

A regular meeting of the Troy Planning Commission was held in Council Chambers, City Hall on Wednesday, December 27, 2023, at 3:30 p.m. with Chairman James McGarry presiding. ATTENDING: Members – McGarry, Oda, Westmeyer, Wolke, and Titterington; Development Staff – Long, Eidemiller and Bruner; and Development Director Davis.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Upon motion of Mr. Titterington, seconded by Mayor Oda, the minutes of the December 13, 2023 meeting were approved by unanimous voice vote.

HISTORIC DISTRICT APPLICATION, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, 9 – 11 W. MAIN STREET (MAYFLOWER BUILDING)

EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS; OWNER – WESLEY MARTIN; APPLICANT – ANDREW CIRCLE ARCHITECT LLC. The staff report noted: The applicant and owner, Wes Martin is requesting the Planning Commission to review brick infill window opening at the property located at 9-11 W. Main Street; at the Nov. 22 meeting, the Commission approved four window infills with brick at a depth of 3" inset; the 3" depth is required to meet the Ohio Building Code per the Chief Building Official; on December 17 staff found that the work was done and the windows were infilled with a depth of ¾" instead of the approved 3"; the applicant indicatd the window sill depth was not as wide as expected; the applicant is requesting the Commission to now approve the ¾" inset of the brick window infills instead of the approved 3"; staff recommends denial of the application unless another option is provided at the meeting that is suitable to the Planning Commission.

DISCUSSION. The mason was not present. Mr. Martin commented that the goal was to provide the fire escape and fire proof windows that maintain the character of the windows, and he believes that has been accomplished; he stated that the mason was instructed to provide a 3" fill; and he is not saying that the 3" fill cannot be done. Mayor Oda commented that the appearance is of patched windows. In response to Mr. Wolke about the impact of now performing the work as approved, Mr. Martin indicated what was done would have to be ripped out, a different block provided, the drywall would be disrupted on the inside, and there would be additional labor costs. The Commission discussed that it would be preferable to have the mason present for comments as to why the 3" fill was not done.

A motion was made by Mr. Westmeyer, seconded by Mayor Oda, to table the Historic District application for 9-11 W. Main Street until the mason can attend the meeting and discuss options.

MOTION ADOPTED, UNANIMOUS ROLL CALL VOTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT APPLICATION, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, 220 W MAIN STREET; EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS; OWNER – KLEPTZ DEVELOPMENT

GROUP, LLC (TOM KLEPTZ); APPLICANT – MICHAEL TWISS. The staff report noted: property is zoned B-2 General Business District; the OHI form describes this as a Queen Anne Style building; contributing features include complex roof massing, paneled recess with transom and high side lights with etched glass windows 1/1/ DHS, large bay with overhanging eaves, eaves and box cornice and half-timbered gables with mullion windows, and the front gable has a split ridge and ridge ornaments are also referenced. The report detailed:

“PROPOSAL:

Front Façade (facing Main Street). The applicant is proposing new black asphalt shingle roofing to match the existing black asphalt shingle roofing. Six windows are proposed to being replaced with double hung windows with muntins. The tope gable end is proposed to be infilled with a decorative trim at the top. The second story porch on the west façade is being proposed to be removed however it will be visible from the front façade. See below elevation drawing:



West Façade (facing S. Short Street). A new entry porch is proposed where the second-floor porch (northwest side of building) is proposed to be removed. The second first floor porch is also being proposed to be removed. There is not an infill porch proposed in this area. The fish scales are going to remain intact in the middle of the building.

South Façade (rear). Four windows are being replaced on the rear façade with Pella Reserve Prevision-fit double hung windows. The Pella Reserve window has a tradition look with a wood and aluminum clad wood double hung window. Finally, a new ridge is being proposed to divert rainwater.

Finish Details: The main body color is proposed to be painted with Sherwin Williams Dowing Slad 2819. The lower wall color is black with an accent color of white. The roof is being replaced with black asphalt shingles (currently black shingles).

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Design Manual. 2.4 Architectural Details

- A. Significant architectural elements that have deteriorated should be repaired rather than replaced.
- B. Avoid adding cornice or frieze elements as extra ornamentation on a building if not originally present on the building.
- C. Original architectural elements should not be covered, especially when located on a front elevation.

The OHI form denotes multiple significant features that are being proposed to be altered. First, the front gable end has a split ridge. The application proposes to infill the ridge of which will remove the split ridge. Additionally, the front ridge ornaments will be removed with the proposed infill. Staff feels that these important features should be preserved.

Design Manual. 2.9 Porches

- A. Wrought or cast-iron supports should not be used to replace original porch columns unless such iron elements were part of the original design; the same is true for wrought iron railings.
- B. Avoid enclosing porches to create permanent interior space, particularly on front elevations.
- C. If a porch is proposed to replace an original, missing porch, the characteristics of original porches on similar buildings, such as height, materials, roof slope, and width of original porches, are preferred.
- D. If a porch is to be added where a porch never existed, a simple design should be used.
- E. Avoid ornamentation such as spindles and scrollwork unless they were traditionally used on the porches of similar buildings.

The proposed porch replacement does not match the original height and width of the original porch.

When using criteria from the Design Manual, it is Staff's opinion that the following alterations do not meet the standards and intent of the Design Manual: Staff analysis can be seen above in red.

- 1. The alteration to the front gable end.
- 2. The removal of the porches.

Staff supports the window replacements and the paint. The windows were already altered in 2012-2013. The paint colors can be seen in other areas of the district.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of the porch remove and infill on the split ridge on the front façade facing Main Street due to the following:

- The alterations do not meet the Design Manual section 2.4 & 2.9, and;
- The Contributing features as referenced per the OHI form are being altered.

Staff recommends approval of the window replacements and paint based on the following:

- The original windows referenced in the OHI form are being maintained, and the already altered windows are being replaced, and;
- The paint colors can be found in other areas of the district. “

DISCUSSION: Mr. Twiss, architect, and the owner, Mr. Kleptz, were present. Mr. Twiss commented that the double gable is being modified to address a drainage issue; if the double gable has to stay, there has to be another way to address the water collection and damage from it. Mayor Oda indicated she did not mind removal of the double gable. Mr. Titterington commented that removal of the double gable takes away a noted historic feature as stated on the OHI form. Mr. Titterington suggested the architect look at alternative ways to address the water issue that would retain the gable and bring those options back to the Commission. Mr. Westmeyer commented that he struggles with trying to retain a historic feature as that feature is poor construction of the past now creating a drainage problem that is causing damage to the structure. Mr. Twiss commented that he could look at updating the rendering to adjust the gutter and downspout. There was discussion regarding the porches, with it indicated that the rear porch is not referenced on the OHI form; the rear porch may have been added after original construction, but that is not known; that the second story of the porch is in bad shape with rotten wood and a very low rail and any reconstruction of that porch would have to be to current code and the appearance would be misaligned and the historic significance would be lost. It was noted that no documentation was submitted regarding cost of reconstruction of the porch to match the current design to determine if there is a “prohibitive cost” to replace it. Mr. Twiss questioned if history supersedes safety code enforcement. Mr. Titterington stated concern about removal of the front porch without information as to options to address rain water, if there is a way to incorporate some kind of quasi porch that handles diversion of the downspout to the west and comes off the porch and could be hidden. Mr. Twiss stated concern about modifications as the porch does not meet at a corner and there could still be moisture issues. A motion was made by Mr. Titterington, seconded by Mr. Westmeyer, to table the application to allow the architect to look at alternatives associated the gutter along the front and eliminating the double gables and regarding the northwest porch with the cost to reconstruct the porch and the cost to repair it as it is provided.

MOTION ADOPTED, UNANIMOUS ROLL CALL VOTE

HALIFAX VILLAS PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, MINOR AMENDMENT TO THE RECORD PLAN; OWNER/APPLICANT – HARLOW DEVELOPMENT. Staff reported that the Record Plan for the Halifax Villas Planned Development was approved by Council Ordinance No. O-10-2019 with additional amendments in 2021; the Record Plan states that the rear yard setback is 25’ for the patio homes section (west of Piqua-Troy Road); applicant requests a minor amendment to the Planned Development to permit a rear yard setback reduction for Inlot 1123; applicant wishes to rotate the house and use the point at the rear to establish the rear yard setback; this would reduce the rear yard setback for the rear portion of the house; however, a small portion would encroach the rear yard setback; and staff recommends approval of the minor amendment for inlot 11231 as the lot will not have a negative impact to the overall PD being adjacent to a cul-de-sac. It was stated that the request to rotate the placement of the house was made by the purchaser to provide a water view.

A motion was made by Mr. Westmeyer, seconded by Mr. Wolke, to approve the minor amendment for Inlot 11231 of the Record Plan for the Halifax Villas Planned Development – Residential as submitted as the minor amendment will not have a negative impact to the overall PD as it is adjacent to a cul-de-sac.

MOTION ADOPTED, UNANIMOUS ROLL CALL VOTE

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m. upon motion of Mr. Titterington, seconded by Mr. Westmeyer, and approved by unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

_____Chairman

_____Secretary