

A regular meeting of the Troy Planning Commission was held in Council Chambers, City Hall on Wednesday, January 10, 2024 at 3:30 p.m. with Chairman James McGarry presiding. ATTENDING: Members – McGarry, Oda, Westmeyer, Ehrlich, Emerick, Wolke, and Titterington; Development Staff – Long, and Bruner; and Development Director Davis.

[Note – Prior to the meeting, the Oath of Office was administered to Mr. McGarry and Mr. Westmeyer, both of whom had been reappointed to new six- year terms of 1-1-2024/12-31-2029.]

**REORGANIZATION:** Following the motion of Mr. Titterington, seconded by Mrs. Ehrlich, that Mr. McGarry be elected Chair of the Commission and that Mr. Wolke be elected Vice-Chair of the Commission for 2024, both were elected by unanimous roll call vote.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Upon motion of Mr. Emerick, seconded by Mr. Westmeyer, the minutes of the December 27, 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.**

**TAKE FROM THE TABLE:** A motion was made by Mr. Titterington, seconded by Mr. Wolke, to Take from the Table the application of 9-11 W. Main Street. Motion adopted, unanimous roll call vote.

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 indicated 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 applicant, Wes Martin, and the mason, Doug Schoening, were present. Mr. Schoening commented that he did not see the email that instructed he was to provide a 3” infill, but followed his usual practice of ¾”, and stated that with ¾”, he can use additional mortar for a stronger bond and it would be more weather resistant. Mr. Schoening indicated that to redo the work with a 3” fill, it would be necessary to seal with a mortar wash to seal the area and not have it crack over time.

In response to a question, staff stated there is no standard for the depth of fill of which they are aware, and confirmed that the 3” fill was what the applicant stated on the application, was what was approved, and was not followed.

Mr. Titterington commented that he anticipated the applicant would provide some options to what had been done to meet what was approved, and not just have comments on safety and weather resistance. He commented that when old brick is filled in with newer brick and the fill is flush it looks like more of placarding over, a 3” relief would show some variation, he does not like to see what just looks like patches in the side of a historic building; and would like to see an alternative that would show the perception of some relief.

Mr. McGarry agreed that a deep relief would not look so much like a patch.

Mayor Oda commented that this would look like a window removed and patched not matter how it is done.

Mr. Martin commented that the brick could be painted, but would prefer not to paint the brick; he believes that painting a border and trim would detract more; and suggested that dressing the area up with paint would detract more from the character of the window.

In response to Mr. Emerick regarding the window removal area being covered by the fire escape, Mr. Martin indicated one window has already been covered by the stairs.

Mrs. Ehrlich commented that she does not believe the work is so noticeable as it is on the side. Mr. Titterington stated that he finds it is still very visible when one is driving by.

Mr. Wolke asked what would have been the staff recommendation if the application was for a ¾” fill of the windows. Mr. Davis stated staff would have probably made a recommendation for approval as there is no standard for the depth of a brick infill of a removed window.

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Mayor Oda, seconded by Mr. Wolke to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for 9-11 W Main to approve the 3/4” inset of the brick window infills instead of the previously approved 3”.

VOTE: Yes – Oda, Ehrlich, Emerick, Wolke, Westmeyer, McGarry. No – Titterington

**MOTION ADOPTED**

**HISTORIC DISTRICT APPLICATION, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, 220 W MAIN STREET; EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS; OWNER – KLEPTZ DEVELOPMENT GROUP, LLC (TOM KLEPTZ); APPLICANT – MICHAEL TWISS.**

**TAKE FROM THE TABLE:** A motion was made by Mayor Oda, seconded by Mr. Westmeyer, to Take from the Table the application of 220 W. Main Street. Motion adopted, unanimous roll call vote.

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

**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 traditional 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 removal 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. It was noted that there are two parts of the application. One is regarding the front double gables, which the applicant wishes to remove, with there being discussion about extending the roof line at the first story porch and extending the downspout to the porch and keeping the gables. The second is reconstruction of the first and second story porches and extensions, with the applicant commenting that for the second story porch, the porch materials have deteriorated and have to be replaced, with that being custom work, and it would be repair and not replacement. The applicant further noted that if the second story porch and rail are reconstructed to fit current codes, the rail would have to be higher.

Mr. McGarry commented that it is not known when a porch facing Main Street was removed.

Mr. Titterington noted that the applicant had provided an estimate of \$130,000 and asked if that included the new railing, and Mr. Twiss stated that it did. Mr. Twiss commented that running the gutter to the NE corner is the least visible of the options for the downspout.

Mr. Titterington suggested the Commission deal with the gutter and downspout issue first, because if the decision is to run the downspout down the NE side, that negates the necessity of extending the porch out to the NW corner.

Mr. Twiss commented that if the gutter is required and the double gable has to stay, then the applicant prefers that the gutter should run down the east wall.

Mr. Kleptz stated that everything suggested by the architect is to solve issues of water getting into the building and creating damage and to extend the life of the building; that he does not want to run the gutter down the front of the building, would prefer to not retain the double gables, and would like to have the Commission approve the submitted application.

Mrs. Ehrlich stated her opinion that to lose the double gable is to lose an interesting architectural feature of the house.

Commission Decision Regarding Retaining Double Gables.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mrs. Ehrlich that the double gables are to be retained and the downspout moved to the east. Motion seconded by Mr. Titterington.

Discussion: In response to Mayor Oda, Mr. Twiss stated that the single gable solves problem of water coming down the front of the building. He further commented that the downspout is a residential rainwater solution, but not commercial solution, and will not look as nice coming down the side; however, the building was originally a residential structure.

Mr. Wolke asked if the downspout will solve the drainage issue for the front. Mr. Twiss commented that it will work because nothing is there now to address the water. Mr. Twiss concurred with Mr. Wolke that it is a matter of aesthetic. Mr. Wolke commented that it is his opinion that both the single and double gable design are aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Twiss commented that it will be a maintenance issue with having a longer downspout.

In response to Mr. Emerick, Mr. Twiss stated that the keeping the double gable will add some to the estimate.

Voting: Yes – McGarry, Ehrlich, Titterington, Oda. No – Wolke, Westmeyer, Emerick.

**MOTION ADOPTED**

Commission Decision Regarding Modification to Remove the Second Story Porch and Rebuild the First Story Porch.

Discussion: It was confirmed that the proposal to be considered is that shown on the rendering 04 West Elevation.

Regarding the OHI forms, staff stated that staff continues to recommend that the second floor porch be retained and repaired. Staff also stated that the second floor porch is not specifically referenced on the OHI form but is only referenced. It was stated the second floor porch is only decorative.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Westmeyer, seconded by Mayor Oda, to remove the second floor porch and to reconstruct the first floor porch to about the same dimensions as exists now to the same dimensions as shown on 04 West Elevation rendering (see below).

**MOTION ADOPTED, UNANIMOUS ROLL CALL VOTE**

**HISTORIC DISTRICT APPLICATION, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, 10 W MAIN STREET; REFACING OF EXISTING SIGN FOR WINANS COFFEE AND CHOCOLATE; OWNER – ROBERT AND HEATHER DAVEY; APPLICANT – QUINT CREATIVE SIGN.**

The staff report noted: property is zoned B-3, Central Business District; building was built in 1878 by Hays, Cruikshank & Wilmington; building is listed on the National Register of Historic Places; applicant plans to reface existing sign measuring 15' x 2', or 30 square feet, with new logo; sign will have three-dimensional lettering and will comply with the design manual; the sign will have a white background and black lettering; and staff recommends approval based on the findings of:

- The sign complies with the Design Manual and Sign Code
- Similar colors and material are found in other areas of the district

A motion was made by Mr. Westmeyer, seconded by Mrs. Ehrlich, to approve the certificate of appropriateness for the historic district application for 10 W. Main Street as submitted, based on the exact colors and materials in the application, and based on the findings of staff that:

- The sign complies with the Design Manual and Sign Code
- Similar colors and material are found in other areas of the district

**MOTION ADOPTED, UNANIMOUS ROLL CALL VOTE**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m. upon motion of Mr. Emerick, seconded by Mr. Titterington, and approved by unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_Secretary