

HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION

June 8, 2020

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Mark Weber. Commission members present were Scott Anderson, Susan Edinger, Jeff Oster, Victor Senn, Patrice Spitzer, and Mark Weber (6). AJ Coleman was absent (1). Also present were Cody Grodi, Zoning Inspector, Mark Easterling, Deputy Planning & Zoning Administrator, and Law Alkire, Law Director.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Edinger moved to approve the minutes of the March 9, 2020 meeting as written. Seconded by Mr. Spitzer. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

APPLICATION 10-20 – Mark Wagner is requesting a certificate of appropriateness to install a porch on the front of the house. The property is located at 203 E. Second Street and is zoned R-4 (Single Family Residential).

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 10-20. Mark Wagner was present, and added that he would like to tear off the old steps, and replace them with a cement porch, and also replace the sidewalk. There was a brief discussion about the current sandstone sidewalk, and Mr. Easterling confirmed that the Commission does not have a say in the materials used to replace a sidewalk. Mr. Senn confirmed that the second story window above the rooftop will not be removed. Ms. Spitzer recommended that Mr. Wagner take a look at the porch at 241 E. Front Street, as it was built in the same era and it's the original porch. Ms. Edinger asked if the porch was attached to the property at one time, and Mr. Wagner said that he believes that originally there was a porch across the front of the house. Mr. Oster asked about the sample materials that will be used, and Mr. Wagner noted that they have a few options in their application that they haven't decided on yet. Mr. Weber confirmed that the materials will be wood, and that the railing for the steps will be rot-iron. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission. Mr. Anderson moved to approve Application 10-20. Seconded by Mr. Senn. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

APPLICATION 11-20 – Chris Skiveron, on behalf of Carranor Hunt and Polo Club, is requesting a certificate of appropriateness to remove a door and replace it with wood siding. The property is located at 502 E. Second Street and is zoned INS (Institutional Use).

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 11-20. Chris Skiver was present, and added that they were able to locate the original drawings of the project, and that originally there was no door drawn. Mr. Weber confirmed that the siding will remain a cedar lap. Ms. Spitzer agreed with Mr. Skiver's findings about the door from the original drawings. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission. Mr. Senn moved to approve Application 11-20. Seconded by Mr. Oster. Ayes: Anderson, Edinger, Oster, Senn, and Weber (5). Nays: (0). Abstain: Spitzer (1).

APPLICATION 12-20 – Tony Lockard, on behalf of Edward Jones, is requesting a certificate of appropriateness to reface an awning. The property is located at 215 Louisiana Avenue and is zoned C-2 (Central Business).

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 12-20. Loren Odegaard was present on behalf of the application, and added that they are keeping the frame of the awning, and simply replacing the skin. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission. Mr. Oster moved to approve Application 12-20. Seconded by Ms. Edinger. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

APPLICATION 13-20 – PMBA Architect is requesting a certificate of appropriateness to replace three windows, one on the front façade and two on the back façade of the building. The property is located at 114 Louisiana Avenue and is zoned C-2 (Central Business).

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 13-20. Craig Pickerel, PMBA Architects was present, and added that they are replacing the front window to match existing, and two windows in the rear to mimic the store front system. Mr. Weber confirmed that the materials will be aluminum, and Mr. Pickerel added that it will be bone white to match. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission. Ms. Edinger moved to approve Application 13-20. Seconded by Ms. Spitzer. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

APPLICATION 14-20 – Zachary Wolff and Shannon Walsh are requesting a certificate of appropriateness to install a fence. The property is located at 228 E. Front Street and is zoned R-3 (Single Family Residential).

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 14-20. Shannon Walsh was present, and gave a copy of the proposal to the Commission. Mr. Weber confirmed that the fencing will be ornamental on the west side. Ms. Walsh added that the privacy fence is falling, and that they would like to match it to the ornamental fencing in the front. Mr. Weber confirmed that currently they are only replacing a portion of the deteriorated fence from the east corner of the property to what is in sight on Front Street. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission. Ms. Edinger moved to approve Application 14-20. Seconded by Mr. Weber. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

APPLICATION 15-20 – Puffin Properties LLC is requesting a certificate of appropriateness to demolish the front portion of the building and replace with a similar style structure. The property is located at 111 E. Second Street and is zoned C-2 (Central Business).

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 15-20. Attorney Neil McElroy was present on behalf of Puffin Properties LLC and Stephen Fowler. Ms. Spitzer stated that she's concerned that the application was submitted with only one (1) Report provided from an Engineer stating that the building should be demolished, and added that she thought that two (2) Reports were required. Mr. McElroy noted that according to the Code, it is stated that "an Engineer's Report" is required, and Mr. Weber said that the Commission had previously suggested two (2) reports when this property was previously discussed. Mr.

Oster asked if it were possible for the Engineer's report to include the facts and figures, and the cost to retain the structure. Ms. Edinger referenced Chapter 1245.55(a)(2) of the Code, and added that she agrees with Ms. Spitzer's concerns with the single Engineer's report. There was further discussion on a cost estimate to retain the building versus demolition and rebuilding a new structure, and Mr. McElroy stated that the cost is not currently clear to his clients. There was further discussion on when the property was bought, and Mr. McElroy stated that Puffin Properties LLC bought it in 2015 from the original owners. Mr. Fowler added that they put about \$20,000 worth of improvements into the property upon ownership, and Mr. McElroy said that the property was originally bought to be primarily used for an online design and printing business with storage, and a gift shop.

Mr. Weber added that the Commission's goal is to preserve the history of the district. Ms. Alkire reminded the Commission that they have the authority to request additional supporting documentation according to Chapter 1245.55 – "Demolitions", when an application of demolition has been brought forth. She added that the Code allows the Commission to take ninety (90) days to make an informed decision. Ms. Edinger noted that the Code is specific when it relates to the "burden of the applicant" and to which he or she is entitled to a demolition. Mr. McElroy added that he tried to provide a narrative at the last meeting regarding the condition of the building and its current use. Mr. Senn stated that he appreciates the request of the application, and added that additional supporting details and information from the applicants would help him to make an informed decision, and Mr. Oster agreed. Mr. McElroy asked for clarity from the Commission on further supporting details that they should present when they return with their future application. There was a brief discussion about the degree of restoration of the building that the Commission requires, and Mr. Oster referenced Item #2 of the Engineer's Report, asking for a cost estimate of those details. Ms. Alkire asked the Commission if they would be satisfied with information that demonstrated through credible evidence to stabilize and restore the structure with regards to a future application for demolition, and the Commission agreed that the details would be useful for the Commission to make an informed decision. There was a brief discussion about "fair market value" with regards to demolition and restoration, as stated in Chapter 1245.55(c)(2). Mr. Weber added that the Commission desires to make an informed decision based on the facts. There was a brief discussion about the value of Historic Perrysburg. Ms. Alkire clarified that the Commission has ninety (90) days from today on which to render a decision on this applications demolition. Mr. McElroy added that Mr. Easterling has been extremely helpful with this process, and added that he understands the need for the Commission. Mr. Weber confirmed with Mr. McElroy that he is clear with the supporting and credible evidence that the Commission needs to see to render a decision.

Mr. Weber confirmed with Mr. Easterling that the newly proposed building meets setback requirements. Mr. Weber also asked about the use of the new building, and Mr. McElroy added that it will be proposed as a retail and/or restaurant use with a garage door on the east side. Mr. McElroy added that the garage style door would be like an "open air" dining roof, and Mr. Easterling stated that it would be comparable to the

dining experience at Social on Dixie Highway. Mr. Weber asked for further details with regards to the proposed windows, and added that the drawings look modern. Ms. Spitzer asked about the materials that are proposed for the new building, and Mr. McElroy said that they would like to build with a composite material with lap siding, and reclaimed red brick, and that it will be the same as the house on the corner of W. Second and Walnut. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission. Mr. Weber moved to table Application 15-20, and requested additional supporting details as discussed at tonight's meeting. Seconded by Mr. Senn. Ayes: (6). Nays: (0).

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Anderson asked about the historic boundary discrepancy with regards to the Elm House at 230 Elm Street, and Mr. Easterling added that there will be a formal process moving forward to clarify a few other discrepancies, as well. Ms. Spitzer added that she would like to see that proposal.

Ms. Alkire stated that she will email the Commission members further information about the appeal for the property at 401 W. Front Street, and added that a decision is anticipated by June 25, 2020.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Alfaro