many windows suits the business needs.

Staff asked the applicant if the brick was going to be painted grey. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Patrick Lynch commented he likes the new shingles chosen.

Mr. Wood asked the applicant how large the wall signage is. The applicant indicated 50 sq. ft.

Mr. Wood asked if the scale of the building number signs are appropriate. The applicant indicated that they have gone back and forth with staff and they feel the signage is appropriate due to how far back the buildings are from the street view. Mr. Patrick Lynch agrees with the applicant and states that it helps break up the façade and fits the scale of the large industrial metal buildings.

Mr. Peter Lynch suggested that the outside ring of the building numbers could be painted a darker or muted color so that the red does not take over the building and to keep the red only on the number and Ohio logo. Mr. Patrick Lynch added that he likes the red color.

Mr. Bob Wood asked if the parking lot that is gravel was going to be paved. The applicant commented that asphalt is going to be repaired in the existing lot and they are going to add head in parking in front of the main building.

A motion was made by Member Patrick Lynch, seconded by Member Bob Wood II, that this Certificate of appropriateness be approved as presented and the Variance request for the 25 sq. ft. monument sign, as indicated at the 9/25/17 meeting be recommended for approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-17-037

Property Owner: John & Kim Stedman

Applicant: John & Kim Stedman

Location: 38 East Columbus Street

Request: New Asphalt Shingles

Mr. Moore presented the application for John & Kim Stedman for property located at 38 East Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting approval to replace the 3-tab asphalt shingles on the home with new dimensional shingles. As part of the request, the applicant would also like to remove the shingles from the sides of the dormers and replace the material with new wood. Staff shared with the commission photographs of the property and the new shingles being requested.

No questions were asked.

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

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-17-038

Property Owner: Craig & Daniella Kahle
Applicant: Craig & Daniella Kahle
Location: 54 Liberty Street
Request: New rear window.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Craig and Daniella Kahle for property located at 54 Liberty Street. The applicant is requesting approval to add a window to the rear of their house. The applicant has stated that there are no first floor windows on the rear of the house and they would like to add one so that they can have a view of their back yard. The window they are looking to install is a large 40" x 40" vinyl casement window. Staff commented that they do not have an issue with adding a window in this location but suggested a different window style be used to match the rest of the home.

Larry Kahle spoke on behalf of the applicants and stated he does not have much to add but will answer any questions.

Mr. Abbott confirmed with the applicant that they want to cut a new window in the rear of the home. Mr. Kahle stated that they would like a window to watch their daughter play in the rear yard.

Staff asked what area in the house will the window be facing. The applicant indicated they are going to be doing a kitchen remodel.

Staff suggested that the applicant should use a different window to be more traditional with the rest of the house. Mr. Patrick Lynch commented he has a series of casement windows in the rear of his home. Mr. Abbott added that he does not care because it is on the rear of the home.

Staff added that they would just like clarification on how the applicant decided to use that window style. Mr. Kahle commented he was not sure why his son chose that window style. Mr. Moore added that it could be a series of double hung windows.

Mr. White commented they could approve a number of window styles.

Mr. Abbott confirmed with staff's suggestion.

Staff added that they are not concerned about window size, just the style.

Mr. Patrick Lynch commented based on the casement style chosen it might be due to a counter being in the way. Mr. Peter Lynch agreed.

Mr. Peter Lynch stated that they could do a one over one casement window where both top and bottom panes crank out.

The applicant discussed with Member Peter Lynch window options.

A motion was made by Member Peter Lynch, seconded by Member Patrick Lynch, that this Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the condition that the window style be modified to either of the following styles:

- 1. Casement one over one;**
- 2. Traditional one over one;**
- 3. Double casement window.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-17-030

Property Owner: Eric Campbell

Applicant: Eric Campbell

Location: 153 Washington Street

Request: Renovation to existing home and new addition.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Eric Campbell for property located at 153 Washington Street. The applicant is requesting approval to remove the existing rear addition on the home and to construct a new larger addition in its place that will extend south. The new addition will be two stories in height and will feature a new two car attached garage that will be relocated to the other side of the property. With the new addition, the applicant is looking to paint the existing brick and replace all of the windows with new Anderson Simulated Divided Light windows in a Historic Bronze color.

Staff updated the Landmarks Commission that the applicant went before the Planning and Zoning Commission for the variance request for the building addition encroaching the side yard setback and front build-to line and they were approved. Since the applicant received approval for site design, he has returned to the Landmarks Commission with a complete package for review. As a reminder, this application was tabled during the August meeting to wait for P&Z Approval on the variances.

Staff discussed the current condition of the property with the commission and shared existing site photographs. Some of the notable changes are the applicant wishes to remove the existing addition to the rear and replace it with a larger two story addition. This new addition will relocate the driveway. Staff shared photographs of the existing driveway, noting it is a shared driveway with the neighbor and it has a south central utility pole located in the center of it.

With the relocation of the driveway the applicant plans on constructing a two car garage on the new addition. This garage will feature a carriage style door and will have decorative lighting above it. The applicant looked at alternatives to have a side load garage but with the limited lot width it was not feasible.

Staff discussed that the applicant wishes to paint the existing brick white. The applicant has tried to sandblast and clean the brick with little success. The white tone will help clean up the imperfections in the building and make it match with the proposed addition. Photographs were shared of the existing brick condition.

Staff discussed that the existing windows have not been maintained and are not in good condition and the applicant wishes to replace the wood six over six windows with new Anderson Simulated Divided Light windows with a six over six grid pattern in a historic bronze color. This change will also have the new addition windows match the existing home.

Staff shared with the commission the floor plan layouts of the building and new addition. The applicant has included a material list for review as well. With the updates to the existing structure, the applicant plans on shortening the damaged part of the existing chimney and capping it with concrete.

The new addition will be made out of board and batten and will have a simulated slate asphalt shingles. The existing roof will keep the original slate. The applicant will have the exposed basement walls in the smooth concrete texture to more closely resemble a sandstone foundation. The existing home will have the basement windows filled in with a solid material to remove the windows. The addition will also feature new 6" half-round gutters.

Mr. Moore shared to renderings to the commission noting the two color options the applicant is thinking about. The first is an all-white home and the second is to paint the existing brick white and have the addition be a brown or grey tone to break it apart from the main house. Staff noted that the option A with the two colors is preferred.

Mr. Eric Campbell approached the podium to discuss the application with the commission.

Mr. White commented that within the last week the house has been completely sandblasted. Mr. Campbell commented that it was cleaned to prep for paint. The problem with it now is the natural brick red was removed and the house is orange. With it being sandblasted, the brick is now porous and can be damaged by water. Mr. Abbott affirmed that once you sandblast brick you have to coat it.

Mr. Peter Lynch commented he likes the idea for the painted brick.

Mr. Patrick Lynch commented he really likes the garage roof line has been lowered from the primary house.

Mr. Bob Wood commented he really likes the option to paint the addition different from the main house. The applicant agreed.

Mr. Abbott stated his only concern was the windows but once it was clarified that they would be replaced with all simulated divided light there is no issue.

Mr. Peter Lynch asked the applicant if the window material is paintable. The applicant confirmed but it comes pre painted from the factory.

The commission confirmed with the applicant that all windows would be the simulated divided light.

A motion was made by Member Peter Lynch, seconded by Member Patrick Lynch, that this Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as presented with the preference for Option A paint scheme.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Old Business

New Business

Staff indicated that they received a tip from Roger White that the property at 95 North Trine Street has been doing exterior modifications without approval from the commission. The property owner was notified that they need to apply for the changes, which at this time include new vinyl siding over the existing wood siding and new front porch decking. The property owner should be before the commission in the October meeting for review. If the applicant does not want to apply for approval then they will have to remove the changes.

Staff updated the commission that the former Community Garden site has a grading permit to prep the site for any future development. The property owner got free dirt from Canal Cove and is helping that developer remove their excess dirt while raising their site.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked if that site was going to be seeded soon. Staff indicated that it will be seeded this current week or the next.

As part of the project the driveway that was used to access the site will be replaced as it was destroyed with the trucks hauling dirt to the site.

The commission confirmed with staff that the city just purchased the property at 26 East Waterloo Street and asked if there are any plans for the property. Staff affirmed that it was acquired but there are no immediate plans to do anything with it.

Adjournment

Time Out: 8:38pm

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

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

Date

Joe Abbott, Landmarks Chairman