

Canal Winchester

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



Meeting Minutes

February 27, 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: 6:58pm

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)

A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by Dr. Scot Kelly, that David Craycraft be excused.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Approval of Minutes

January 23, 2023 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Wit Wardell, that the January 23, 2023 Minutes be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Tabled Applications**CA-22-042**

Property Owner: Bisrat & Shariah Teklu
Applicant: Bisrat & Shariah Teklu
Location: 79 N Trine Street
Request: Front porch modifications

Mr. Moore presented the application for Bisrat and Shariah Teklu for property located at 79 North Trine Street. The applicant is requesting approval for the modifications that were made to the front porch in fall 2022. Staff shared photographs of the work that was done and recapped the discussion that was had during the December Landmarks Meeting with the applicant. In December, the commission provided feedback for the applicant and recommended that they come up with a plan to address some of the concerns they had.

The applicant has submitted an updated drawing noting that they would like to stain the wood framing for the porch, install a horizontal shiplap skirting under the porch to be painted white, trim the interior porch posts and wrap them to be thicker like the end columns, construct a decorative corbel and paint the porch floor a dark grey.

Dr. Kelly asked the applicant what the spindles on the front porch would be in the updated drawing. The applicant noted that the plan was to keep the porch spindles as they are currently installed with the metal. Then they would trim out the center posts and stain the new wood.

Dr. Kelly notes that the updated photo shows the front porch railing at a much shorter height than what has been installed. The applicant noted that the drawing is not reflective of the scale.

Mr. Lynch noted that it looks like to repair the end columns they had to deconstruct the entire porch. Additionally, the way it was before looks to have had some missing and damaged sections to the railing. Typically, the best route is to replace it in a like-for-like scenario and the new metal rails that were installed is a modern building style that does not seem appropriate for this application. This can be seen by the height of the railing is about 10" – 12" taller than the rails that were removed. The older rails came up to about the bottom of the windows. Mr. Lynch notes that the product that was installed for the new rails are a universal building product designed to be 36" in height to meet standard building codes. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked what the plans were to trim out the center posts. The applicant discussed that during the December meeting it was noted that these needed to be wider to match the side of the outside columns.

Mr. White asked if the height of the center posts would be lowered. The applicant affirmed that the December meeting that was discussed and they planned on matching the height at the house. Mr. Wardell noted that was what was discussed before.

Mr. Lynch asked if any measurements of the old railing was taken before it was removed. The applicant indicated they did not measure the old railing that was removed.

Mr. Lynch discussed with the applicant and other commission members that the old railing looked about even with the bottom of the window sill. This is about 24 inches or so in height.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant what they wanted to do for the skirting under the porch since the lattice was removed. The applicant noted they wanted to do horizontal boards like the drawing that was supplied.

Mr. White noted that he has noticed significant warpage to the columns and asked the applicant how they planned to address it. The applicant stated they are going to consult with the neighbor Mike Gust on how to fix the columns as he has more construction experience.

Mr. White asked if the vertical lines on front steps in the drawing are something they intended on adding. The applicant indicated they wanted to paint that detail on the steps for a little flare.

Mr. Lynch asked staff what recommendations were made to the applicant during the December meeting. Staff stated that the commission discussed the

front center posts needed to be appropriately scaled to match the width of the columns and that they were too tall. The lattice skirting that was removed not be replaced as it was and to do a vertical skirt board and leave the brick column supports exposed. Stain colors were discussed and the commission did talk about the option of painting the new lumber to match the trim on the home. The corbels were not discussed.

Mr. Lynch asked if the plan was to install corbels like the drawing. The applicant noted that it was possible.

Mr. Bisrat passed out stain samples for the porch.

Mr. White discussed with the commission that he does not like the height of the new railing that was installed. Mr. Lynch responded saying that removing the railing and replacing it with something that is comparable with what was removed seems to be the most appropriate. Mainly due to it being the front of the home.

Mr. Bisrat asked the commission if there was a specific reason why they wanting the porch railing that was installed changed. Mr. Lynch noted that if you look at the previous designs for the porch rails they were all at the height of the windows. This would have been more historically accurate to not cut off the windows on the front of the home. Even looking at the photo from the late 80's the porch rails were much shorter in height.

Mr. Lynch notes to the commission that his recommendation would be to replace the rails with something more appropriate in scale and material. The columns should be fine with the finish work. Building out the center posts to match the dimensions of the columns and adding a cap to the top. The skirt board should fit between the brick columns and not go over top of them.

The applicant noted that they planned on having the brick supports exposed under the porch and have the skirting fit between them.

Mr. Lynch asked if the commission has any concerns with the corbels proposed for the porch. That design is not something common to this area. Mr. White notes he does not feel the corbels fit the home and would look better without. Mr. Lynch noted they are not structurally necessary.

Dr. Kelly noted he thinks the porch spindles should be wood. Mr. Lynch agreed noting that 1.5" or 2" square wood material with a maximum 4" spacing would fit what was there before.

Mr. Bisrat discussed that they have spent money on what was installed and asked if there was any compensation for the changes being requested. The commission noted that they took on the risk by doing the work without prior review from the commission. The applicant noted they did not know about the review board until after the work was performed.

Staff asked the applicant if the porch railing they installed was in the decking section of a Lowes or Home Depot. The applicant affirmed it was at Home Depot. Staff indicated that decking and porch construction materials are different in terms of scale. That relates to the commissions discussion this evening the porch rails are too tall.

Mr. Bisrat asked staff what the recourse is if they do not make any changes to the porch. Staff noted that the commission has three different routes they can take on the application. They could approve as presented, approve with conditions or disapprove the application. Approving with conditions would allow some changes to remain while fixing others and disapproving would require the porch to go back to the design it was before the work was performed. Failure to make any of the changes would initiate the next step in the violation notice process to go to court. Staff suggested to the applicant that it sounds like the commission is finding a middle ground with some of the work that was done can stay but other things need to be modified.

Mr. Lynch noted to the applicant that he thinks they are on the right track, the biggest change would be to the railing.

Mr. White notes he is comfortable with the recommended changes that the Chairman provided this evening.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if the recommendations are things they could work with. The applicant affirmed.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness application #CA-22-042 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1) The porch railing be replaced with a traditional style railing to match what was previously on the porch;**
- 2) the height of the porch railing be similar to what was there before;**
- 3) the center posts be trimmed out to match the thickness of the outside porch columns;**
- 4) the height of the center posts be no more than 5" taller than the railing;**
- 5) the horizontal skirt board as shown in the rendering be located on the inside of the brick columns;**
- 6) the porch be painted the trim color of the home;**
- 7) and the decorative corbels be removed from the design.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Pending Applications**CA-23-002**

Property Owner: RRCT LLC
Applicant: DaNite Sign Co.
Location: 152 W Waterloo Street
Request: New Freestanding Sign

Mr. Moore presented the application for DaNite Sign for property located at 152 W Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval to install a new freestanding sign for NAPA on the eastern corner of the property. The sign is proposed to be 5.1 feet from the right-of-way, 5' 1" tall on a stone base to match the building and a 9 sq. ft. sign face. The sign is shown to have downward facing lighting.

Mr. Lynch asked staff if there are any concerns with the setback for the sign. Staff indicated that the sign meets setback requirements at 5.1 feet from the right-of-way.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if the sign will sit perpendicular to the street. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. White asked the applicant if the sign panel has any dimension or is flat. The applicant indicated it is a flat panel. White asked if there was any consideration to having any dimension to the sign. The applicant stated there was but it was a cost savings after they looked at having a stone base to match the building.

Mr. Lynch asked if the stone base will match the building or be close. The applicant stated it would match the stone on the building exactly. The same stone veneer that is on the building is intended on being used.

Dr. Kelly asked if there is a sign on the building. Staff affirmed. Dr. Kelly asked if the sign was fiber cement from the 2021 approval. Staff indicated the approval from 2021 was to approve the two fiber cement accents on either side of the storefront glass. Those are areas where signage could be mounted on the building. The 2022 approval was for the NAPA sign that was installed on the east end of the building. Staff noted the wall sign is a hexagon panel with a 2" relief.

Mr. Lynch asked if there was a reason for the signage to be different. The applicant noted that they both are metal panels with vinyl decals applied.

Mrs. Boving asked if the letters are dimensional at all. The applicant indicated they are not.

Mr. Dobda asked staff if the sign is permitted to have overhead lighting like what is being presented. Staff indicated that illumination for signage is permitted if its externally illuminated, not internally illuminated.

A motion was made by Rich Dobda, seconded by Linda Boving that Certificate

of Appropriateness application #CA-23-002 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-23-003

Property Owner: RRCT LLC
Applicant: Todd Weiser
Location: 152 W Waterloo Street
Request: Metal flashing cap for membrane roof

Mr. Moore presented the application for Todd Weiser for property located at 152 West Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval to install a metal flashing cap for the membrane roof on the subject property. Staff shared with the commission the application contents including the detail for the flashing installation and a sample of the material for the color.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness application #CA-23-003 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-23-004

Property Owner: Anastasia & Andrew Smoot
Applicant: Anastasia & Andrew Smoot
Location: 27 West Columbus Street
Request: New vinyl siding

Mr. Moore presented the application for Anastasia Smoot for property located at 27 West Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting approval to replace the aluminum siding and trim on the exterior of the home with new vinyl siding and vinyl trim. Staff discussed that the application submitted notes the existing aluminum siding is 5" lap siding that has hail damage and a large section to the rear of the home has siding missing. Staff presented photographs of the condition of the siding to the commission.

The applicant is requesting to replace the 5" aluminum siding with new 5" vinyl lap siding with a wood grain finish in 'Urban Blue'. The aluminum trim around the windows would be replaced with white vinyl. The applicant notes that this request for the vinyl siding is what the insurance company has noted they would fund and they would only process a request for a different material if there was an official denial notice that the vinyl siding was not approved.

The applicant introduced herself to the commission and stated she can answer any questions.

Mr. White noted that the windows on the home look like they are currently wrapped with aluminum. Staff noted that the existing window trim has been wrapped with aluminum. The applicant stated the new trim would be white to match what is there now.

Dr. Kelly discussed that with the pending application for the cement board he has no comments for the applicant. Mr. White affirmed.

Mr. Lynch notes that he cannot recall approving an application to remove a material for new vinyl siding, outside of the instance for the one home removing the aluminum from the garage to match the vinyl on the home that was already there.

A motion was made Roger White, seconded by Peter Lynch that Certificate of Appropriateness application #CA-23-004 be approved as presented.

The motion failed by the following vote:

No: 6 - Linda Boving, Peter Lynch, Roger White, Rich Dobda, Whit Wardell & Dr. Scott Kelly

CA-23-005

Property Owner: Anastasia & Andrew Smoot
Applicant: Anastasia & Andrew Smoot
Location: 27 West Columbus Street
Request: New hardi-board siding

Mr. Moore presented the application for Anastasia Smoot for 27 West Columbus Street. The applicant has filed for a second request to replace the existing 5" aluminum siding with a 5" cement board lap siding. The application notes that the siding would have a wood grain finish in the color 'Deep Ocean'. The trim for the windows would be white cement board.

Staff asked the applicant if the siding they wanted came in a smooth finish. The applicant responded that their contractor did not say anything about a different finish option but they do have a book for the different products and some of the specs were provided in the submittal.

Mr. Lynch asked if there are any windows that currently are not wrapped with the aluminum trim to see what the original trim looked like. The applicant indicated there are not and noted that they do have some water intrusion on the inside of the home with the plaster bubbling around the windows.

Mrs. Boving discussed with the applicant the differences between the "Urban Blue" and "Deep Ocean" paint colors. The applicant noted that the vinyl product came in "Urban Blue" and the cement board product came in "Deep Ocean".

Mr. White asked the applicant if they could choose between the smooth siding and wood grain which would they prefer. The applicant noted they would prefer the smooth siding and was not aware that was an option. The company that is installing the siding is not used to using the hardi-board product, but the applicant notes that they can ask if the smooth finish is an option and that it is shown in one of the cut sheets.

The applicant noted that they can be flexible with the color for the siding as long as it is in the same color family. Mr. Lynch asked if they are looking at a premanufactured color for the warranty aspect. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch informed the applicant that if they wanted to do a custom color there is a company in Zanesville that will factory paint any color they want but there is about a 12% increase in material cost. They will ship directly to the supplier. The applicant noted that is good information because they wanted a blue color and this factory color has some grey tones to it.

Mr. Lynch notes that the James Hardi is a 6" product that can be used in a 5" lap, but not a 4" lap. The applicant noted they wanted a 5" lap to match the profile of what is on the home now.

Mr. Dobda asked the applicant if the trim around the home would remain white. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked if they went with the smooth siding if the trim would remain smooth. The applicant affirmed that they would match.

Mr. Lynch discussed with the applicant the different alternatives there are for the trim around the windows and doors including a product called Boral. James Hardie does not allow you to fill the nail holes unless it is a specific product or it can void the warrant. Boral does not have that restriction. The applicant noted that is information she was not aware of. Mr. Lynch stated he wanted to let her know because the recommended nail filler from James Hardee is not an exact match and leaves a shiny finish.

Mr. Lynch noted that natural cedar would be another alternative if they did not want to use Boral or cement board.

The commission and the applicant talked about future projects for the home including the skirting under the porch, the porch railing and detached garage.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if the aluminum in the frieze board was going to stay or be changed. The applicant noted they thought it would remain. The commission noted that they would want to paint it so it matches the trim. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked if the outside corners in the siding would match the trim or the siding color. The applicant noted they would like for it to match the siding color.

The commission discussed the three windows on the east elevation of the home that does not currently have window trim with the applicant and recommended that window trim be added.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Rich Dobda that Certificate of Appropriateness application #CA-23-005 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1) The new hardi-board siding be a 5" lap siding;**
- 2) The exterior trim material can be either hardi-board or a boral material;**
- 3) All of the windows be trimmed out, including the three windows on the east elevation that currently do not have window trim;**
- 4) The existing coil trim that was discussed at the meeting could remain if not being replaced but is recommended be painted to match the new trim.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-23-006

Property Owner: 5W Properties LLC
Applicant: Stan Riley
Location: 10 South High Street
Request: Reface neon sign

Mr. Moore presented the application for Stan Riley for property located at 10 South High Street. The applicant is requesting approval to reface the neon sign located at the front of the building.

Staff presented photographs for the current sign configuration and the proposed design for the new business. The sign post would be painted black and the green neon would be changed out to white. There is a logo at the top of the sign that would illuminate in red. All of the neon tubing would be clear, including the logo.

Dr. Kelly asked if any of the dimensions for the sign would be changed. The applicant indicated that the sign would be the same dimensions.

Mr. Dobda asked staff if the existing sign had acrylic on it or just vinyl. Dr. Kelly notes that the previous application states vinyl graphic only. Mr. Dobda noted that he sees the "Taproom & Kitchen" lettering says it would be a clear acrylic lettering and asked if that material choice was an issue. Staff indicated that the lettering style should not be an issue.

Mr. Lynch asked staff to note where the neon is on the sign. Staff discussed the location is the frame, logo and words "Homestead" and "Beer Co". The logo would illuminate in red. "Taproom & Kitchen" is not neon as the lettering is too small.

The applicant passed around a digital photo showing the signage that was a little more clear than the application submitted.

The commission talked to the applicant a bit about the change in concept for the restaurant.

A motion was made by Rich Dobda, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness application #CA-23-006 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Old Business

Staff discussed with the commission the Community Plan workshop #2 that took place at the end of February.

Mr. Dobda noted that during the discussions the new mixed-use buildings in Old Town were brought up and have been favorable looked at by the community.

Staff discussed one of the activities during the workshop was talking about future annexation potential for the Village of Waterloo. Mrs. Boving asked what the process would look like from a zoning perspective. Staff discussed several scenarios but that is something that the consultants will be evaluating as part of the planning process.

Staff discussed the possibility of updating the Old Town Guidelines as part of the future zoning code update.

New Business

Adjournment

Time Out: 8:17pm

A motion was made by Peter Lynch and seconded by Linda Boving, that this meeting be adjourned.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Date

Landmarks Chairman