

CITY OF AURORA
OHIO
Landmark Commission
Meeting Minutes
June 20, 2019

The Landmark Commission met in a rescheduled meeting Thursday, June 20, 2019 in the Council Chambers at City Hall. Jeff Clark called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Present: Jeff Clark
Jason Coleman
Tim Holder
John Kudley
Thomas Shrout
Also Present: Meredith Davis, Ass't. Director, Planning, Zoning & Building Division
Ron Lowe, Advisor to Landmark Commission
Marie Lawrie, Secretary

AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA:

MOTION: To adopt the revised meeting agenda, with a time change from 6:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. and the addition of a project at 290 S. Chillicothe Rd.

Mr. Holder moved; Mr. Coleman seconded, and the motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

MOTION: To adopt the minutes of the March 21, 2019 meeting

Mr. Kudley moved; Mr. Coleman seconded, and the motion carried on a 3-0-2 roll call vote.
Yeas: Mr. Kudley, Mr. Coleman, Mr. Holder
Nays: None
Abstention: Mr. Clark, Mr. Shrout

MOTION: To adopt the minutes of the April 18, 2019 meeting

Mr. Coleman moved; Mr. Kudley seconded, and the motion carried on a 3-0-2 roll call vote.
Yeas: Mr. Coleman, Mr. Kudley, Mr. Clark
Nays: None
Abstention: Mr. Holder, Mr. Shrout

NEW BUSINESS:

108 S CHILLICOTHE ROAD, WINDOWS, SHUTTERS, DOOR, SCREENED PORCH

Amy Malafarina, homeowner was in attendance to discuss the projects. Daniel Finnerty, fiancé of the property owner was also in attendance, as well as two contractors. Michael Ranallo, of Pella Windows was on hand to talk about the windows the homeowner

would like to install. Ms. Malafarina reported that one window, due to the type of glass, may be original to the structure. All others were likely replaced at some point. Ms. Malafarina explained that she intended to install the Architect Series Pella window. These windows are aluminum clad wooden double-hung windows. Mr. Ranallo explained all existing windows are double-hung with the exception of two small casement windows that they would be replacing with double-hung windows for consistency. He showed samples of two windows. One had removable muntins and the other had non-removable muntins. He stated that the current windows have true divided glass, however; the new windows would have a removable wooden muntin that would allow easy cleaning. Although the solid wood muntin is removable, they are constructed with a clip and pin system that allows a very tight fit. The grid pattern will be 6 over 6. Current windows have white trim and the proposed windows would be cased in black. The new windows would be inserted in the opening and would not disturb the existing trim. He called it an insert replacement, meaning that the storm windows and sash would be removed and the new window would fit in the opening. Mr. Clark asked if the windows would then be smaller. Mr. Ranallo stated that the proposed replacements have a narrow sash and the windows were not much smaller. Looking over the photos that were provided in the packet, Mr. Clark pointed out that a few windows on the addition were 9 over 6 pattern. The homeowner would like them all to be 6 over 6 for consistency. Dormer windows were confirmed to be 6 over 6 grid pattern. Mr. Lowe asked if there was a reason that the windows on the north elevation kitchen had approximately 12 inches between them. He further asked if they intended to keep the division between the 2 double-hung windows. The answer was yes. The homeowner was uncertain of why the windows were installed in that fashion. Ms. Malafarina stated that the trim on the windows would be refinished and refurbished, remaining white in color. Mr. Lowe stated that the window heads need to stay and that the 6 over 6 pattern is appropriate. He thanked the new owner for her willingness to rehab the house and also thanked her for her excellent submission pertaining to the windows. He stated that it would be nice if the space was eliminated between the kitchen windows, however, that was a minor consideration. There was a brief discussion about how those windows came to be separated. A leak in the dormer may have caused a need for a structural alteration. The homeowner would discuss it with her contractor. Mr. Clark was in favor of the black windows. Mr. Holder asked if the shutters would be removed. Ms. Malafarina explained that current windows with shutters would continue to have shutters and the few windows that do not have shutters would continue the same way.

MOTION: To issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the window replacement, as discussed and submitted

Mr. Kudley moved, Mr. Holder seconded, and the motion carried on a 5-0 roll call vote.
Yeas: Mr. Kudley, Mr. Holder, Mr. Clark, Mr. Coleman, Mr. ShROUT
Nays: None

Shutters were discussed next. An inventory of the current shutters proves that 80 percent of existing shutters are rotten. Different options for shutters were shown in the

submission. Mr. Kudley explained that the board and batten shutters were not appropriate for this home. He stated that board and batten shutters were often found on older, more rustic houses. He was in favor of option B, which was a louvered shutter, similar to the existing shutters of the home. Mr. Lowe and Mr. Clark agreed. Ms. Malafarina agreed to the louvered shutters. The replacement shutters were stated to be vinyl. Mr. Clark suggested holding off on the shutters at this time. Mr. Clark would like to see a new and old shutter on the house at the same time for comparison. He even suggested that old shutters that are in good shape be re-installed on the front and left elevation and that the new shutters be installed on the elevations that are not as noticeable from the street. The homeowner was agreeable to that and will postpone the shutters.

MOTION: To postpone discussion on the shutters

Mr. Coleman moved, Mr. Holder seconded, and the motion carried on a 5-0 roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Coleman, Mr. Holder, Mr. Clark, Mr. Kudley, Mr. Shrout

Nays: None

The screened porch and door were discussed. Katherine Knettel, of CPK Construction was in attendance to answer questions. The porch of the structure had glass windows and the foundation consisted of 1x6 wood that was rotten. Photos of the screened porch before demolition began and elevation drawings of the proposed replacement structure were provided. Waterproofing needs to happen around the foundation under the screened porch area once it is fully removed. Mr. Kudley explained that a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the porch is normally issued before a homeowner can remove such a structure on a landmarked property. It was stated that the demolition was started due to safety concerns for the waterproofing contractors. Ms. Knettel explained that unsafe structures have collapsed on workers in the past. Ms. Davis explained that the contractors were asked to stop the demolition and come before the board with their plans before they move forward with the project. The homeowner and contractors complied with that request.

A three-season room is planned to resemble the original porch. Inside the screened porch is an access to the cellar. A new hatch will be made. The original floor was constructed of wood; however a concrete slab is planned for the new porch. It was reported that animals are burrowing underneath and entering the home. The homeowner verified that the front rectangular section of the home, as well as the perpendicular addition have stone foundation. Later additions have slab foundation. The proposed windows will be from the Amazing EZ-Screen Porch Windows Company out of Minneapolis, MN. These windows have moving glass panels and built-in screens. Black framed windows with white siding was confirmed. The door that is being proposed is an EMCO 400 Series. The door will be black to match the new windows on the house. Mr. Clark stated that this is a minor section of the home and this will be an improvement over what exists and is in disrepair. Mr. Clark asked if the picket fence would be replaced. The homeowner has not designed the exterior landscaping plan to date.

Mr. Lowe advised that building plans would need to be reviewed. He had concerns about

the construction due to the flat roof. With water issues in mind, he advised the homeowners to consider removing the west and north siding and installing ice guard to protect against melting snow. He was in favor of the design but requested that the applicants return once building plans have been drawn and reviewed. The contractor explained that she was seeking approval on the elevations before taking the next step of having the building plans submitted. The board agreed that they could give approval on the concept and allow the contractor to have the building plans drawn up.

Mr. Lowe asked what the plans are for the small wood door on the north elevation that is not part of the screened porch. Ms. Malafarina stated that it would be refinished and will remain.

MOTION: To approve the style and appearance of the replacement porch, with final approval pending review of the construction drawings

Mr. Coleman moved; Mr. Holder seconded, and the motion carried on a 5-0 roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Coleman, Mr. Holder, Mr. Clark, Mr. Kudley, Mr. Shrout

Nays: None

Discussion of gutter replacement ensued. The contractors reported that the gutters would be replaced with the same style. Landmark approval will not be necessary for this gutter replacement, however; a building permit will be necessary. The homeowner reported that the roof will not be replaced at this time. Mr. Lowe informed the homeowner that the garage door would need approval before they replace it. It was confirmed that the half round windows will be refurbished and remain, as they are a very distinguished feature of the home.

Mr. Kudley expressed gratitude on behalf of the board considering the large undertaking the new homeowner has committed to. He explained that this home is very prominent and visible. Ms. Malafarina expressed her willingness to work with the board as the progress moves forward on the restoration. Mr. Clark expressed a willingness to be a resource, as needed, throughout the process. Mr. Shrout expressed his congratulations to the new homeowners and thanked them for their efforts to restore the home.

290 S. CHILLICOTHE ROAD, REPLACEMENT DETACHED GARAGE, FUTURE REAR ELEVATION ADDITION, BRACKETS TO THE FRONT ELEVATION

Melissa Malich, homeowner was in attendance to discuss some renovations. The current garage is in need of replacement. The homeowner received a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals to construct the replacement garage in the same area as the existing structure. The homeowner explained that she wanted to be mindful of the lot size and submitted to construct a single car garage with a carport. Mr. Clark stated that the craftsman-style plans for the garage are an improvement over what is currently there.

The design of the garage and the style for the porch renovation were discussed at the same time. Ms. Malich stated that the front porch is in need of maintenance. The porch columns, railings, and window trim will be updated. Grids were proposed on the front

elevation upper story windows in a 6 over 1 pattern. The shutters would be removed. Mr. Lowe asked what the columns would be constructed of. The answer was wood. The same columns are planned on the garage carport. Mr. Lowe was concerned about the stability of the columns with vehicle parking next to them. Wood accents on the front elevation of the garage were confirmed. Colors for the brackets, truss, and trim would be white. The siding would be Knoxville Gray. Mr. Lowe inquired about the scissor truss, questioning the sturdiness of the feature on the garage. Wind loads were discussed. The garage will have two windows on the carport side of the structure. Mr. Kudley asked if they would have muntins to match the house. The homeowner was not opposed to grids in the garage windows. Mr. Clark was concerned about the underside of the carport. Birds and racoons might nest there, depending on the design.

Mr. Lowe stated that with brackets and scissor truss features on the front porch, it might be too busy. He stated that this home is a simple farmhouse. Without architectural drawings, it was difficult to approve all aspects of the projects for this home. However, Mr. Lowe was able to offer some feedback to the homeowner for a revision that will return in front of the board at a later meeting. He recommended that the homeowner re-think the scissor truss idea and to carry the same design on to the garage as well. He was in favor of the railing and stairs. He requested drawings with dimensions.

The kitchen addition was discussed. A 16-foot addition will be considered in the future. Mr. Clark let the homeowner know that the foundation block of her house is still available. He stated that the new owner of the commercial building at 173 South Chillicothe Road was able to get it for her project. Mr. Lowe asked the resident to return at a later date with their building plans for the addition when they are ready to construct that addition, with window dimensions, foundation plans, etc.

Mr. ShROUT asked the homeowner what is located behind her current garage. She stated that a small patio area is there currently. He asked her if she considered a deeper garage to stack two vehicles. She stated that she has not considered that, as it is very difficult to back out of her driveway.

Mr. Kudley asked the homeowner if she had permission for the second curb cut for the proposed new driveway, which was drawn as a horseshoe. Ms. Davis stated that two curb cuts are permitted. Mr. Kudley stated that the historic district does not allow parking in the front yard. The homeowner explained that she was not looking for parking in the front yard, but is looking for a safe way to exit her driveway. To install a turn around in the rear yard, would take up most of the outdoor living space. The homeowner stated that they currently turn around in the front yard in order to pull out onto the road. She said that the proposed driveway would be more visually appealing than how it looks now. Mr. Clark asked for other driveway proposals. Mr. Lowe stated that the lot size might be difficult for the proposed driveway and the material would dominate the front yard. Mr. Kudley stated that a neighboring house has a pad to turn around on, that did not seek Landmark approval, and now a car is parked there in the front yard on a regular basis.

Mr. Clark asked about the sidewalk shown on the site plan. The homeowner has concerns about the city sidewalk that have not yet been addressed. She stated that she

has difficulty getting out of her driveway now and the sidewalk would bring pedestrians to complicate the situation. She has questions about who is responsible for the maintenance of the sidewalks. She is further concerned about her legal responsibility of city sidewalks.

Ms. Malich stated that the feedback gave her an excellent place to start with her plans and ideas for the renovation. Mr. Clark offered additional advice, if needed to help her along the way. Mr. Holder stated that the board wants this project to work for the homeowner and also to fit within the guidelines of the Landmark Commission. He stated the willingness of the board to work with her to that end.

MISCELLANEOUS:

Pioneer Trail Improvement Plans

Mr. Kudley spoke with someone on the jobsite. He stated that some of the stamped concrete was removed for this improvement and that he was told that it would be replaced with regular concrete. Ms. Davis will follow up with the Service Director. Mr. Clark inquired about the landscaping and the tree on the gazebo side that may die from the manner in which the road crew treated the roots during construction.

Mr. Clark also stated that light posts were replaced during that improvement project. He stated that it would have been nice to be consulted before installation, as the posts are Victorian with Federal glass globes. He also expressed an interest in an operable, period-appropriate water fountain.

Mr. Clark corresponded with the Ohio Historical Preservation office. They indicated that municipalities work with their Landmark Commission to different degrees. He expressed a desire to be included on plans for improvements within the historic district.

Richard Fetzer, Aurora Historical Society Representative

There was discussion pertaining to whether Mr. Fetzer would return to the Landmark Commission and whether meeting packets still need to be mailed to him. Mr. Holder confirmed that Mr. Fetzer will not be able to return to the group. The Landmark Commission will send a letter of appreciation and a plaque will be given to Mr. Fetzer for his many years of leadership and work with the commission as a voting member and also a representative of the historical society. His contributions are great and he will be sorely missed. The Mayor will be informed and a replacement will be needed.

Thomas Shrout

Mr. Clark thanked Mr. Shrout for joining the Landmark Commission and asked him to speak about his background as an introduction to the membership. Mr. Shrout stated that he was the Associate Vice President of Case Western Reserve University working with Public Relations and later moved to Virginia, where he was

involved with Colonial Williamsburg. He is now retired and he will be the joint member of the Landmark Commission and the Architectural Board of Review.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Kudley moved to adjourn at 9:10 p.m. Mr. Coleman seconded, and the motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Jeff Clark - Chairman

Marie Lawrie - Secretary