

# Canal Winchester

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



## Meeting Minutes

**September 25<sup>th</sup>, 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 Mr. White, seconded by Mr. Craycraft, that Rich Dobda be excused.**

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

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

Approval of Minutes

August 28<sup>th</sup>, 2023 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

**A motion was made by Mr. Craycraft, seconded by Mr. Wardell, that the August 28<sup>th</sup>, 2023 Minutes be approved.**

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

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

Pending Applications**CA-23-035**

Property Owner: David Tebben  
Applicant: Window Depot Columbus East  
Location: 66 N Trine Street  
Request: New Windows

Mr. Moore presented the application on behalf of Window Depot for new windows at 66 N Trine Street.

The residential house was constructed around 1885. It is noted in the historic inventory form that there is a small brick building behind the house that was constructed around 1922. Later there was a detached garage-style accessory unit building constructed behind that.

The applicant is seeking approval to replace 27 windows on the single family home. Most of the existing windows are wood, varying in age and condition. The applicant is requesting to install new vinyl double hung windows. Two windows are located in the basement. The applicant is requesting to do ventilated glass block, if permitted, or a single patterned tilt window.

Mr. Craycraft asked if there was a mixture of wood and vinyl on the home. The applicant said it is mostly wood, it has just been installed at various different times. The current windows do not match the sashes and frames and it was all cobbled together throughout the years.

Mr. Craycraft asked to clarify what type of windows were on the front of the home. The applicant responded that on the front of the house, they are single lite windows and on the sides they are 2-over-2. The proposal is to replace 2-over-2 throughout, except in the back where the windows are smaller and would be single lite.

The applicant also noted that they would be replacing the windows in the original house as well as the addition.

Staff asked the applicant to clarify what types of windows would be used in the replacement as the paperwork was showing windows with no grid. The applicant stated they would be using simulated divided lite windows.

The applicant described the different styles of windows currently on the home and where they were located.

Mr. Lynch asked if the 2-over-2 windows, that were not shown in the cut sheets, were going to be replaced like for like. The applicant affirmed and stated they do offer a simulated divided lite and are not grids between the glass.

Mr. Lynch asked if the remaining 1-over-1's were original to the addition and the applicant said they were.

The applicant stated that everything above grade in the original structure would be 2-over-2. In the basement portion, there are 2 full size windows that would remain 1-over-1 windows.

Mr. Craycraft asked if it would make more sense to have all the windows be a 2-over-2 so they are all uniform. Discussion ensued about how many total windows were on the structure(s) and what would be best solution regarding consistency of all the windows.

The applicant noted that they plan to reuse as much of the existing trim as possible and match to the best of their ability any remaining trim.

The commission commented that they do not believe they have approved any glass block windows in the Preservation or Historic District.

**A motion was made by Mr. Craycraft, seconded by Mr. Lynch, that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-035 be approved as with the following conditions.**

- 1. The main home windows be 2 over 2, simulated divided lite.**
- 2. The addition be 1 over 1 windows.**
- 3. The basement windows be the awning style vinyl windows.**
- 4. All exterior window trim to match.**

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

**Yes: 6 – Peter Lynch, Dr. Scott Kelly, Roger White, Whit Wardell, Linda**

Boving & David Craycraft

**CA-23-036**

Property Owner: The Arthur Group LLC  
Applicant: Phillip Arthur  
Location: 30 West Oak Street  
Request: New Freestanding Sign

Mr. Moore presented the application for a new freestanding sign at 30 West Oak Street. The applicant is seeking approval to construct a new freestanding sign on the front of the property. The sign is shown to be centered on the frontage and 10 feet from the curb. The sign will be dual sided and under 8 square feet. The application does not note how tall the sign will be, but the maximum height in Old Town is 6 feet. The drawings note the sign will be constructed out of a ½" MDO panel with printed graphics.

The applicant is present. Mr. Lynch asked staff if this project meets all of the setback requirements. Mr. Moore acknowledged that it appeared so and the specifics would be addressed when the permit is pulled.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the posts would be pressure treated, painted or cedar. The applicant responded that they would be pressure treated.

Dr. Kelly inquired if there would be any lighting. Mr. Arthur said he plans to use solar lighting on the ground aimed upwards at the sign.

**A motion was made by Mr. White, seconded by Mr. Craycraft, that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-036 be approved as presented.**

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

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

**CA-23-037**

Property Owner: Fairfield Trine LLC  
Applicant: Kessler Sign CO  
Location: 29 W Waterloo Street  
Request: New Sign

Mr. Moore presented the application for a new wall sign at 29 West Waterloo Street. In April 2021, the Landmarks Commission approved the construction of a new 11,000 sq. ft. mixed use commercial building. Construction was recently completed earlier this year.

The applicant is seeking approval to install a new wall sign above the front entrance of 29 West Waterloo Street. The signage being requested is 12.3 sq. ft. and is proposed to be aluminum channel letters. The letters will stand off of the wall 1 inch and are ¼ inch thick. The applicant is also requesting to install three (3) gooseneck lights above the sign.

Mr. Craycraft asked if there are currently any gooseneck lights on the building and the applicant stated there were not.

Mr. Craycraft noted that if they were approved, they would need to approve the same thing for the potential tenant of the neighboring space in the building.

Ms. Boving noted she thought the lights looked good with the existing black railing.

Property Owner, Mr. Weiser noted that they have not seen this application before this evening but noted they liked the design and in the future the other tenant on the other half would have to match the style of sign and lighting.

**A motion was made by Mr. Lynch, seconded by Dr. Kelly, that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-033 be approved as presented.**

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

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

**CA-23-038**

Property Owner: Weiser Wood LLC

Applicant: Todd Weiser

Location: 8 South High Street

Request: Selective Demolition

Mr. Moore presented the application for selective demolition at 8 South High Street. The applicant is seeking approval to perform selective demolition on the front façade to remove the existing marble. The applicant wants to see the condition of the façade underneath the marble to determine a plan for renovation to bring the building back to the early 1900's photograph provided in the application.

The applicant is also seeking approval to remove the existing ATM canopy area behind the building, accessible from West Waterloo Street. This area will be cleared and used for parking for the time being. As of now, there is no known timeline for when the applicant would return with a revised plan for the future of this building as it is dependent on what they find during the demolition.

Mr. Craycraft inquired whether the applicant knew how much of the original façade was intact or if that would be discovered upon the removal of the marble panels. Mr. Weiser informed the commission that they found many original features of the space that had been covered up, including fireplaces and railings, so he is hopeful that the original façade is under the marble. They are committed to recreating it if it is not.

Mr. Weiser stated that it would probably be close to spring 2024 before they would return to the commission with a plan for the property.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant what the plans were regarding the potential mess and if it would be covered up or stay as is until the spring. Mr. Weiser explained that they have filed for a right of way permit to be able to occupy the sidewalk while they remove the marble. Once they can see the condition of the existing windows they will develop a plan to make it pleasing to look at and safe until they can begin work in the spring.

The commission asked if they had started demolition on the inside. Mr. Weiser answered that they have begun cautiously and plan to make it an empty space so they can see everything they are working with.

Mr. Weiser stated that ideally he hopes to keep the space as just one tenant. The restrooms are not adequate and will need to be updated. They intend to leave the vault in the middle.

Mr. Craycraft asked for the square footage. Mr. Weiser stated there is about 4,000 square feet as well as a full basement.

The commission collectively stated that they believe this will be a great addition to the downtown area.

Staff asked if there were any other questions regarding the canopy demolition and there were none.

**A motion was made by Mr. Craycraft, seconded by Mr. Lynch, that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-038 be approved as presented.**

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

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

**CA-23-039**

Property Owner: Patrick & Theresa Reade LLC

Applicant: Danite Sign Co

Location: 44 South High Street

Request: New Freestanding Sign

Mr. Moore presented the application for a new freestanding sign at 44 South High Street. He updated the commission that on Labor Day weekend, one of the pillars fell down and there is currently a temporary post in place for safety. They are working on sourcing matching materials to best match what has been there.

The applicant is seeking approval to install a new freestanding sign on the southeast corner of High Street and Columbus Street. There is an existing sign that is proposed to be completely removed for the installation of the new sign. Plans submitted show a new sign to go in its place. The sign will be set between two (2) 4x4 posts with an aluminum cap painted white. The new sign will be double sided instead of the L shape that is currently there.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if it would be similar in scale to what is currently there and she responded yes. The new sign would be made of aluminum instead of wood with no lighting.

Staff asked the applicant if the bolts on the frame would be visible. The applicant was not positive but was going to confirm with her office and believed they would not be visible.

**A motion was made by Mr. Craycraft, seconded by Ms. Boving, that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-039 be approved as presented.**

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

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

**CA-23-040**

Property Owner: Ally & Casey Cook  
Applicant: Ally & Casey Cook  
Location: 56 Washington Street  
Request: New Fence

Mr. Moore presented the application for a new fence at 56 Washington Street. The applicant is seeking approval to construct a new 3.5' wooden picket fence in the rear yard. They have submitted examples of a cedar French gothic picket fence panel system that they would prefer to use. If the neighbor permits, they would like to tie into that existing fence.

The applicant affirmed that the two styles would match. His fence would be painted white to match the other fence and the trim of his home.

Mr. White asked if the fence would need to age for a while before painting and the commission answered that if it was cedar, he would not need to wait.

**A motion was made by Mr. Lynch, seconded by Mr. Craycraft, that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-040 be approved as with the following conditions.**

- 1. The fence be painted white with the finished side out.**

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

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

**CA-23-041**

Property Owner: MOBO Holdings LLC  
Applicant: Meg Fruth  
Location: 48 E Waterloo Street  
Request: Modifications to CA-22-040

During the renovation of this commercial space, the applicant made some changes to the original approval, CA-22-040, and is seeking approval of those changes.

Mr. Moore presented the requested modifications. The first change was the original prints showed one light being installed by the door and the applicant installed two lights.

When looking at the detail on the side of the house, it was spec'd that the covered walkways for the detached garage were to have a similar design feature, however the applicant did something a little more substantial with the posts. This change has caused an obstacle and makes it hard to access the porch. The applicant is looking to extend the walkway out further so you may access the porch entrance.

There was supposed to be a ½ lite rear door installed in the garage and a ¼ lite door was installed.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the door to the garage faces the alley and the applicant affirmed.

The applicant, Mrs. Fruth, stated that the changes were done by the contractor and rather than have them change these retroactively, they are seeking permission for what was done.

Mr. Moore asked the applicant if she had spoken to the contractor about dressing up the posts. She stated that planters and landscaping are coming.

Mrs. Fruth also brought attention to another request they were seeking, which is to add an additional parking spot. The prior approval was to add two more parking spaces and they believe they will need three.

Discussion ensued about the changes to the rear and garage entry points, specifically the posts that were used and how to dress them up to be more cohesive with front of the property. Pictures were provided of the changes for the commission to look at and offer suggestions.

Mr. Lynch asked the commission if they had any issues with the two lights by the front door and they agreed that it looked nice and symmetrical.

The commission asked why the different door was chosen in the back. Mrs. Fruth answered that she believed it was availability of materials and her instructions to the contractor were to not install a full lite door.



The commission discussed the variations of the doors on the property and ultimately decided that because the doors are on different elevations and sides of the property, they are ok with the new door remaining as is.

The Commission discussed further details for dressing up the garage posts to match the lower column trim on the main building. A drawing was provided to the applicant as Exhibit A on how to do so. The commission also noted that the gable ends on the canopy at the garage is aluminum and is already seeing signs of warping. The commission noted to install a thin piece of wood or wood composite material directly over the aluminum to hide the defect. The applicant affirmed of these changes.

**A motion was made by Mr. Craycraft, seconded by Mr. Craycraft, that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-23-041 be approved as with the following conditions.**

- 1. The 4x4 posts be trimmed out with a lower panel to 36" in height to match exhibit A.**
- 2. The gable ends on the detached garage be wrapped with a natural material and painted to match the trim color.**
- 3. Both gable ends have matching trim.**

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

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

Old Business  
**CA-22-030**

Property Owner: Teena Brown  
Applicant: Michael Felkey  
Location: 29 West Oak Street  
Request: New Metal Roof

Mr. Moore invited the owner of 29 W. Oak Street to come talk about application #CA-22-030. After doing other progress checks around town, Mr. Moore noticed that the roof installed at 29 W. Oak Street did not appear to match what had previously been approved in August 2022.

Mr. Moore presented the details from the original application, including previously presented photographs. A G-Rib style roof with exposed fasteners is what has been installed on this roof in the same color that was presented.

Mr. Moore noted that the applicant came in and spoke with him and the applicant commented that the roof that was installed is what was intended and

the photographs presented at the original meeting were for color only and not for material.

Mr. White asked staff if the audio was available and staff responded that it was on the City's website. Mr. Moore noted that the original application prompted a very brief discussion and the minutes from that meeting reflect what was discussed.

Mr. Lynch stated that the original application was presented as requesting a new standing seam metal roof. A true standing seam roof does not have any visible fasteners. He believes there could have been a misunderstanding in what a standing seam roof meant.

The property next door to 29 W. Oak Street installed the same roof as this applicant and the commission had them remove it to install a more appropriate roof.

Discussion ensued about the original approval and the documents presented at that time, including the contractor agreement, which included the materials intended to be used. The commission reviewed the minutes, staff report and pictures that were presented.

Staff is asking the commission to vote on if they approve the roof as it was constructed or if they approved the roof based on what was presented at the original meeting in August 2022, which is different from the installed roof.

Ms. Boving asked staff if she should vote as she did not become a member of the commission until 2023. Staff explained that it was at her discretion as she has been able to read the minutes and look over the original application.

**A motion was made by Dr. Kelly, seconded by Mr. Lynch, that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-22-030 be approved as constructed.**

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

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

The applicant excused himself and the commission discussed how to avoid this problem in the future. Suggestions included requiring actual examples of the materials and stating in the approval that no visible fasteners are to be used.

Staff informed the commission what the applicant's options would have been had they decided to not approve his roof and also that the building inspector will not look at anything aesthetic.

Staff informed the commission that Brian Vance would be appealing their decision to City Council on October 2<sup>nd</sup>. Mr. Haire will be handling that discussion as he was present for the initial application hearing. Mr. Lynch was encouraged to attend as the Chairman of the commission.

New Business

Mr. Craycraft presented a change the applicants were hoping to make to the prior approval at 121 W. Columbus Street. The contractor is in the process of ordering the shutters for the windows and the owner does not want to put shutters around the big window under the porch. The majority of the commission was ok with omitting the shutters on that one window.

Mr. Craycraft also brought up a change to the white panels presented to be on the garage. He no longer thinks the three panels are necessary for the garage. He also informed the commission that there is a plan for a fence to go up on the property which would hide the garage from view. The commission was in agreement with omitting the panels.

Adjournment

*Time Out: 8:33pm*

**A motion was made by Mr. White, seconded by Dr. Kelly, that this meeting be adjourned.**

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Landmarks Chairman