

# Canal Winchester

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



## Meeting Minutes

Monday, March 25, 2019

7:00 PM

## Landmarks Commission

*David Craycraft  
Pete Lynch  
Roger White  
Jamoya Cox  
Rich Dobda  
Dr. Scott Kelly*

Call To Order

*Time In: 7:00pm*

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)Approval of Minutes

February 25, 2019 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

**A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Jamoya Cox that the February 25, 2019 Minutes be approved.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 4** - Peter Lynch, Roger White, Jamoya Cox, Rich Dobda

**Abstain: 2** – David Craycraft, Dr. Scott Kelly

Pending Applications**CA-19-005**

Property Owner: Johnnie Woodrow

Applicant: Johnnie Woodrow

Location: 116 West Columbus Street

Request: Replace rear porch decking with concrete pad

Mr. Moore presented the application for Johnnie Woodrow for property located at 116 West Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting approval to replace the rear porch decking with a concrete pad. Staff presented photographs off the existing rear porch and noted that it is in need of repair. The applicant has indicated they would like for it to match the style of the front concrete porch.

Mr. White noted that the front porch has a molded concrete block base and asked if the rear concrete porch will have the same detail. Mr. Woodrow commented it is his goal to have the rear porch match the front porch.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the design change is to make maintenance easier. The applicant indicated that the existing porch is rotten and needs replaced. The concrete will make future maintenance less but it will also get the front and rear porches to match.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the corner post was going to be replaced. The applicant noted that it is going to be re-anchored to the new concrete.

Dr. Kelly noted that the front porch looks like it has a 4" concrete cap. The applicant indicated it is closer to 3 inches. Kelly asked if the concrete base that is in the back is going to be replaced with something to match the front. The applicant affirmed.

**A motion was made by Jamoya Cox, seconded by David Craycraft that application #CA-19-005 be approved as presented.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 6** - Peter Lynch, Roger White, Jamoya Cox, Rich Dobda, David Craycraft & Dr. Scott Kelly

**CA-19-007**

Property Owner: Todd & Colleene Weiser

Applicant: Todd Weiser

Location: 24 North High Street

Request: New Vinyl Windows and Dimensional Asphalt Shingles

Mr. Moore presented the application for Todd Weiser for property located at 24 North High Street. The applicant is requesting to replace the existing windows with new white one-over-one vinyl windows and the existing 3-tab grey asphalt shingles with new grey dimensional asphalt shingles. Staff noted that the existing windows comprise of a mix of six-over-six, six-over-one, one-over-one and some but not all have aluminum storm windows.

Mr. Craycraft if all asphalt shingles are to be replaced and the metal roof is going to stay as-is. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft asked the commission if they are OK with the vinyl windows spec'd. Mr. Lynch commented that the existing windows are a "hodge-podge" and not consistent.

Staff noted that the applicant stated the new windows will fit the openings and will not have an aluminum coil trim around them.

Mr. White noted that the existing building has aluminum storm windows and removing those with this application will be an improvement from the current windows with the storm windows.

Mr. Lynch commented that the bay window section was a little confusing. The Colonial casement window that was spec'd only appears to come in a six-over-six design. Asking if the window replacement on the south end a misprint. Mr. Weiser indicated that the house was built in 1895 with multiple additions over time. Each addition had different window configurations including the bay window. However, the bay window is going back as it appears now.

Mr. Craycraft asked if shutters are going to stay. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. White asked if the existing shutters are vinyl. The applicant indicated that they are functional wooden shutters.

Dr. Scott Kelly asked if there was a reason why the applicant wants to remove the grids from the windows. The applicant indicated that there is no continuity of what is there now and it looked like the cleanest way to move forward is a one-over-one window. Mr. Lynch commented that without the shutters that are on the building now he would prefer keeping the grids. But keeping the shutters make a difference on the window style.

Mr. Dobda asked the applicant what the color of the existing metal roof is. The applicant indicated it is white. Craycraft and White noted it looks silver.

**A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by David Craycraft that application #CA-19-007 be approved as presented.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 6** - Peter Lynch, Roger White, Jamoya Cox, Rich Dobda, David Craycraft & Dr. Scott Kelly

**CA-19-008**

Property Owner: Mike Green  
Applicant: Jayson Waits – Orchids & Ivy  
Location: 15 East Waterloo Street  
Request: New Hanging Sign

Mr. Moore presented the application for Orchids & Ivy for property located at 15 East Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval to install a new hanging sign at the shops new location. The sign proposed is 24" x 32" aluminum sign with vinyl graphics and replaces the former Leander Boutique sign.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant what the material of the new sign will be. The applicant indicated it is a tin sign with a vinyl overlay.

Mr. Lynch commented to the commission that this sign is a like for like change.

**A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Peter Lynch that application #CA-19-008 be approved as presented.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 6** - Peter Lynch, Roger White, Jamoya Cox, Rich Dobda, David Craycraft & Dr. Scott Kelly

**CA-19-009**

Property Owner: Cristina & Harry Hanna  
Applicant: Harry Hanna  
Location: 17 East Columbus Street  
Request: Balcony addition to carriage house

Mr. Moore presented the application for Harry Hanna for property located at 17 East Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting approval to construct a balcony onto the west side of the carriage house that was constructed in 2018. Staff presented photographs of the property noting the location of the carriage house. The applicant is requesting to construct a 46 sq. ft. balcony to the rear to overlook the field. The structure is to be made from a composite wood material and will require replacing one existing window with a single man door. The window that is being removed will be relocated to the stairway leading upstairs. The balcony itself will have a wooden brace onto the wall of the west elevation.

Dave Craycraft notified the commission he is the architect for this project and is representing the home owners this evening. In 2018 the carriage house was designed and constructed. The applicant is looking to add a balcony onto the rear elevation. This balcony will be similar in style to the photographs provided in the application.

Mr. White asked the applicant if the supporting structure will be painted to match the trim on the building now. Mr. Craycraft noted that if the wood is redwood or cedar it will be left natural. If the support is pressure treated pine it will be painted.

Mr. Lynch commented that the entire project looks great and it is shame you cannot see the project from the road.

Mr. White asked if the balcony door will be a full size door. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked if it is a single or double door. The applicant stated a single door that will swing in.

**A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Rich Dobda that application #CA-19-009 be approved as presented.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 5** - Peter Lynch, Roger White, Jamoya Cox, Rich Dobda & Dr. Scott Kelly

**Abstain: 1** – David Craycraft

**CA-19-011**

Property Owner: Morley Properties  
Applicant: Ken Morley  
Location: 93 East Waterloo Street  
Request: New Composite Porch Decking

Mr. Moore presented the application for Ken Morley for property located at 93-95 East Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval to remove the existing tongue and groove decking on the front porch and replace it with a composite Trex decking. Staff noted that the decking being requested is the same as what was installed at 95 North Trine Street.

Mr. White asked staff if there is a requirement for a hand rail. Staff indicated they do not believe so. The applicant affirmed.

Dr. Kelly asked the applicant what the board width for the composite decking is. Staff indicated that the Trine Street application notes it is 5 inches wide. Dr. Kelly asked the applicant if he has ever explored using a narrow board that closer matches the existing. The applicant indicated he is not opposed to that. Kelly noted that Timbertech makes a narrow tongue and groove board.

Mr. Morley noted that he did get the Trex approved on Trine Street so he originally wanted to try and use that again.

Mr. Lynch commented over the last several years more companies are coming out with a narrow composite decking to match historic profiles. The applicant asked where he could find that information and Lynch responded saying Home Depot carries the product they typically don't stock it on the shelves. Dr. Kelly commented the board width does look very close to a historic profile.

Mr. Lynch commented that an adjacent business on North High Street has the more narrow tongue and groove decking on the front porch, possibly the aeratis brand. Dr. Kelly noted that some stores call it porch decking. Lynch further commented that those are a true tongue and groove decking to hide the fasteners.

Mr. Morley asked the commission if they would rather see a traditional tongue and groove decking and several members of the commission affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the North Trine Street house was tongue and groove. Staff indicated it was not.

Mr. Lynch commented that just based on where the home is located the thinner board width will make a bigger visual difference.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if they were specifically looking at the grey deck boards. The applicant affirmed noting they think it would go well with the white siding. Lynch did comment that the aeratis decking is paintable and still keeps its warranty even when painted.

Mr. White asked the applicant if they are replacing the lattice under the front porch. The applicant indicated that the intention was to take the deck boards removed and turn them up to be a new panel under the porch. White commented that losing the lattice is good.

Mr. White asked staff to show the photograph of the Trine Street house skirting. Staff pulled up a photograph showing the two homes and noted that it appears the Waterloo Street house has a new layer of lattice covering the old layer. The applicant affirmed.

The applicant commented they were thinking of doing something similar as Trine Street to this property or something with vertical boards. Mr. Lynch commented that the home across the street from Keystone has a vertical skirting. Mr. Haire commented that Kathy Binner's recent proposal last month for 57 West Waterloo had a vertical skirt board with gaps between the boards.

Mr. Craycraft commented he wonders what the decking looks like underneath. The applicant asked if he meant under the decking or under side of the decking. Craycraft elaborated the bottom side of the decking.

The commission discussed the vertical tongue and groove decking for the skirting and noted that the vertical skirt couldn't have spaces in this application because you would be able to see the joints.

Mr. Dobda asked staff if they could pull up the photographs of the West Waterloo Street skirting. Staff shared pics with the commission.

The applicant commented he likes the photos of what was approved down the street and commented he would do something to match and asked if the existing boards could be reused. Mr. Craycraft noted that he turned deck boards over on a project and the underside looked brand new. Lynch noted in a tongue and groove decking scenario you couldn't have the gaps and would want to go with a pressure treated lumber. After time it could be painted.

Dr. Kelly asked if the pillars are going to be reset on the porch. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked if the pillars are original to the building. The applicant indicated that he assumes they are since the roof of the porch appears to be original.

**A motion was made by Rich Dobda, seconded by Peter Lynch that application #CA-19-011 be approved with the following conditions:**

- 1. The lattice be replaced with a vertical skirt board like what was approved for the renovation at 57 West Waterloo Street.**
- 2. The composite deck boards be a +/- 3" tongue and groove design.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 6** - Peter Lynch, Roger White, Jamoya Cox, Rich Dobda, David Craycraft & Dr. Scott Kelly

**CA-19-012**

Property Owner: Todd Weiser

Applicant: Stan Riley

Location: 10 South High Street

Request: Enclosure in rear parking lot for bbq smoker.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Stan Riley for property located at 10 South High Street. The applicant is requesting to install a wooden enclosure to the rear of the building within the parking lot to house a bbq smoker. Staff presented the applicants rendering for the enclosure which features a wooden fence style wall on all four sides with a raised pitched roof that has an exhaust vent in the top.

Staff discussed that while reviewing the application they feel that the fence style needed to have some mass to it so it looked better free standing in the parking lot so they are recommending a board on batten design which features the "battens" as reliefs in the wall system. With the board on batten design the fence can be trimmed out on all four sides to give it some weight and profile. Staff is also recommending that the structure be painted or stained black and have a black standing seam metal roof so it does not tarnish with the smoke over time.

Mr. Lynch asked staff if they were recommending a true standing seam or surface fastened metal roof. Staff indicated a true standing seam.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the panels will go to the pavement or be lifted off the ground. Mr. Moore indicated he was not sure but it is going to house the bbq smoker and a grease dumpster. Mr. Haire indicated it will be constructed to be all the way to the ground and be built as a permanent structure. The bbq smoker is a self-enclosed unit in a trailer. The structure will have gates on both ends, one end to get the trailer in and out and the other end for employee access.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the staff suggested fencing design allows for the airflow needed for the unit. Staff affirmed because the unit is self-contained and there is a vent on the roof.

Mr. White asked about ventilation for the food preparer. Mr. Haire indicated that the recommendation has been presented to the applicant and they agree to this type of construction and like the recommendations.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the parking lot is in need of paving or anything in the near future. Staff indicated it does not at this time. The portion that the structure is being located on is on the private lot not public parking.

Mr. Lynch asked if the structure will be contained to one parking spot or go into the drive isle. Mr. Haire stated the applicant's intention is to have it fully contained in one parking stall so it does not obstruct the isle.

Mr. Dobda asked staff if Landmarks should recommend installing a bollard so they do not back into the structure. Staff indicated it is required for a dumpster screen.

Mr. Craycraft commented on the slope of the roof and stated maybe the slope is too steep. Staff indicated that the rendering staff created is most likely exaggerated and wrong and what the applicant originally put together is more than likely the roof pitch.

Mr. Dobda asked staff if there were safety concerns with the structure. Staff indicated they are not concerned because the smoker is a self-contained unit designed on a trailer so it is insulated and should not get physically hot to the touch.

Mr. Craycraft confirmed that the entire trailer pulls into the enclosure. Staff affirmed.

**A motion was made by Dave Craycraft, seconded by Roger White that application #CA-19-012 be approved with the following conditions:**

- 1. The enclosure "fencing" be a board on batten design and at a minimum, the same height as the equipment inside.**
- 2. The enclosure have a black standing seam metal roof.**
- 3. The enclosure be painted or stained black.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 6** - Peter Lynch, Roger White, Jamoya Cox, Rich Dobda, David Craycraft & Dr. Scott Kelly

**CA-19-010**

Property Owner: City of Canal Winchester  
Applicant: Trine-Fairfield LLC  
Location: 18-26 West Waterloo Street  
Request: New Mixed Use Building

Mr. Moore presented the application for Trine-Fairfield LLC for property located at 18-26 West Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval for a new 3-story mixed use commercial building along West Waterloo Street. The building would feature approximately 7,000 sq. ft. of commercial space on the first floor and 14 residential apartments on floors 2 and 3.

Staff presented a brief history of the site noting that 18 West Waterloo Street was a former Marathon gas station. The gas station was constructed around 1930 and was condemned by the building department in 2000 and then condemned again in 2006. The Landmarks Commission approved the demolition of the structure 2008. In 2010 the structure was removed by Central Ohio Community Improvement Corporation and the site was environmentally remediated from contamination. The City of Canal Winchester purchased the property from the Central Ohio Community Improvement Corporation in 2018.

26 West Waterloo Street was constructed in 1922 as a single family home. The Canal Winchester historic inventory form states that it was a residential home constructed in the commercial section of West Waterloo Street. The City of Canal Winchester purchased the property in 2017 to move forward with future economic development opportunities identified in the Old Town Plan adopted by City Council in 2017. This property was constructed as a residential dwelling and was converted in 1996 for commercial use. Due to the interior layout, it is limited to what types of commercial uses can operate inside. The City has entered into a demolition agreement with the Central Ohio Community Improvement Corporation to demolish this structure. The City and the COCIC have determined the structure has a blighting influence on the surrounding properties and supports its redevelopment with the adjacent lot that has been remediated for redevelopment.

In addition to the single family home being removed from the site, staff explained that an existing detached garage to the rear of 16 North High Street will be removed for the project. The detached garage is constructed mainly of concrete block and has entry facing the alley. This structure is currently seeing failure in the roof truss system as it is braced internally at this time to keep the roof from collapsing.

The applicant is requesting approval for a new +/- 20,000 sq. ft. mixed use commercial building along West Waterloo Street. The building would feature 6,835 sq. ft. of commercial space on the first floor and 14 residential apartments on floors 2 and 3. The mix of residential units are six (6) two-bedroom units and eight (8) one-bedroom units. With the proposal, the applicant intends to raze a detached concrete garage behind 16 North High Street. The existing lots of 18

and 26 West Waterloo will be combined with portions of 16 and 24 North High Street to achieve the building and parking configurations as shown on the plans.

Through 2016-2017 the City of Canal Winchester went through a comprehensive planning process for the Old Town District. The Old Town Plan was completed and adopted by City Council in 2017 via ORD-17-011. In the plan it was identified by public stakeholders and local residences that some of the most important goals for future were to extend the commercial area, increase all forms of connectivity and diversify housing opportunities within the Old Town area. It was also identified that the two highest rated housing opportunities to be capitalize on were strategic infill and new mixed use products. These goals were set to increase the livability of the Old Town, promote commercial growth and enhance the public space while retaining a sense of local charm and character. One of the areas identified for future redevelopment opportunities include the subject parcel as the Old Town Plan identified West Waterloo Street as the next logical step towards commercial and mixed use growth within the community.

The applicant has designed a three-story mixed-use building for the subject site. This building is designed to be flexible to allow between two and five commercial tenant spaces on the ground floor. Future commercial tenants have not been determined at this time but the space is being designed for retail and or restaurant uses. The building is designed to have primary commercial entry from the front of the building, and depending on the layout of the user a secondary public access may be available at the rear of the building facing the parking lot.

The second and third floors are designed to be residential apartment units. The one-bedroom units are at 700 sq. ft. and two-bedroom units at 1,168 sq. ft. The two-bedroom units will face West Waterloo Street and the one-bedroom units will face the parking in the rear. All of the units will have ground floor access from the rear of the building via internal stairwells and will have a central shared corridor (hallway) in the middle.

Chapter 1189.04(a)(6) of the Old Town Commercial zoning district requires dwelling dimensions for a mixed-use building be a minimum of 700 sq. ft. for a one-bedroom unit and 860 sq. ft. for a two-bedroom unit. The units proposed meet this requirement. The same section also sets a density cap of twenty (20) units per acre. The proposed site would allow for a maximum of 14 dwelling units.

The building has been designed with four-sided architecture in mind. The front elevation will be primarily red brick and dimensional stone with accents of fiber cement paneling on the storefronts and EIFS on the wall returns. All windows are proposed to be a dark bronze finish, with vinyl two-over-two windows for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors. The commercial storefronts are proposed in the same dark bronze finish and will feature a mix of larger metal canopies in the center of the building and fabric awnings for the end tenants.

The rear elevation has been designed with the same mix of materials, however with EIFS being the primary material and the dimensional stone and red brick as accents. The rear of the building will have fabric awnings over the rear entryways as shown. On the second floor the windows feature Juliette balcony railings to break up the façade.

The proposed building is 39.8 feet tall from grade to top of the roof. The architectural parapet wall in the center of the building is an additional +/- 4 feet tall. Chapter 1161.04(d)(4) allows for the maximum height of a building in the Old Town Commercial District to be forty (40) feet, or three (3) stories. Chapter 1183.01(a) for height modifications allows for architectural features and parapet walls to extend an additional four (4) feet above the limiting height in the zoning district.

The front yard build-to line for the subject site is between 5.4 feet and 11.4 feet from the right-of-way line based on other buildings along the same street. The proposed building is setback 10.5 feet from the right of way meeting setbacks for the area.

The site has been designed to have the building pushed towards W Waterloo Street with parking located to the rear with access provided from Cherry Alley. The proposed parking lot will feature room for 38 parking spaces (7 of the spaces being tandem). Chapter 1161.04(a)(6)(C) requires a total of 7 parking spaces for the commercial space and 14 parking spaces for the residential units, totaling a required 21 parking spaces. The parking lot also features a dumpster pad and sidewalks leading to the front of the building.

The conceptual landscape plan shows a mix of deciduous and ornamental trees around the site and within the parking area. A hedge row is shown on the east end of the parking lot to screen the parking from the rear of the adjacent properties along North High Street. The front of the building features several patio areas with brick pavers and ornamental metal fencing with brick pillars. The patio areas are buffered from the public walk with landscaping elements. The applicant is actively working with the City Urban Forester on a final landscape plan for review.

The applicant is planning on installing a 6 foot wood privacy fence between this property and the rear of 12 North High Street so there is a clear delineation from the property boundaries and a limit to the walkway leading from the parking to the street. Additionally, the applicant is showing a wooden dumpster screen enclosure in the rear parking area. The parking lot will feature one parking lot light that will be in a historic bell head fixture.

Staff went out and measured some adjacent structures with an Omni-level to give some perspective on existing building heights in the area. 26 West Waterloo is 33 feet tall. 29 West Waterloo is 33 feet and 9 inches tall. 3 West Waterloo is 37 feet and 10 inches tall. 10 North High Street is 32 feet and 4 inches tall. The tallest building in Old Town is Fitness Firm at 19 East Waterloo at

42 feet tall. Fitness Firm is also the only full three story building in Old Town. Staff noted that Fitness Firm would remain the tallest building as the proposed structure is 39 feet and 10 inches tall. Another main visual difference between the two structures is Fitness Firm is right against the sidewalk and the proposed building would be 10 feet away from the sidewalk.

At this time there is no signage being proposed for the building as the applicant wants to wait for future tenant demands. However, the preliminary thought is the commercial pieces will have blade signs over the entry facades.

Staff explained that the applicant is requesting a demolition permit for the detached garage behind 16 North High as part of this application, while the commercial house at 26 West Waterloo Street is exempt from a demo permit request as the structure and property is owned by the city.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if Cherry Alley is going to be improved with this project. Staff discussed that preliminary conversations with the Construction Services Administrator involve signing the alley for one way traffic. This would allow for all traffic to travel east bound by starting on Elm Street and then exiting onto High Street. The thought behind this is due to North High Street being more limited access most people would turn towards Waterloo so this traffic flow would have people turning into the travel lane rather than crossing over a lane. At this time the Alley is open to both directions and it works because you can currently use the gravel parking lot to turn off if there is a conflict.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the Fire Department has reviewed the site plan for number of exits, EMS access and circulation. Staff explained that the Fire Department gets involved some during the Engineering Review process after Landmarks and P&Z approvals but mainly reviews site plans and building plans during Construction Plan Review. Staff has preliminarily had the applicants include wider parking lot lanes to help accommodate a fire truck turn radius and parking with the outriggers fully extended. Additionally, the building is planned to be sprinkled on the inside based on the number and mix of uses within the building. Mr. Haire noted that the fire code requires access within 300 feet of the building and with the building being 65 feet deep access is not an issue.

Mr. Craycraft asked about parking requirements for the site. Staff discussed that the zoning changes to allow mixed use buildings with higher densities added parking regulations to Old Town. Currently there is an overlay on Old Town that if you have a business within the boundaries there are zero requirements for parking. When adding the mixed use component it was important to alleviate some public concern about parking so it is required to have 1 parking stall per 1,000 sq. ft. of commercial space and an additional 1 parking stall per residential unit. The applicant is required by code to have 21 parking stalls and is installing 38 parking spaces. The applicant has also agreed to reserve 5 of those parking spaces for the sheriff's department.

Mr. White commented that the adjacent property is in disrepair and is in need of some maintenance. Mr. Haire noted that he had discussed the repairs needed with the property owner for several years now and with the new building being constructed the timing is going to move much faster on those repairs.

Mr. Cox asked what type of tenants are anticipated for the ground floor commercial space. Mr. Haire indicated that is a question more for the developers and owner.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the hard surfaces in the front of the building within the patio area are going to be impervious for drainage. Staff noted the architect should be able to answer that a little better but when looking at the site plan all roof drainage is going to the parking lot and there will be catch basins in the parking lot to take it to the public storm system.

Mr. Cox asked the applicant about the commercial tenant uses anticipated. Don Meier, architect for the project indicated that the commercial space use has not been determined. It has been designed to be flexible enough for all types of spaces. The space can be broken into five commercial bays if needed that are 20 feet wide. The intention is the east end of the building is ideal for a restaurant with the patio space being provided. However, it is possible the ground floor is 1, 2 or even 5 different tenants.

Mr. White asked about a timeline for the project. The applicant indicated that they are in the design development process for engineering and they hope to have that completed this summer.

Mr. Craycraft asked about the first floor elevation in regards to the street elevation. The applicant indicated the site is fairly flat and the building is going to be designed to be ADA accessible.

Mr. White commented that on the east end of the site where the gas station sat, the spots where the tanks were removed from the ground are filled with a lot of gravel. The applicant indicated that they will review the soils report to verify any fill that is needed.

Mr. Craycraft asked if there are any environmental construction techniques being used, referencing the permeable pavement on Columbus Street. Staff indicated that the permeable pavement on Columbus Street has not held up as expected over time and that may eventually be replaced with permeable pavers. The engineering for the storm water is not completed yet for the site.

Mr. Meier passed around the building materials for review.

Mr. White confirmed with staff that this evening the Landmarks Commission is voting on the demolition of the garage and the site plan of the new building. Staff affirmed and noted that it is mainly on the architecture of the building and layout of the lot in relation to the surrounding uses.

Mr. Cox asked if there are any bike racks integrated into the site plan. Staff noted that the plan shows bike racks on the south east corner of the parking lot.

Mr. White asked if two handicap spaces are adequate. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Meier commented that the biggest challenge for the architecture was the brick style and presented a sample they think will work better than the one in the color rendering.

Mr. Craycraft asked if it is a face brick and not a veneer. The applicant stated it is real brick.

Mr. White commented he likes one brick more than the other since it is less busy and would look better with the proposed stone.

The commission compared the stone proposed with two brick choices.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the eifs texture on the panel the texture proposed for the building façade. The applicant affirmed. Craycraft asked if that textured finish would look dirty over time. The applicant indicated that they use that finish on a lot of projects and it holds up very well.

The applicant discussed that they are proposing Eifs in two different colors depending on the placement on the building as well.

Mr. Craycraft pointing at the colored rendering asked what is eifs on the front façade. The applicant indicated that the storefront level is the stone while the returns on the front façade are proposed as eifs. As you wrap around the building the amount of eifs increases.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the stone is a veneer. The applicant indicated it is a cap stone product where it is 3 5/8 inches thick. The stone brand is Rock Cast.

Mr. Lynch asked if the Rock Cast varies in colors. The applicant indicated that the colors are true throughout and they do have about 12 colors to choose from.

Mr. Craycraft asked about the mortar color. The applicant indicated that the mortar for the stone will match but they have not determined the mortar color for the brick as it may be the same or they might change it up.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the lighting on the building is representing on the color rendering and there will not be any up or down lighting. The applicant indicated that they do not have specific fixtures picked out yet but they would like to do something historic that provides area lighting like the rendering.

Mr. Lynch asked if there is any up lighting or not. The applicant stated they do not plan on any up lighting.

Mr. Craycraft asked if there is any existing street lighting. Staff pointed out the two existing street lights.

Mr. Haire asked if the existing street trees will remain. The applicant stated that is the intention.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if there is an existing fire hydrant nearby. Staff stated there is one just west of the building. Mr. Lynch asked if the existing hydrant is sufficient. Staff stated it should be and they will be required to install an FDC connection with a hydrant outside somewhere by the water room as part of the Fire Department requirements.

Mr. Dobda commented this building looks like another newer building in the Short North and asked if it's a copy of something else. The applicant indicated that they do not believe so and named some other buildings in that area they have done.

Mr. Meier commented the design came from local Central Ohio Italianate design along with reviewing the Old Town Guidelines and other Canal Winchester structures. An architect in the office has a historical background so he was in charge of the historic component.

The applicant commented that the building height shown on the plans is based off a worst case scenario for floor to ceiling clearance and structural steel thickness. If anything the building will get shorter and not taller. First floor to second floor is 16 feet tall.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the architecture style will be steel studs. The applicant indicated the first floor is steel construction with concrete floor and the second and third floors will be wood construction.

Mr. Lynch asked if the residential ceiling height will be at 8 feet. The applicant indicated 9 foot ceiling in the residential units.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the glass storefront is similar to what is being used at 3-7 South High Street. The applicant indicated it is a traditional aluminum storefront in a dark bronze finish. The mullions will break up the glass. Craycraft commented more on the height of the glass and the doors. The applicant stated the doors will be eight foot tall.

Mr. Haire asked if the mullions are internal or external or simulated divided light. The applicant indicated the intent is for a true divided light window. Mr. Haire commented that a true or simulated divided light reflects the style of town halls windows as well.

Mr. Craycraft commented that a true divided light would be better than a simulated divided light. Mr. Lynch affirmed and asked the applicant what the second story windows would be. The applicant indicated the residential windows would be a vinyl window in a historic profile with a dark bronze finish. The exact brand is not determined yet. Predominately a 3 foot by 6 foot window that is a two-over-two. Some windows on the ends will be smaller for bathrooms and such.

Mr. Lynch commented that elevation drawings show windows but the floor plans do not. Mr. Meier stated that is possible and Lynch commented he wanted to make sure windows are going in. The applicant commented they are starting to lay out the units on a formal basis for how windows will actually fit with floor plans and furniture. The commission talked in detail about window placement on the elevations to break up the façade.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if they have considered adding Juliet balconies to the front of the building in the Eifs return areas to give the front of the building more of a residential vibe. The applicant responded by saying that it is a good idea and that would be the place to do it.

Mr. Lynch commented that the panel work between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors are distracting and take the focus of the front façade and asked the applicant if the sill and header could be reincorporated and to shrink the panel. The applicant commented that the panel was added to tie the elevation together so it doesn't look as plain. Mr. Meier commented that adding a Juliet balcony to the third floor might help break the façade apart. Mr. Craycraft commented that the Juliet balcony would look better on the third set of windows.

Mr. White asked for a clarification on a Juliet balcony. Mr. Lynch showed Mr. White on the plans and noted that they are typically 6 to 8 inches deep to be an aesthetic touch.

Mr. Meier stated that they are looking at a decorative aluminum for the Juliet balconies.

Mr. Lynch encouraged changing up the front eifs window areas. The applicant noted that they will play with the rendering to see what looks best.

Mr. Lynch asked how the balconies are mounted. The applicant indicated that they will have a bracket with a return. Lynch asked if they are square or have any curvature. The applicant indicated they intend on square.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant about the patio fencing and its location and design choice. The applicant noted that the elevation drawings do not show all the fencing so the drawing is easier to read.

Mr. White commented he is comfortable with the application as presented and likes the ideas of the Juliet balconies.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if they need to address anything else. Staff discussed the recommendation process to P&Z with the commission. The applicant asked if the landmarks changes need to happen prior to P&Z meeting. Staff noted P&Z does not need to see the final site changes.

Mr. Haire commented that he feel based on the direction Landmarks has been discussing the this application, it should be tabled to be reviewed during the April agenda. Mr. Haire discussed the questions he had heard this evening are in regards to the balconies, specific light fixtures, window style, details on paneling and windows to be on the side of the building. Mr. Craycraft asked about the window comment. Haire stated Mr. Lynch discussed the window panels and amending them and there is no specific vinyl window brand being used.

Mr. Haire commented that he wanted to ask the commission how they felt about the proposed patio areas and their interaction with the street. Mr. Craycraft asked Mr. Haire if he meant from a business owner perspective.

Mr. Lynch commented that the fencing proposed may restrict access to the building. The applicant commented that the access really depends on the number of tenants.

Mr. Haire commented that the fencing may not need to be installed as presented but more of a concept of how to create patio space. Mr. Meijer commented the color rendering lends itself to two tenants.

Mr. Meier commented that the design has tried to incorporate some seating areas in the public space. Mr. Cox commented that he likes the addition of the public seating element to the plan.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the window glass is going to be reflective. The applicant indicated it will not be reflective.

Mr. Lynch asked about color selection for the awnings. The applicant stated there is no specific color or pattern picked out but the canvas will be one color and the metal awning will be another color.

Staff discussed that the thought is to table the Landmarks review but to recommend to P&Z a positive recommendation so that the P&Z meeting will still happen on April 8<sup>th</sup> and then landmarks will review the changes made on April 22. Mr. Craycraft affirmed.

The commission asked if they need to recommend the design changes to P&Z. Staff noted that is not necessary.

**A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Roger White, to recommend to P&Z approval of SDP-19-002, approve the demolition of the detached garage at 16 North High Street and to table application CA-19-010.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 6** - Peter Lynch, Roger White, Jamoya Cox, Rich Dobda, David Craycraft & Dr. Scott Kelly

#### Old Business

Staff discussed that they are working with the contractor for the property at 18 East Columbus Street on the design changes. They plan on being on the May agenda for review.

Mr. White asked about the Washington Street paint job. Staff discussed that they feel the commission should reach out to the property owner about the paint if they feel it is a concern because that area is not regulated by paint color. However, the property will be sold when it is complete so it is possible that the new owners will paint it eventually.

Mr. White asked for a status on the Columbus Street Lean-to application. Staff indicated that the applicant has not filed for a building permit yet on the project.

New Business

Adjournment

*Time Out: 8:55pm*

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

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes: 6** - Peter Lynch, Roger White, Jamoya Cox, Rich Dobda, David Craycraft & Dr. Scott Kelly

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Landmarks Chairman