

Canal Winchester

COMMUNITY CENTER
22 SOUTH TRINE STREET
Canal Winchester, OH 43110



Meeting Minutes

September 28, 2020

7:00 PM

Landmarks Commission

Pete Lynch - Chairman
David Craycraft – Vice Chairman
Rich Dobda - Secretary
Roger White
Jamoya Cox
Dr. Scott Kelly
Whit Wardell

Call To Order

Time In: 7:00pm

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)

A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by David Craycraft that Whit Wardell be excused from the meeting.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Dave Craycraft, Roger White, Rich Dobda, Jamoya Cox, Dr. Scott Kelly & Peter Lynch

Excused: 1 – Whit Wardell

Approval of Minutes

August 24, 2020 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Jamoya Cox, that the August 24, 2020 Minutes be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Dave Craycraft, Roger White, Rich Dobda, Jamoya Cox, Dr. Scott Kelly & Peter Lynch

Pending Applications**CA-20-025**

Property Owner: Jo Lavender

Applicant: Jo Lavender

Location: 52 North Trine Street

Request: Wood Deck & Vinyl Siding on Garage

Mr. Moore presented the application for Jo Lavender for property located at 52 North Trine Street. The applicant is requesting approval for two items this evening. The first is to remove the concrete stoop at the rear entry to the home and replace it with a composite wood deck. The second is to wrap the detached garage in vinyl siding. Staff presented a brief history of the property as indicated in the CW Historic Inventory Form.

Staff shared photographs of the existing stoop to be removed and the drawings for the new deck. The plans show the deck will go all the way to the right and fill in the gap where the stoop stopped short. The drawings indicate the decking will be made out of a Trex material with an aluminum rail on the left side. The plans do not note the color of the proposed Trex or aluminum to be used.

The second part of the application is the wrap the detached garage with new vinyl siding to match the single family home. The applicant has supplied

photographs of the existing condition of the detached garage for review. Staff noted that the home got the vinyl siding added in the late 1980's and it is noted that the home featured a wide hardboard wood siding prior. The existing wood siding is a 5" profile and the proposed vinyl siding is a 4" profile.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant what color the Trex deck boards were going to be. Mrs. Lavender said that the decking is a charcoal grey color, called 'Island Mist'.

Mr. White asked what color the railing is going to be. Mrs. Lavender said the posts will be wrapped in white aluminum and the caps and spindles will be black.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if the stoop is being removed. The applicant affirmed and noted that the new deck will go all the way to the door on the right hand side.

Mr. Craycraft commented to the commission that he does not have any further questions on the rear deck.

Mr. Lynch commented that after reviewing the photographs of the detached garage, that aside from some scraping needed for new paint, are there other issues with the wood that the photographs do not show. Mrs. Lavender noted that some of the wood is rotten around the base of the building. A few painters came out and looked at the garage and said that if they paint it, it will need to be scraped and painted again in 2-3 years.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the new vinyl is going over top of the wood siding. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. White asked if the pergola is going to remain. The applicant affirmed.

Dr. Kelly asked the applicant if the painter provided a letter or estimate noting that they do not think the building is in good shape to paint. Mrs. Lavender said she does not have anything in writing.

Mrs. Lavender stated that the cost to paint the building was at \$1,500 and the cost to install new vinyl siding was \$2,100. It made more sense to install new siding that to repaint and scrape the garage every few years.

Mrs. Amos stated to the commission that there are soft spots around the garage that with little pressure the wood will crumble. Mr. Lynch asked if she was referring to the siding or the wood trim. Mrs. Amos stated the siding.

Mrs. Amos further explained that the contractors think that the wood studs are good enough that they can still install the new vinyl overtop and that the studs will hold. If they were going to repaint the building, some of the boards would need to be replaced as they are not viable for paint.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if they have explored replacing the bad sections of wood siding. Mrs. Amos said that they have not and the existing siding is old and not well maintained. Mrs. Amos stated that she wishes she could say its salvageable but it is not. As you can see by the photo's, there is a lot of paint texture in the wood and pressure causes the paint to flake off.

Mrs. Lavender commented that one of the painters did note that even if it was scrapped and repainted, you will still see the unevenness in the wood from the previous layers of paint. Damage would still be visible through the paint.

Dr. Kelly asked the applicant if they have considered a different material other than vinyl, such as a cement board. Mrs. Lavender said she is not sure what cement board is but the thought was to use a material that matched the house.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if the main house has wood siding under the vinyl. Staff indicated that they are unsure but the inventory form notes that the wide hardboard wood siding was replaced or covered in 1987.

Mr. White asked the property owner if there were any plans for the windows on the garage. Mrs. Lavender commented that they will be trimmed. Mrs. Amos added that they will not be replaced.

Mr. Lynch commented that with a standard vinyl siding installation, the installer would try and wrap the window in a metal trim. The aluminum trim is something that the commission has not permitted in new vinyl siding applications. The option would be to leave the window alone or after the new siding is installed to retrim the windows with wood.

Mr. Lynch stated that a hardi board is a fiber cement composite material that is highly recommended by the commission. It looks very similar to wood siding and can come pre-painted. This product is preferred the commission typically recommends to not use vinyl siding. Mrs. Lavender said she knows what hardi plank material is and was not aware that was a cement board. That product is priced more than vinyl.

Staff commented that the application does note metal trim is to be installed around the building with the vinyl siding.

Mr. Lynch asked staff about the other property in the area that has the aluminum wrap on the windows. Staff commented saying that one application was denied and in another application aluminum wrap was installed by the home owner when during the meeting the confirmed the use of wood trim. In that specific case the applicant did comment to the board that he was going to replace the siding in the future and at that time the aluminum coil wrap around the windows was to be removed.

Mr. Lynch commented that it is hard to tell from the photo's if the windows will need new trim or not. Mrs. Amos stated there is a small ¼" lip around the windows, but applying new wood trim around the windows to go with the new vinyl siding is easy. If that is what it takes for approval.

Mrs. Amos stated that the applicant's main request for the vinyl siding is that she just purchased the home and is to have the garage match the home. However, wood trim around the windows are not a problem.

Mr. Lynch stated that the door may need to be trimmed out as well. Mrs. Amos commented that the door has a wider ¾" trim than the windows so it should be OK as is.

Mr. Lynch stated that it is always a tough decision when the main structure has vinyl. Typically, that product is encouraged to be eliminated throughout town. Mrs. Amos stated that if the house siding was not so new, she would agree. However, the vinyl siding on the house is in great shape.

Mr. Lynch asked staff how old the vinyl siding is. Staff indicated it was installed around 1987. Mrs. Amos said it is in great shape.

Mr. Lynch asked if they have verified they can match the color of the main house. Mrs. Lavender confirmed that they can. Mrs. Amos commented that the existing vinyl is a very natural light grey color. It's a very cute house with original stunning hardwood floors.

Mrs. Lavender said she loves the house but thinks the current garage is an eyesore.

Mrs. Lavender said that the vinyl siding can come in a wider width than the 4" if they are considered with the width of the new material. Dr. Kelly said they are more concerned about the material itself.

Mr. Craycraft asked what the exposure is on the siding on the house. Staff indicated that application shows it's a 4" vinyl on the home.

Mrs. Amos stated that for a point of reference, the garage can not be seen from the street and only from the alley located behind the home.

Mr. Craycraft commented that he does not know the condition of the wood on the garage is and if it can hold new paint.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Jamoya Cox, that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-20-025 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. The vinyl siding be the same 4" profile and color as the single family home.**
- 2. All doors and windows on the garage have wood trim.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Dave Craycraft, Roger White, Rich Dobda, Jamoya Cox, Dr. Scott Kelly & Peter Lynch

CA-20-026

Property Owner: John & Marshall Crabtree
Applicant: John & Marshall Crabtree
Location: 116 East Columbus Street
Request: Vinyl Privacy Fence

Mr. Moore presented the application for John & Marshall Crabtree for property located at 116 East Columbus Street. The applicants are requesting approval for a new vinyl privacy fence along the eastern property line. Staff discussed the application and noted that the property owners received approval during the August 2020 Landmarks Commission meeting to construct a 6 foot decorative wood privacy fence along the same location on the east side of the lot.

Staff discussed that since the last landmarks meeting, the applicant has reached out to staff with concerns about the wood fence that was approved, specifically maintenance. The applicant has indicated that they already have a wood picket fence in the same location and while it is most likely located on their property, the fence belongs to the adjacent land owner. The applicant believes there was some verbal agreement with the old property owner and the neighbor that permitted the picket fence to be located there. The concern being that if they construct the new wood fence directly adjacent to the existing picket fence, there would be limit ability to paint the one side of the fence in the future.

Staff clarified that the application does not state the height of the proposed vinyl fence but it is believed to be 6 foot based on the previous application.

The applicant has prepared a presentation for the commissions review showing all of the other vinyl fences in the old town area and in other various subdivisions that surround the old town district. Staff presented those photographs to the commission.

Mr. Lynch asked staff to clarify which photographs in the applicant's presentation show vinyl within the landmarks review district. Staff clarified each location for the commission.

Mr. Lynch asked staff when the Dairy Queen vinyl fence was approved. Staff stated they think it was around 2014 - 2015. Lynch asked if that property is within the preservation district. Staff affirmed.

Marshell Crabtree asked if the photographs of the rear of their yard could be pulled up for the commission to review. Staff pulled up the photos. Mrs. Crabtree discussed that within the rear yard there was previously a row of arborvitae trees that screened the rear yard from the adjacent property. Those since have died in several spots so they are looking to install the fence.

Mrs. Crabtree discussed that based on the elevation of the property and the location of the proposed fence section, it will not be visible from the street. The fence is to provide the screening for the future swimming pool. The vinyl fence is cost efficient for this project and is in a limited location.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if they were here last month for approval for a wood fence. The applicant affirmed.

Mrs. Crabtree said that if you look at the front of the house, there is a wood fence that goes down the front and left property line of the home. That wood fence is not being proposed to change, just a portion of the eastern property line.

Staff shared with the commission the plans for the wood fence that was previously approved.

The commission discussed that there have been several requests in the past few years for vinyl fences and one in this same area that ended up being constructed out of wood.

Mr. Lynch discussed that he can not reference any vinyl fences that have been approved within the original historic district. As decent as this one looks in terms of style, a wood fence should be used in this application.

John Crabtree discussed that it is an accessibility issue for him. Mr. Crabtree continued to note that the house is the landmark, not the fence. The fence would not be visible from the street. Mr. Lynch responded noting that not all applications that come before the commission are items that are visible from the public street.

Mr. Crabtree discussed that this fence is going up against an existing wood fence. Due to this placement, there would be the inability to preserve it, which will cost money over time.

Mr. Lynch asked the property owners if the application is proposing two fences back-to-back. The applicant affirmed.

Staff clarified that Mr. & Mrs. Crabtree already have a wood picket fence on their property line. They have indicated that the wood picket fence, even though it is located on their property they believe it is owned by the neighbors. The property owners concern is that if they install a second wood fence, back-to-back, they will not have the ability to perform necessary maintenance on the opposite side.

Mr. Lynch asked staff if the fence along that property line is the same 4 foot picket fence. Staff affirmed noting that both this property and the property to the east have the same style picket fence around the rear yard.

Mr. Lynch asked the property owner what is holding back the removal of the existing picket fence for the new fence construction. The applicants indicated that the picket fence on their lot belongs to the neighbors and was there before they purchased the home.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicants if they purchased an easement for the fence. Mrs. Crabtree said that they do not know what arrangement the previous property owner made but they were told that the owner to the east paid for that fence to be installed. The neighboring property does not want their fence removed.

Mr. Crabtree indicated that they are doing a boundary survey for their own property to property identify everything. But they are giving the elderly neighbors deference because they have a historic home, which was moved to the property without a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Crabtree stated that he feels the vinyl fence should be approved for accessibility concerns as he is blind. Crabtree further discusses that he does maintain his property and he also wants to help out his veteran neighbor.

Mr. Crabtree discusses to the commission that they can advise him to do whatever the commission wants but the vinyl fence is what he wants to do. If this application is struck down, Mr. Crabtree stated he would appeal the decision to City Council. The house is the landmark, not the fence. Crabtree adds that he has the right to privacy, but he may not have the right to the material the commission thinks is appropriate, but what is being proposed is a suitable construction material that has been around for awhile now. Other property owners had to beg for vinyl, but he will not beg. At the same time, in this application the vinyl fence is appropriate.

Staff shared the aerial imagery to the commission again noting that both this property and the property to the east have the same style picket fence. As indicated by the applicant, based on this request the vinyl fence will be constructed directly against the picket fence. This would create a situation where this property owner would have two rows of fence line on their eastern property line.

Mr. Crabtree stated that there may be an ADA situation here and he might have to follow this discussion with a lawyer. However, he would hate to do that for a fence that will not be visible from the street.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant, with reference to the neighbor, that this fence request was discussed with them and that there would be difficulty maintaining a wood fence due to proximity to their picket fence. Mrs. Crabtree affirmed noting that the neighbors want to paint the picket fence before theirs is constructed to preserve theirs. Mr. Lynch asked why the two fences couldn't be maintained if there is a 4 foot gap between them. The applicant clarified that the new fence will be right against the 4 foot tall picket fence.

Staff noted that they have discussed with the applicant alternatives to the vinyl fence prior to the meeting to see if there is a solution that allows the previously approved fence to be constructed. These ideas ranged from stepping back the wood fence to only be around the perimeter of the pool concrete to taking down the existing picket fence and giving the material back to the neighbors so if they want they can construct it on their property. The property owners have explained that their goal is to gain the screening while allowing the neighbors the ability to keep the fence that is there. Both properties have a 4 foot picket fence on all property lines.

Dr. Kelly asked the applicant if they would shift the proposed fence line to step away from the picket fence. Mrs. Crabtree indicated that there were arborvitae that provided screening on the east property line before. Some have since died and been removed. Dr. Kelly asked if the new fence could be moved further into their yard. Mrs. Crabtree indicated no they do not want to do that.

Mr. Crabtree comments that the survey they are getting done will show the picket fence is on their property. It's a deference issue with the existing fence. The issue with the wood fence is that if they step it back and make the fence dual sided then there is now a 5 foot gap that interrupts the sidewalk. The existing house is nice and the proposed changes for the wood fence will make it not nice. Mr. Crabtree said if he has to install a wood fence then it will go against the neighboring fence and the outside will not get painted.

Mrs. Crabtree starts to discuss the stone patio at the rear of the yard and Mr. Crabtree states that they have the right to privacy and the right to install vinyl.

Staff stated that due to the number of items still to be on the agenda this evening, if there are any further questions for the applicants to try and wrap them up and gather their thoughts to vote on the application.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by Roger White that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-20-026 be approved as presented.

The motion failed by the following vote:

No: 6 - Dave Craycraft, Roger White, Rich Dobda, Jamoya Cox, Dr. Scott Kelly & Peter Lynch

CA-20-027

Property Owner: Venta Coffey
Applicant: Tyler Maginn
Location: 31 Liberty Street
Request: 4' Privacy Fence

Mr. Moore presented the application for Tyler Maginn for property located at 31 Liberty Street. The applicant is requesting approval for a 4 foot privacy fence that was installed on the northern property line. Staff presented photographs of the property to the commission, noting the different fencing styles around the yard.

The applicant has modified a portion of the northern fence line to be a privacy style by eliminating the gaps between the pickets. The change to the fencing was done only to that one section of the yard. The remainder is still the existing picket fence. A plot plan created by staff was presented to represent the current fence condition to the board.

Staff has reviewed the request for the change and is recommending to the commission that the east and western ends of the picket fence be modified to be a solid fence to match the change to the north. In addition, there is a section of fencing on the north end that remained a picket style. This section extends

towards the intersection, and staff feels that this fencing style inhibits sight lines for traffic flow and is recommending that it be removed.

Mr. White asked staff what the fence design is on the south property line. Staff indicated that the adjoining property owner has a 6 foot tall privacy fence.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff about the comment to remove the section of fence that goes towards the intersection. Staff noted that the existing fence does not meet current height regulation. Changing the style of the fence to be a privacy format does raise a safety concern going towards Liberty Street to be able to see around that corner. Additionally, the fence does turn now and tie into the rear corner of the house. This recommendation is to help clean up the lot.

The applicant indicated that they were under the impression that the fence that goes down Towing Path Alley could not be removed since it was installed by the city. Staff indicated that the fence is not required.

The applicant indicated that they are happy with the staff recommendation for the fence placement.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant if the privacy fence is 4 foot tall. The applicant affirmed.

The applicant indicated that they modified the fence to a privacy fence because the two dogs they have were able to push the pickets out on the fence wide enough to squeeze through and escape the yard.

Mr. Lynch asked staff if their recommendation is reflecting keeping the style as what was done on the north end by closing the gaps. Staff affirmed.

Mrs. Coffey discussed with the commission that there have been many different fence layouts on this and surrounding property over the years. The new fence design is to keep the general public happy as well as themselves.

Mr. White asked if the back of the fence will still have the plywood like the photographs. The applicants indicated that the plywood was just temporary until they could complete the fence.

Dr. Kelly asked if the fence was going to be painted or left natural. The applicant indicated that they were going to put a protective coating on it and leave it natural.

Mr. Lynch discusses with the applicant and the commission that an alternative to having the fence be a privacy style is to stagger the pickets inside and out. This allows for some visibility but also helps keep animals inside.

Mr. Maginn discussed that part of the request going to a solid privacy fence is to help keep the dogs from barking when they see people walking down the street.

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Peter Lynch that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-20-027 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. The existing 4' picket fence be removed at the current termination point towards Liberty Street.**
- 2. The remainder of the 4' picket fence be modified to match the 4' privacy fence along the north property line, per staff recommendation layout.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Dave Craycraft, Roger White, Rich Dobda, Jamoya Cox, Dr. Scott Kelly & Peter Lynch

CA-20-028

Property Owner: Jeff & Lisa Fisher
Applicant: Jeff & Lisa Fisher
Location: 46 East Columbus Street
Request: New Paint Color

Mr. Moore presented the application for Jeff & Lisa Fisher for property located at 46 East Columbus Street. The applicants are requesting approval to paint the wood addition to the rear of the home and the front door Sherman Williams 'Charcoal Blue'. Staff presented the photographs of the areas requested to be painted a color sample of the new paint scheme.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the side door on the front of the home will be painted blue with the rest of the siding. The applicants indicated that the side door will remain the white trim color.

Mr. Lynch commented that the new colors look great.

A motion was made by Roger White, seconded by Dr. Scott Kelly that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-20-028 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Dave Craycraft, Roger White, Rich Dobda, Jamoya Cox, Dr. Scott

Kelly & Peter Lynch

CA-20-029

Property Owner: Canal Winchester Area Historical Society

Applicant: Larry Flowers

Location: 10 West Oak Street

Request: New Wood Siding

Mr. Moore presented the application for Larry Flowers for the Chaney Mill located at 10 West Oak Street. The applicant is requesting approval for the removal of the exterior wood siding on the eastern face of the building to replace it with new wood siding. With the change for new material, the new siding will be left natural and not painted like the rest of the building. This is phase one of the project, with the entire building to be refaced over time.

Mr. Craycraft asked the applicant what size the boards are on the building. Mr. Flowers indicated that they are 1"x14".

Mr. Lynch asked what material will be used for the new siding. Mr. Flowers said it will be Oak. The Oak is a rough cut board.

Mr. Lynch asked if it is newly timbered material. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Flowers stated that this is phase one of the project. Over the next few years they will get the entire exterior redone and then start working on the interior of the building. The building will be left natural with some sort of water repellent. Once the outside is buttoned up, the inside will be done for museum space for the area's agricultural history.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the new boards are going to be nailed on the existing structure. The applicant indicated that the siding is actually a batten board.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicants if they are fastening the boards will old style nails. Mr. Flowers stated that most contractors are recommending using screws for the new siding. Craycraft asked if it was similar to a deck screw, the applicant stated a heavy duty deck screw.

Mr. Lynch commented that he has seen decking screws used in a similar type of application, but that is usually 10+ feet off the ground, that way the pedestrian scale see's a traditional nail head and not a more modern screw. Mr. Lynch suggested that be done for a little historical accuracy.

The applicants indicated that the building has been piecemealed together over time and at one point some of the siding was furring strips, which are now falling off the building.

Mr. Craycraft asked how wide the battens are. Mr. Flowers stated about 3”.

A motion was made by David Craycraft, seconded by Peter Lynch that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-20-029 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Dave Craycraft, Roger White, Jamoya Cox, Dr. Scott Kelly & Peter Lynch

Abstain: 1 – Rich Dobda

CA-20-030

Property Owner: Jacolyn Smith

Applicant: Jacolyn Smith

Location: 27 Washington Street

Request: 6’ Wood Privacy Fence

Mr. Moore presented the application for Jacolyn Smith for property located at 27 Washington Street. The applicant is requesting approval to install a new 6 foot wood privacy fence on the north side of the yard.

Staff presented photographs of the current modified chain link fence and informed the commission that the property owner was send a notice of violation for modifying the existing chain link fence without approval from the historic review board. Staff also informed the commission that the use of chain link and the green plastic material to fill in the fence panel was likely not to be approved so suggested looking at different styles. The applicant is now proposing a 6 foot dog ear style fence.

Staff informed the commission that the 6 foot fence would require a variance from the Planning and Zoning Commission based on its location within the yard. The fence is not permitted to be taller than the existing non-conforming 4 foot chain link fence if it is in its current location. As an alternative to a variance request, the applicant could move the fence to be in line with the house to the garage and in that location, it could be 6 foot tall.

Mr. Craycraft asked staff if the variance is to allow the fence to be 6 foot tall. Staff affirmed.

Mrs. Smith informed the commission that the fence that is up there now was an idea her and a friend came up with the deal with the new dog in the house. The fence extension is to help secure the dog within the yard. Ever since the parking lot went in across the street, the amount of privacy for the rear hard has been reduced.

Mrs. Smith stated that she was unaware of the Landmark's requirements.

Mr. Lynch asked staff if this property is right down the street from the previous fence application. Staff affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the fence should only be 48" to meet code. Staff stated that if there was not a preexisting fence, the new fence would have to be 3 foot tall. However, there is an opportunity to have the same height of fence as the existing chain-link, without the zip tied extensions it has now.

Staff asked the applicant if she received the email that was sent with the information on how to apply for the Variance. The applicant indicated that she received it but had troubles getting any attachments.

The applicant stated that the existing fence height will not keep the dog in the yard. Mr. Craycraft asked what height of a fence would keep the dog in the yard. Mrs. Smith stated that she thinks a 4 foot fence will be too short. Mrs. Smith discussed that she is looking at installing a pre-fabricated panel fence system and those typically are 4 or 6 foot in height. A 5 foot tall fence should work.

Mr. Lynch asked staff to show the commission the existing 42" fence in the yard. Staff discussed that the fence in the picture provided is a 42" fence that has a 6' tall dog kennel zip tied to the original fence. The applicant then added the green plastic material to provide the screening element.

Mr. Craycraft discussed that he did not like the 6 foot dog ear style fence proposed in this location. Craycraft suggested something more decorative with maybe the top 16" – 18" or so have a lattice or something to break the design up. The applicant stated that she did look at a similar style for the fence, however it is more expensive.

Mr. Lynch and Dr. Kelly agreed that the concern is with the height of the fence in the proposed location along the alley. Mrs. Smith stated that she is trying to screen her yard from the parking lot across the alley.

Mr. White stated that he does like the idea of the 6 foot fence with the top section open in design. That would help keep the dog inside the yard and provide the screening.

Staff suggested that the application be tabled to the October meeting so that the applicant can look at alternative fence designs. However, the commission can make a recommendation to the P&Z Commission on the variance request

this evening. This way the applicant can get a head start on the next process to request a taller fence in the location shown in the application.

A motion was made by Peter Lynch, seconded by David Craycraft that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-20-030 be tabled at this time, but recommend to the P&Z Commission approval of the variance request for the 6 foot height to the fence.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Dave Craycraft, Roger White, Rich Dobda, Jamoya Cox, Dr. Scott Kelly & Peter Lynch

CA-20-031

Property Owner: Christopher & Andrea Filio

Applicant: Andrea Filio

Location: 51 East Mound Street

Request: New Roof and Vinyl Siding on Accessory Building

Mr. Moore presented the application for Christopher and Andrea Filio for property location at 51 East Mound Street. The applicants are requesting approval for a new asphalt shingle roof and vinyl siding on the detached accessory structure in the rear yard.

Staff presented photographs of the existing structure and noted that it has a cedar shake siding on it currently and a 3-tab asphalt roof. The property owners are wanting to replace the siding and roof to match the single-family home.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the existing windows are trimmed out with wood. The applicant indicated that the windows are trimmed with an aluminum wrap. The windows were replaced when the purchased the property in 2016.

Staff informed the commission that the newer windows on the house or detached unit did not go before the Landmarks Commission for approval.

Mr. Lynch discussed with the commission that this is another instance where the main house has vinyl and they want an accessory building to match.

Mr. Craycraft asked if a new fascia board will be added. The applicants affirmed.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the rental unit would match the main house. The applicant affirmed that they have picked out the same color siding and shingle roof.

Mr. Lynch asked the applicant if there is going to be an issue with the removal of the cedar shake siding to have the new vinyl siding fit against the aluminum wrap around the windows. The applicant indicated that the contractor did not see any potential issues.

Mr. Lynch discussed the house on Park Street with the commission that was recently approved to have new vinyl siding. During that discussion the gables were discussed to be accented in a vinyl shake siding to break up the façade. If this application is to be approved, Mr. Lynch suggested that a vinyl shake in the gables be added. Mr. Dobda affirmed.

Mr. Lynch asked if the applicants had any questions on the vinyl shake for the gables. The commission and the applicants discussed the change in more detail with the gable to use a matching color vinyl but for it to be a shake style. Between the horizontal vinyl siding and the shake is a horizontal board to separate the two materials.

Staff shared a photograph with the applicants for what is being discussed.

Mr. Lynch asked if any doors are being change. The applicants indicated that it will remain the same.

Mr. White asked if they will be adding gutters. The applicants stated that they will be adding gutters for the sides that are missing.

A motion was made by Rich Dobda, seconded by David Craycraft that Certificate of Appropriateness #CA-20-031 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. Wood Facia and trim be repaired.**
- 2. The applicant install vinyl shake siding on all gable ends that match the color of the horizontal siding below.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Dave Craycraft, Roger White, Rich Dobda, Jamoya Cox, Dr. Scott Kelly & Peter Lynch

Old Business

Staff updated the commission on the current projects under construction and projects that recently completed construction.

New Business

Adjournment

Time Out: 8:40pm

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

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Dave Craycraft, Roger White, Rich Dobda, Jamoya Cox, Dr. Scott Kelly & Peter Lynch

Date

Landmarks Chairman