

CITY OF AURORA  
OHIO  
**Landmark Commission**  
Meeting Minutes  
August 15, 2019

The Landmark Commission met in a scheduled meeting Thursday, August 15, 2019 in the Council Chambers at City Hall. Jeff Clark called the meeting to order at 6:30 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:**

None

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**MOTION: To adopt the minutes of the July 18, 2019 meeting**

Mr. Holder moved; Mr. Shrout seconded, and the motion carried on a 3-0-2 roll call vote.

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

Nays: None

Abstentions: Mr. Coleman, Mr. Kudley

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**290 S CHILLICOTHE ROAD, JAMES AND MELISSA SKOLARIS, REAR ADDITION FOR KITCHEN**

James and Melissa Skolaris, homeowners were present at the meeting. They were seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 16' x 9'1" addition. The existing addition on the rear of the home has a stairwell under it but not a full basement. There is a basement with a lower ceiling under the main original home. The homeowner stated they are not looking for more basement area, just more square footage on the first floor. Materials and colors for the addition will match the existing home. The commission members would like to see the building plans to review the foundation plan, and confirm that plans match what has been discussed in the meetings, before issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**MOTION: To approve the conceptual plan for a kitchen addition, the Certificate of Appropriateness will be pending review of the building plans**

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

**290 S CHILLICOTHE ROAD, JAMES AND MELISSA SKOLARIS, FRONT ELEVATION INCLUDING THE PORCH RENOVATION**

The applicants discussed the front elevation renovation. The porch decking is in need of replacing. The posts are deteriorating and need replaced. The porch posts will be redesigned with more of a substantial base and the two posts on the left side of the porch will be centered on the front door. The applicant was uncertain at this time on what type of wood he would use for the project. The roof will remain intact. The front steps will be removed and will be wider than existing steps with hand rails added. Rake board will be added in the gable. The size of that rake board will be determined by the space available considering the highest window. The plans show the shutters will be removed. Windows will not be replaced. Building plans, including a foundation plan will be reviewed when they are submitted. Mr. Lowe described this project as a repair with some improvements.

**MOTION: To approve the conceptual plan for the front elevation including the porch with handrails, the Certificate of Appropriateness will be pending review of the building plans**

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

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

Nays: None

**290 S CHILLICOTHE ROAD, JAMES AND MELISSA SKOLARIS, REPLACEMENT OF DETACHED GARAGE**

The applicants discussed the garage replacement project with the members. There was a discussion that the rear entry porch and the existing garage should receive a Certificate of Appropriateness before the structures are removed. That will be considered at a future meeting when the building plans are submitted for final approval. The existing garage is in disrepair and not in service. The project was in front of the Board of Zoning Appeals for a variance for the side-yard setback, which was granted. The plans show a single-car garage with an attached carport-type structure. After discussion, it was stated that the garage would have a flat wood-paneled ceiling with some kind of access for storage above. Sconces will be installed on the front elevation to add character. Carriage-style doors will be installed. The post supporting the carport section may be 6x6 posts with framing and masonry at the base. It was stated that the roof would be pitched and that 15 feet is the height limit. The carport will also serve for entertaining and could have a picnic table under the roof for that type of purpose. The garage was stated to be 13' x 26' in size. The carport is shown on the drawings as an additional 11' x 26' in size. Doors and windows were discussed. The building plans will be reviewed before the Certificate of Appropriateness is given. The members were in favor of the general concept.

**MOTION: To approve the conceptual plan for the replacement detached garage, the Certificate of Appropriateness will be pending review of the building plans**

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

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

Nays: None

**290 S CHILLICOTHE ROAD, JAMES AND MELISSA SKOLARIS, DRIVEWAY EXTENSION**

The applicants presented plans for a “U” shaped driveway. They were looking for a solution to their parking issues. The homeowners stated that all other homes near them have the ability to pull out forward onto State Route 43. They were also seeking a solution to holidays when family with several cars are in the driveway and need to be shifted around.

Grass pavers were discussed. The applicant was not in favor of grass pavers, as the turning of vehicles tires is likely to pull the grass out. The applicant expressed his desire to install asphalt paving. Mr. Lowe explained to the members that he attended a meeting along with the applicants, Building Department staff, the directors of the Service Department to discuss the projects. Multiple driveway possibilities were discussed. Mr. Lowe was concerned about the amount of paving the “U” driveway would require. There was a discussion about softening the look with landscaping. Mr. Lowe asked the members for their thoughts on the driveway.

Mr. Kudley stated that no other landmarked home has this style of driveway. He further stated that the commission is not in favor of front yard parking. He did not want to set a precedence with this request. He stated that he understood the need to pull out into traffic facing forward. He was in favor of a turn-around pad but not a parking space in the front.

Mr. Skolaris stated that they will not use the driveway to park cars on for long periods of time or overnight. It would strictly be used to help shuffle cars around safely. Mr. Lowe stated that all the surrounding homes in the district have various ways to leave their driveways front-facing. The design of the current driveway is a problem and they need a solution.

Mr. Clark stated that he walks his dog in the area and finds long stretches without traffic, due to the timing of the traffic lights. He asked if turning south was the problem. Mr. Skolaris stated that there is a problem each way due to his specific location in between the traffic light at Aurora Hudson and the traffic light at Pioneer.

Mr. Holder stated that he was absolutely opposed to the “U” driveway and was not very happy about the slab in front of the porch. He further stated that he understood the problem but was not convinced that he has heard a solution in either the “U” driveway or the front turn-around pad.

Mr. ShROUT was uncertain of the best solution. He was more in favor of paving the existing gravel turn-around than a "U" driveway, as he was not convinced that the property was wide enough to accommodate it.

Mr. Coleman stated that the property was too narrow for the "U" driveway. He inquired about the parking pad at the neighboring property to the south. Mr. Clark and Mr. Kudley stated that when that new home was constructed on what had been a vacant property,

Landmark Commission reviewed the plan and after it was completed, there was a parking pad in the front yard that may not have been present on the plans they reviewed.

Mr. Lowe stated that he remembered that project slightly differently. He thought a small area was on the plans to turn-around but what they were presented at the meeting may have been wrong. He recalled a debate about the driveway. He confirmed that a Certificate of Appropriateness was not issued for that parking pad and when the contractor did the work, it was installed in a different location than the members had reviewed. Mr. Coleman asked if there were consequences. Mr. Lowe stated that the Landmark Commission let the administration know about the issue, but the administration decided not to pursue legal action.

Mr. Lowe stated to the applicants that he hears reservation about the "U" driveway. He asked what progress was made on the city sidewalk easement. The applicants stated they had no further discussions about the city sidewalks with administration since the meeting Mr. Lowe attended. Mr. ShROUT asked the applicants what their plan "b" would be. Mr. Skolaris stated that the gravel he has placed out front does not work very well year round. It also does not solve his problem on holidays during inclement weather. He said he was not looking for a parking lot, but he really needs a solution.

The possibility of extending the gravel area was discussed. Mr. Clark suggested that the driveway be postponed and other options explored at a future meeting. Ms. Davis stated that a standard parking space is 10' x 20' when asked. There was discussion about whether stipulations for use of the turn-around could be included in an approval. Mr. Lowe reminded the members that the applicants are considering quite a bit of improvements to their home and would not likely want to turn their front yard into a parking lot. They have an issue with their current driveway and need a solution that everyone can agree upon.

Mr. Clark mentioned a German village he was familiar with and the parking solutions that they have constructed. He stated that this project could be done nicely. He suggested that pavers might be used instead of asphalt paving. He suggested a front yard patio-type of area that may be used to turn cars around. The dimensions of a paver area were discussed. Mr. ShROUT suggested including the walkway to the front entry with the brick or paver turn-around to create a patio-type area.

**MOTION: To postpone the driveway extension**

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

**MISCELLANEOUS:**



Bicentennial in 1999

Mr. Clark stated that he was in touch with Cable 9. They could put a short video of the event together free of charge.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**MOTION: To adjourn the meeting.**

Mr. Kudley moved to adjourn at 7:48 p.m. Mr. Holder seconded, and the motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

---

Jeff Clark - Chairman

---

Marie Lawrie - Secretary