

CITY OF AURORA
OHIO
LANDMARK COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
October 27, 2009

The Aurora Landmark Commission met in a regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, October 27, 2009, in the Council Chambers of Aurora City Hall. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman John Kudley.

ROLL CALL:

Present:	John Kudley Sue Sutton Melanie Miguel-Courtad Tom Spape
Absent:	Richard Fetzer
Also Present:	Ron Lowe, Advisor to Landmark Commission Karen Mitchell, Liaison - Aurora Historical Society Susan Dombeck, Secretary

AMENDMENTS TO AGENDA:

There were no amendments to the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes for the September 22 meeting could not be approved because not enough members who were present at that meeting were in attendance.

OLD BUSINESS:

SEWARD-GILES CEMETERY FOLLOW UP

Mr. Lowe told the members that the contractor has submitted all of the drawings to Ross Brankatelli in the Engineering Department. Referring to the bench and sign that were placed in the easement, Mr. Lowe stated that it appears that the owner of the property is agreeable to signing an acceptance letter regarding the minor encroachment. Mr. Brankatelli sent the document to the owner and once it is signed the project will be closed out. He explained that it is just a matter of the language of the document being accepted. He added that the contractor has submitted all of the necessary paperwork and Mr. Brankatelli is satisfied with it.

Mrs. Sutton felt that vandalism could be a problem and wondered if the site could be checked on a regular basis. Mr. Kudley said that the city does have someone that takes care of the central cemetery and suggested contacting John Trew about this cemetery. Mr. Lowe agreed to contact Mr. Trew.

NEW BUSINESS:

LAWRENCE LAHNAN, 76 EAST PIONEER – CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Mr. Lowe explained that this project is a detached garage. Mr. Lahnan was in attendance with Keith Allen, the contractor. Mr. Lahnan said the original garage was demolished last year. He stated that the proposed garage is to be 22 feet wide. It will be 22 feet by 30 feet with the 22 foot side to be facing the street.

Per an inquiry by Mr. Lowe, Mr. Allen said that the building is to be a pole structure. He also stated that the garage door is to be 16 feet wide and 9 feet tall, and will be a white metal standard raised panel door. Mr. Lahnan said that after the structure is built they will trim it to match the house, including the siding. According to Mr. Allen, the trim and roof will also match the house. He said that a 1 x 6 rake board will be in the front. The corner boards will be 1 x 4 and the siding will be wood. Answering additional questions by Mr. Lowe, Mr. Allen stated that there will be 1 x 4 trim around the garage door.

Mr. Kudley explained that the structure should match the house more than is shown on the drawings. Mr. Allen replied that the drawings are just the standard lumber drawings.

Mr. Lowe asked if the gable could match the house in terms of the pitch. Mr. Allen said that it could match. Mr. Kudley said that the drawings make the proposed structure look modern compared to the house, and there is much concern about the building matching the house in the historic district.

Mr. Allen stated that the entry door will have panels, and it will be on the east elevation, which will also have a window. Mr. Lahnan said that he would prefer to have the window on the back elevation.

Mr. Lowe advised the applicant that before going to the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) the drawings would need to be revised to show all of the information being discussed at this meeting. There was a short discussion on shutters, and then Mr. Kudley asked about having a window on the sides. Mr. Lahnan replied that it would only be seen from the neighbor's backyard.

Mr. Kudley asked if a more detailed plan was provided for the ABR. Mr. Allen responded that the submission for the ABR was the same as for this commission. Mr. Kudley commented that he did not think the plan contains the necessary information needed for the ABR. Mr. Lowe remarked that there are many changes being noted and that the plans will not reflect the correct information.

Mr. Lowe asked about the overhangs and Mr. Allen explained that they will match the house. There was more discussion on some of the details of the proposed structure.

Mr. Lowe suggested having two separate garage doors instead of one very large door. There was a brief conversation on other garages in the immediate area. Mr. Lahnan commented that he preferred one large door rather than two smaller ones. Mr. Kudley said that having

two separate garage doors would be more conducive with the surrounding neighborhood. Such a modern looking structure may detract from other buildings in the area. Mr. Lowe gave some background information on plans submitted by the previous owner. Mr. Kudley reiterated his preference for double doors. Additional discussion on garages with double doors in the neighborhood followed. Mrs. Courtad stated that two doors would look better than just one door. Mr. Spape said that how many doors the garage had was not as important to him as the design of the door(s). He advised the applicant that the ABR would need more information for their review, and additional conversation followed.

Mr. Lahnan reiterated his preference for one large door. Mrs. Sutton suggested a small window over the door and Mr. Lahnan said he would be agreeable to it. Mr. Lowe said the applicant, since he is not agreeable to two separate doors, should try to match the house as best as he can. He felt that the door should have a fancier design in terms of shadow lines to break up the large mass of area.

Mr. Kudley stated that he received phone calls from residents in that area who are concerned about the proposed building's design. Mr. Lowe commented that there are garages in the area that are on the plain side and don't have a lot of detail. He said that the motion should contain all the conditions for the garage. Mr. Lowe listed the items to be addressed as: the overhangs matching those on the house; noting the ridge vents on the plan; the shingles, siding and trim are to match the colors on the house; the window is to be a double hung 3 x 3 on the south elevation; soffits are to be vented; and gutters are to match those on the house. He told the applicant that the plans should be redrawn to show all of those items listed and more info if necessary.

Mr. Kudley explained that if the ABR makes changes during their review, those revisions would have to come back to this commission for review and approval.

There was a long discussion on the procedure for having the revised plans go to the ABR and for the commission members to receive the revised plans to review. Rather than have the applicant appear before this commission again with the revised plans, it was decided to have the approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness conditioned upon the members reviewing and signing off on an approval of the revised plans when they are submitted to the city.

MOTION: To accept the plans with the following changes: 1) that the siding match the house; the 1 x 4 corner trim will match the house; the garage door will be white; the shingles will match those on the house as closely as possible; the addition of either a small window or gable vent over the primary entrance car door to match the house elevation on the driveway side; to add windows within the carriage windows of the entry garage door; the soffits are to match the house; rake trim to be installed on the gables to match the existing house; windows to be added to the garage door; the gutters are to match those on the house; and with the revised drawings to be submitted and forwarded to the commission members for their review, and each member that approves the revised plan will so indicate to the commission's secretary and when a majority of approvals is received, and all other approvals given, a Certificate of Appropriateness can be issued.

Mr. Spape moved for approval; Mrs. Courtad seconded, and the motion carried, 4-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Spape, Mrs. Courtad, Mrs. Sutton, Mr. Kudley
Nays: None

REPORT ON 210 CRACKEL ROAD

Ron Lowe reported that he was contacted by Robert Luckay regarding a building at 210 Crackel Road. Mr. Luckay asked him to visit the site to see if there were any materials of the house that would be salvageable. He explained that the interior is a mess, but he went through the house and there really was nothing worth saving. He said that the site is beautiful and using it as a small park with an observation deck that overlooks the falls would be a vast improvement for that parcel.

MISCELLANEOUS:

Mr. Lowe stated that he contacted Larry Selzer, who submitted a proposal on a maintenance review of the historic properties in Aurora. He is unable to meet on Tuesdays or Thursdays due to other activities. Mr. Lowe suggested having November's meeting, which is scheduled for Tuesday, November 24th, changed to either the 19th or 23rd. He said he would contact Mr. Selzer to see if he would be available on those dates.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mrs. Courtad moved to adjourn at 7:59 p.m.; Mr. Spape seconded, and the motion carried, 4-0, on a voice vote.

John Kudley - Chairman

Susan Dombeck - Secretary
AUDIO TAPE ON FILE