

Canal Winchester

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



Meeting Minutes

March 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: 7:00pm

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)

A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by Peter Lynch, that Rich Dobda be excused.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Approval of Minutes

February 27, 2023 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Whit Wardell, seconded by Linda Boving, that the February 27, 2023 Minutes be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Pending Applications**CA-23-007**

Property Owner: Ken Smith
Applicant: DaNite Sign Co.
Location: 30 Liberty Street
Request: New Wall Sign

Mr. Moore presented the application for DaNite Sign Co. for property located at 30 Liberty Street. The applicant is requesting approval to install a new wall sign on the east façade of the building. The proposed sign is a total of 76.6 sq. ft. "Sweet Harmony" is shown at 24" in letter height at a total of 66 sq. ft. and "Canal" underneath is at a 15" letter height at a total of 10.6 sq. ft. The sign is proposed to be made from white aluminum channel letters attached to the face of the building. Lighting is not being requested at this time.

Staff noted that in December there were notes for the signage lighting but specifics were not clear.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if the signage would be all aluminum construction. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. White asked if the signage would be illuminated. The applicant noted that signage lighting is being handled by the architect. Staff noted that in the previous application there were notes for lighting but specifics were not provided and that staff will follow up with the applicant.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the mounting studs for the sign would be exposed. The applicant noted they would be concealed through the back.

Mr. Lynch noted that in this instance the signage only is being requested, not any lighting. Staff noted they will follow up by resending the application from December to see if lighting had previously been approved.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-007 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-23-008

Property Owner: Bryan Bogart
Applicant: Bryan Bogart
Location: 20 N Trine Street
Request: New 6' Privacy Fence

Mr. Moore presented the application for Bryan Bogart for property located at 20 North Trine Street. The applicant is requesting approval to install a new 6 foot wood privacy fence around the rear of the property.

Staff discussed that the property currently has a 30 foot section of a 6 foot French gothic privacy fence and a 40 foot section of 4 foot French gothic picket fence along the southern property line. The 4 foot fence section is proposed to remain and the existing 6 foot section would be removed and replaced with a new 6 foot dog ear privacy fence around the rear yard.

Staff noted that zoning Chapter 1181.07 restricts fences within a side yard setback along an alley to be a maximum of three (3) feet in height. The proposed fence location does not meet code and the applicant would need to relocate the fence to connect the rear corner of the home with the rear corner of the garage to have the requested 6 foot height. The applicant is requesting a recommendation from the Landmarks Commission for a variance to get the fence installed as presented.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the fence was going to be pressure treated lumber. The applicant affirmed. Craycraft asked if the nice side of the fence would face outward. The applicant affirmed.

Dr. Kelly asked the applicant if there would be any gates on the fence. The applicant indicated there is a gate proposed at the garage return and in the return by the side door on the home.

The applicant discussed is that this fence is to create some privacy and keep in the dogs. There are several fences along the alley with the same setback that are 6 foot dog ear privacy style. With this property along the edge of the DORA boundary extra privacy is being requested.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant where the 6 foot privacy fence would start. The applicant noted where the current 6 foot fence terminates now.

Dr. Kelly asked if the fence would be painted white to match. The applicant noted that they planned on keeping it natural. The applicant also noted that they will be replacing damaged boards on the front picket fence section to match.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff what the variance would be for. Staff indicated that this lot is a corner lot with one frontage facing the alley to the south. The variance is for the fence exceeding 3 foot in height on the alley side within the setback.

The applicant noted that the fence will be far enough from both intersections that it should not impede visual site distance for auto traffic. The applicant notes there are other 6 foot fences along the alley.

Mr. White asked how far back the fence will be from the south property line. The applicant noted that it would be approximately 1.5' from the property line.

Mr. Lynch asked if the existing landscaping will be removed for the fence. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft noted he is not opposed to the style or material of the fence. Planning and Zoning would determine if the placement was okay.

Mr. Lynch noted that he is accustomed to the existing 6 foot section of fence and with it staying just as far back from the intersection it keeps plenty of distance to see what is going on.

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-008 be approved as presented and that a variance from Chapter 1181.07 be recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-23-009

Property Owner: Amy Vereb
Applicant: Amy Vereb
Location: 34 East Mound Street
Request: New 6' Privacy Fence

Mr. Moore presented the application for Amy Vereb for property located at 34 East Mound Street. The applicant is requesting approval to remove the 4 foot wood picket fence at the rear yard to construct a new 6 foot decorative privacy fence. Staff noted that the fence is dual sided with the decorative trim and cap.

Mrs. Vereb noted that she is requesting for the same fence as the prior application and not the decorative fence design that was submitted in the application.

Staff discussed with the commission that the fence design on the screen is not what is being requested. It is a standard 6 foot pressure treated privacy fence.

Mr. Lynch noted to clear up the application, the framework will be internal including the post.

Mrs. Boving asked staff if the applicant wanted to paint or stain the wood would she need to come back. Staff noted that if she indicates what she wants to do this evening she would not need to return for reapproval. The applicant noted she would like the new fence to be white.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by David Craycraft that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-009 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. The fence be a standard 6' dog ear privacy fence.**
- 2. The fence is not required to have the top rail or post caps shown on the sample photograph.**
- 3. The fence be constructed out of a pressure treated lumber to be painted white.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-23-010

Property Owner: 4 East Waterloo LLC
Applicant: Kristin Harlander – Square Canvas
Location: 10 East Waterloo Street
Request: New Garage Door

Mr. Moore presented the application for Kristen Harlander for property located at 10 East Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval to replace the

metal garage door with a new glass garage door to mimic the style of the door at the tenant space at 8 East Waterloo Street. The applicants door will feature a man door in the center to provide a second access to the interior of the space.

Mr. Lynch asked staff if the new door will match the door on the left. Mr. Baker noted that it will as the same manufacture is making it. The new door will have a man door in the center.

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Linda Boving that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-010 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

CA-23-011

Property Owner: David & Tammy Elliott
Applicant: David & Tammy Elliott
Location: 109 Park Street
Request: New Siding, windows and gutters.

Mr. Moore presented the application for David & Tammy Elliott for property located at 109 Park Street. The applicant is requesting approval to replacing the existing cedar shake siding with a new 4.5" dutch-lap vinyl siding in 'Pebblestone' color, remove the existing aluminum awnings, install new gutters and downspouts, new vinyl windows with 6/6 internal grids, wrap the window trim, soffit and fascia with aluminum coil wrap and install new black shutters.

The applicant notes that the new vinyl siding will match the siding on the detached garage.

Staff presented photographs of the property and the existing siding and windows provided by the applicant noting some of the damage to the existing materials on the building.

Mr. White asked if the foundation would be painted to match the new siding color. The applicant affirmed noting they would also match the front door color.

Mr. Craycraft noted to the commission he wonders what the cost difference is between the vinyl and composite for the home.

Mr. Lynch asked if they have had any estimates for other materials. The applicant indicated that they have not. The whole neighborhood has vinyl siding and vinyl windows. A different material would not be cost effective.

Mr. Lynch asked staff if this home has ever come before the Landmarks Commission. Staff noted that it has not.

Mr. Lynch notes that this is one of two homes in the neighborhood that has cedar shake siding. Staff affirmed noting that there is a second house on the north side of the neighborhood that has cedar shake siding. The prior property owner requested to replace that siding back in 2019 and the Landmarks Commission denied the application as presented.

Mrs. Elliott noted that they walked up and down the street in that neighborhood and all of the homes have vinyl siding. They want to keep this home with a cottage feel and charming to fit into the neighborhood. The shutters for the remodel would be a New England/Colonial style.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the awnings would stay removed from the home. The applicant affirmed.

The applicant noted that they wanted to do this project pre-Covid but they have put it on hold until now. The home across the street just got remodeled with new siding and windows and that probably did not get any approval from the Landmarks Commission.

Mr. Craycraft asked if all of the trim up the rake and fascia on the front will be aluminum wrapped.

Mr. Lynch asked if there were any photographs that show the existing window trim up close. Staff put the photo's that were submitted with the application up on the screen for the commission to review.

The applicant noted that one of the windows is leaking on the inside and is in desperate need for replacement.

Mr. White asked if the rear porch railings and posts remain as is. The applicant noted it is a natural finish right now. White asked if the porch skirting would match the home. The applicant affirmed noting the gable under the porch roof will be painted to match.

Mr. White asked the applicant if the siding they wanted to install will match the garage siding. The applicant affirmed.

The commission discussed another house at the corner of the street that had aluminum siding approved to be removed and replaced with vinyl siding. Photographs of the siding that was removed from the other home were shared with the commission. The applicant noted that this home has a dutch lap siding that is similar to what they are requesting to install on this home.

The applicant noted that the house directly across the street that just sold has a new vinyl dutch lap siding on the exterior. An investor purchased the property a few years ago and flipped the home. It has a gray dutch lap siding now.

Mr. Craycraft and Mr. Lynch noted that many of the homes in this neighborhood seem to do what they want without getting any approvals first.

Mr. White noted that he has heard conjecture that this neighborhood should not be part of the Preservation District boundary. Staff noted that City Council added this neighborhood to the Preservation District in 2003 when it was created. All of the homes in this area are over 50 years old at the time.

Mrs. Boving commented to the commission that this neighborhood has various stages with homes of different ages. The homes in the back are newer than her home at the corner of West Street and West Waterloo which is 100 years old.

Mrs. Elliott discussed other homes in the neighborhood that have been purchased by investment firms and flipped with new vinyl siding. The goal with this renovation is to keep the charm of the home. The inside has been updated but the outside needs replaced or it will start to deteriorate as the shingles are already brittle.

Staff asked the commission if there is a vinyl shake siding option available for the home. Mr. Lynch noted they do have vinyl shake siding and he recently spec'd it for a project on Groveport Road. The applicant noted that the vinyl shake siding is very costly and they felt if the neighborhood had other homes with the same style then they would follow suite. They are requesting to install a siding that matches the other homes around them. Mrs. Elliott noted that many of those other properties did not ask for permission and they are and they feel like they are being penalized. They are putting a lot of money into this project and it would not be cost effective to do anything different.

Mr. Lynch noted to the applicant that he does not think the recent quotes he has had for a vinyl shake siding was much more than a lap siding. Switching from a vinyl to composite is completely different cost wise. The applicant asked if the shake siding is individual pieces and Mr. Lynch noted they are in a huge sheet. It is vinyl shake so the scale will be a little smaller than the cedar but it would look similar.

Mr. Lynch noted that normally he would not recommend approval for vinyl going onto a home but given the context of the application and the garage has a newer vinyl product he could be comfortable with the vinyl shake for the home. The applicant noted that they would want the siding on the home to match the siding on the garage. The commission noted that it does not match now and the siding on the garage before was a 2.7" wood lap siding so the garage never matched the home.

Mrs. Elliott discussed that with the home on the corner of the street they were permitted to install a dutch lap vinyl product. Mr. Lynch noted that the home had horizontal siding before. The home being discussed this evening currently has a cedar shake siding. A like-for-like change is something the commission typically looks for on unaltered homes.

Mr. Lynch discussed that when an installer typically does a vinyl siding job they use aluminum wrap. The aluminum wrap covers architectural details around windows the window casings. The aluminum wrap is one item that typically gets an application denied as presented. In the instance for this home there is a detailed window casing that would be covered up if the aluminum wrap would be installed as presented. The applicant noted that they would understand if they were in the Historic District but what they are looking to do will make this one of the nicest homes in the neighborhood. They have taken the initiative to do things the right way and people that do work without asking are doing these things. If this home was on Mound or Columbus Street then it would be a non-issue but even questioning this neighborhood in the preservation district should allow some flexibility.

Mr. Lynch notes that this home is in the preservation district currently. This is one of two homes in the neighborhood that has a shake style siding that is original to the home. This makes it look different than the rest of the neighborhood and creates value. Mrs. Elliott responds saying that the commission does not know how many other homes had cedar shake that has been replaced with something else. Mr. Lynch affirmed that is accurate but the commission also has to consider this decision and how that will guide and influence other future decisions in the Historic and Preservation area. Another home in this neighborhood had a very similar application that was not approved for similar reasons.

Mr. Lynch discussed with the applicant that the coil wrap takes the individual profile in the window casing and covers it with a flat piece of metal.

The applicant asked if this is saying they are not going to approve new vinyl windows on the home. Mr. Lynch noted they do approve vinyl windows but the difference in this application is they are requesting for internal window grids and not a simulated divided light window pattern. The applicant asked for that to be explained further and member Lynch noted that the application shows the grids being in-between the panes of glass and not a physically protruded mullion to the window.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the current windows have grids. The applicant noted that they have grids now but not having grids in the new windows is not a big deal. Mr. Lynch noted if they want to do grids his recommendation would be for the simulated divided light mullions, otherwise no grids would be fine in this application.

Mrs. Elliott asked if the exterior view looks different with the simulated divided light grids. Staff noted that the SDL grids are on the outside as well as the inside. The applicant noted they would not install windows that have interior grids because you can not wash them as easily and it would not be visible from the street. Staff noted that SDL windows have a protrusion which you can see from the outside of the home. Staff noted to the commission that the window

company they intended on using does have an SDL product as it is mentioned in the applicant's submittal.

Staff asked the applicant if they have individual photo's of any of the windows to share with the commission. The applicant searched through their file for photos to share.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the same contractor is doing the install for the siding and windows. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Lynch looking at the photos submitted in the application show one of the windows has a horizontal grid, making it a unique 2/2 window construction. With that being said, no grids is an option if they do not want to do a SDL window. Mr. Elliott confirmed that SDL has grids on the exterior. Lynch confirmed. Mrs. Elliott asked when you wash the windows do you have to wash each grid separately. The commission affirmed.

The commission noted they are comfortable with replacements being a 1/1 window with no grids.

The applicant noted with product delays they are worried about getting this done this spring. Spending more money on different siding that wont match the garage. With the proposed siding and adding the black shutters it would fit into the neighborhood.

Staff noted to the applicant that the current metal awnings help with the sunlight intrusion and energy costs. The applicant noted that the house was professionally insulated right after they purchased in 18 years ago.

Mr. White asked member Lynch what the cost difference was for the vinyl shake shingles. Mr. Lynch indicated for that particular project the cost difference was 4%. Mrs. Elliott noted she is okay with exploring the vinyl shake siding if its similar in cost. Mr. Elliott stated he heard it would cost double. Lynch recommended shopping around and the applicant noted that they already have a contractor lined up and they do not want to shop around and possible lose the person who has committed to doing the job.

Mrs. Elliott explained that they need the work done now so the windows do not leak and cause plaster damage.

Staff pulled up for the commission that the same siding brand as being requested this evening has a vinyl shake shingle product available.

The applicant is pulling up photographs for the shutters on their personal home to show the commission as they are the same style and color they are requesting at this property. Mr. Lynch looked at the photo and noted that Keim Lumber has them in a composite and wood that holds paint better than the vinyl.

Mr. Elliott notes that on Home Depot's website the vinyl shake product is about \$100 more expensive per piece than what they are requesting. Mr. Lynch asked what the brand was and if that was per square. The applicant noted it was a different brand but same per square foot calculation.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant where they got the shutters that are on their personal home. The applicant indicated Amazon.

Mr. Lynch noted that he is not speaking for everyone, but for himself the Landmarks Commission has denied vinyl product applications in both districts. Personally, going out on a limb a vinyl shake for this home seems appropriate. The applicant noted the disappointment in being asked to have the pillar home on the street when others do work without asking. Mr. Lynch responded that it is as equally disappointing to continue to inform people that they have to go before the design review first.

Mr. Lynch informed the commission that his opinion is unchanged on the aluminum coil wrap not being appropriate as it covers the trim. If vinyl siding does get approved then they could explore installing new wood or composite trim similar to what is there now.

Mr. Craycraft noted that the vertical trim on the one photo provided looks like the same as a brickmold. Mr. Lynch noted it is similar just a little bigger than a 1.75" standard brickmold.

Mr. Lynch noted that the windows in the two photo's presented look original to the home.

Mr. Craycraft notes he agrees with the Chairman's comments and that its unfortunate in this neighborhood there is work that is done without review first. Mrs. Elliott noted her disappointment in what is being done about work performed without approval. Those folks should have been required to have stuff replaced or heavily fined. Following the rules is causing a hurt.

Mrs. Boving asked if the garage has vinyl siding and if it was there when they purchased the property. The applicant could not recall if they installed the vinyl siding but they were unaware this was in the Landmarks District until a few years ago a tenant gave them a flier noting that it was within the Preservation District.

Mr. White commented that the city has recently adopted legislation to send mailers out every year letting folks know that their property is within the architectural district.

Mrs. Boving states that while she is new to the board, she feels that the vinyl siding on the garage helps the case for matching siding on the home. Mr. Lynch noted that it sounds like the garage got the new vinyl siding without approval.

The applicant noted that when they replaced the siding on the garage it was a 2-3" wood lap siding underneath. Mrs. Elliott noted it was a like-for-like change. Mr. Lynch stated that the garage and house in that case never matched. Having them not match now but match materials that are there now would be consistent. The applicant noted that they personally think the siding types should match.

Mrs. Elliott asked if they would consider just having shake siding on the gable ends on the front of the building like what was done with the home on the corner. Dr. Kelly noted that the home on the corner already had a break in different siding styles on the gable end that was being carried through to the new design. This home is the same shake siding all the way around.

Mr. Lynch noted another difference between the home on the corner and this property is that the house on the corner had no trim details before and those were added with the renovation. This home has trim already that is being proposed to be covered up. Mr. Lynch discussed the trim on the home now with the soffit and entry crown, including the gable. That trim has to be covered with new wood to act as a spacer or removed to add the coil wrap.

Mr. Lynch noted that what sets this house apart from others in the neighborhood is the trim is still intact. Windows can be trimmed out to match what is there any a piece of J-channel in the vinyl siding could be added to eliminate the need for the coil wrap.

Mrs. Elliott noted that many of these details are not distinguishable from the street. Mr. Lynch discussed that there must have been a reason this neighborhood was added to the Landmark's preservation district. This home is one of the only ones left that still looks like a cottage. The shakes on this home adds variety to the neighborhood.

Mrs. Elliott discussed her concern with the budget of these changes. Mr. Lynch stated it is worth looking into the changes because his vote would be not to install horizontal siding and coil wrap. New vinyl windows are okay with the appropriate grids if they are wanted and shutters are okay in a non-vinyl product.

Mrs. Elliott discussed she does not understand the comments on the trim. Mr. Elliott asked if the commission wants vinyl trim. The commission noted to keep the trim that is there now or replicate it with wood or composite material. Coil is a flat stock so all of the relief and detail gets lost on an old home. That is the whole point of the Commission is to preserve these fine details. Coil will cover it up.

Mr. Lynch discussed with the board that personally coil wrap influences 90% of what is wrong with vinyl siding as a whole. With vinyl comes coil typically because nobody wants to do the work on trimming the windows. The applicant noted that they do not build things like they used too and contractors probably

don't know how to do the work anymore without the coil. This is not a \$500,000 home.

Mr. Lynch noted there are options to the standard practice. Trim can be composite, PVC or other materials to get details. Vinyl siding can be added with trim because it helps the vinyl look better and like something else.

Mr. Elliott noted that the coil was to intended to be used as a cap for the vinyl to fit into. Mr. Lynch affirmed noting that is a J-channel and a traditional house would not have that extra piece.

Mrs. Elliott stated these details will not make their property worth any more than the surrounding homes. These changes could easily double or triple the project cost. That may prohibit the project from being done at all.

Mr. Craycraft asked Mr. Lynch if a vinyl shake product would still have a J-channel. Lynch affirmed noting that it could abut a piece of trim.

Member Mrs. Boving noted that she is abstaining from the vote because she does not understand enough on the background for this particular issue.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-011 be approved as presented.

The motion failed by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Peter Lynch, Roger White, David Craycraft, Whit Wardell & Dr. Scott Kelly

Abstain: 1 - Linda Boving

Old Business

Staff noted that the new build across the street from Local Cantina just wrapped up and the apartment units should be ready to lease soon.

New Business

Staff noted to the commission that they are working on starting a process when someone sets up their water bill to be notified of being in the Landmarks Boundary.

Adjournment

Time Out: 8:23pm

A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by Peter Lynch, that this meeting be adjourned.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Linda Boving, Peter Lynch, Roger White, David Craycraft, Whit

Wardell & Dr. Scott Kelly

Date

Landmarks Chairman