

A regular meeting of the Troy Planning Commission was held in Council Chambers, City Hall on Wednesday, May 27, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. with Chairman James McGarry presiding. ATTENDING: Members – McGarry, Titterington, Oda, Westmeyer, Ehrlich and Emerick; Development Staff – Eidemiller and Burgei; and Development Director Tim Davis.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Upon motion of Mr. Westmeyer, seconded by Mayor Oda, the minutes of the April 2, 2026, meeting were approved by unanimous voice vote.

FINAL PLAT APPROVAL, THE RESERVES AT CLIFF OAKS SUBDIVISION, SECTION THREE, FINAL PLAT APPROVAL AND DEDICATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY. THIS DEVELOPMENT IS LOCATED ALONG FENNER ROAD, NORTH OF THE EDGEWATER SUBDIVISION; DEVELOPER IS BOGLE INVESTMENTS, LLC; DOUG ERNST, SOLE MEMBER. Staff reported.

- This development is located along Fenner Road, north of the Edgewater Subdivision. The developer is Bogle Investments, LLC; Doug Ernst, sole member.
- The Planning Commission approved the Preliminary Plan of this Subdivision on March 13, 2024. The Final Plat of Phase Three is in general conformance with the approved Preliminary Plan. The subdivision will be developed in four phases.
- Phase Three is an area of 13.629 acres with 32 buildable lots on 8.532 acres and two drainage lots comprising 3.508 acres.
- There will be 1.589 acres of new right-of-way to be dedicated – Parkview Drive. Pemberley Court, and Hoying Drive.
- The approved zoning is R-4, Single-Family Residential District, which requires a minimum lot size of 9,000 square feet. Actual lot sizes range from .208 acres to 0.399 acres.
- The developer will be providing private open space for this subdivision, which will be maintained by the future HOA; the green space is included in this phase.
- City staff has reviewed Phase Three in detail and has recommended that the Final Plat of The Reserves at Cliff Oaks – Phase Three and the dedication of Right-of-Way be approved by the Troy Planning Commission and recommended for approval to City Council.

A motion was made by Mr. Titterington, seconded by Mr. Emerick, that the Troy Planning Commission recommends to Troy City Council that the Final Plat of The Reserves at Cliff Oaks Subdivision, Section Three, and the dedication of right-of-way be approved as submitted.

MOTION ADOPTED, UNANIMOUS ROLL CALL VOTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, 6 E. MAIN STREET, INSTALLATION OF 8 SQUARE FOOT BUILDING SIGN, PAINTING, AND REPLACEMENT OF DOORS; OWNER - BS PRESTON ENTERPRISES LLC; APPLICANT – KEN THOMPSON. Staff reported: The applicant has received authorization from the property owner for the proposed request; the OHI form lists the property as a double stone pillared store front intact to include display window framing, 2/2 D.H.S. windows with stone lintels and sills, sloping eave with wood laminated brackets and molded frieze; and the property is listed on the National Historic Register. Staff further reported:

DISCUSSION:

Sign. This building is permitted to have a total of 33 square feet of building signage. The applicant is proposing to install eight (8) square foot building sign. The sign will be white three dimensional carved letting in the center of the storefront. Lights for the sign are not part of this application.

Paint. The applicant proposes painting the areas below the large windows and the door and window frames in the entry area black.

Doors. The applicant proposes replacing the two existing doors with new black framed metal doors with water glass.

STAFF ANALYSIS – in bond (Sign)

Section 5.4. Wall signs should be three dimensional, with letters carved by a router, or; letters should be individually pin-mounted or incorporated into a sign panel. **The proposal meets this guideline.**

STAFF ANALYSIS (Paint)

Section 2.6 A. A concentration of similar colors on the same block should be avoided. **Similar colors on the same block are being avoided. The proposal meets this guideline.**

Section 2.6 B. Historically unpainted surfaces should not be painted. Historically painted surfaces should remain painted. **The unpainted surfaces are remaining unpainted. The proposal meets this guideline.**

Section 2.6 C. Simpler buildings should have a simple color scheme. More ornate structures, such as larger Queen Anne styles, may incorporate three or more colors. **The proposal will have a simple color scheme and will meet this guideline.**

Section 2.6 D. Matte, flat, or semi-gloss paint should be used. Avoid high gloss paint. **High gloss paint will be avoided. The proposal will meet this guideline.**

Section 2.6 E. In all circumstances, avoid bright and obtrusive colors, such as neon or day-glow hues. **Bright, obtrusive, and neon colors are being avoided. The proposal meets this guideline.**

STAFF ANALYSIS (Doors)

Section 2.7 A. The functional, proportional, and decorative features of a primary entrance should be preserved. **The proposal meets this guideline.**

Section 2.7 B. If interior alterations make an existing entrance redundant, the door and entrance should be left intact on the exterior. **The proposal meets this guideline.**

Section 2.7 C. Color should be compatible with historically appropriate colors already on the building. **The proposal meets this guideline.**

Section 2.7 D. Avoid treatments that attempt to “dress up” a door or entrance or give it a character that was never original. **The proposal meets this guideline.**

Section 2.7 E. Surviving original storm doors should be retained. **The proposal meets this guideline.**

Section 2.7 F. New storm doors should be of simple design. The design should be a full-height glass section that permits viewing the main door. **The proposal meets this guideline.**

Staff recommends approval of the sign due to the compliance with Design Manual Section 5.4 and the City of Troy Sign Code requirements; Staff recommends approval of the paint due to the compliance with Design Manual Section 2.6;m. Staff recommends approval of the doors due to the compliance with Design Manual Section 2.7.

ACTION OF THE COMMISSION:

A motion was made by Mr. Titterington seconded by Mayor Oda, to approve the Historic District Application for the sign, painting and door replacements as submitted for 6 E. Main Street, based on the exact colors and materials as stated in the application, and based on the findings of staff as stated in the application for each element of the application.

MOTION ADOPTED, UNANIMOUS ROLL CALL VOTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, 19 S. CHERRY STREET FOR DEMOLITION.; OWNER - ALLEN COUNTY LEASING; APPLICANT - BAKEHOUSE BREAD & COOKIE CO. Staff reported:

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

A request by the applicant, Bakehouse Bread & Cookie Co., on behalf of the owner, Allen County Leasing, for the demolition of the structure at 19 S. Cherry Street. The applicant has received authorization from the property owner for this request.

The Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI) form lists this property as a “Two-Story vernacular frame residence with some Queen Anne elements. The character defining features include: interesting gable roof line, irregular massing; decorative trim around windows and doors; side porches; angled window in the front; front entrance doors. Alterations include: vinyl siding; single story rear wing; a two-story front wing that if not original is an early alteration”.

Historical Archive:

The Troy Historic Library provided a timeline related to the history of this property. The earliest news mention was in 1916 and it was an advertisement for a rental for 4-5 rooms. The advertisement referenced “4-5 rooms, gas, electric lights, both waters in kitchen, newly prepared” Six (6) additional times the property was listed as a rental from 1917 to 1941. In between, there were several different beauty shops and doctors offices. From 1970 into the 1980’s, the latest commercial use was “Ressie’s Beauty Salon”. The full timeline was included in the application.

Professional Engineer Inspection:

The City performed an analysis of the integrity of the structure with professional engineer Bruns Consulting. Based on this analysis, Bruns Consulting identified the following key points:

- 1. The foundation walls have shifted and are significantly leaning to the North (especially in the NW corner of the structure).
- 2. The block/stone foundation walls around the entire perimeter have significantly deteriorated.
- 3. The floor system of the first-floor room in the NW corner of the structure is structurally unstable. It has shifted due to the foundation shift.
- 4. There are significant cracks and holes in the interior walls and ceilings.
- 5. The Electrical system includes junction boxes that are not sealed in compliance with the National Electric Code.
- 6. The two exterior porches have settled.

Based on these factors, Bruns Consulting estimates the total repair budget between \$180,000 - \$250,000. This estimate only addresses the structural and safety concerns and does not consider a full restoration to a productive use.

STAFF ANALYSIS: (Staff analysis can be found following each code section criteria in red below:)

Compliance with the Zoning Code. Zoning Code 1143.22 (m)(6) C. states: “The Planning Commission shall determine whether a structure or site is historically significant by meeting at least four (4) of the following criteria:

i. Value as a reminder of the cultural or archaeological heritage of the city, state, or nation; **There is no value of the structure as it relates to the cultural or archaeological heritage. The demolition application satisfies this criteria.**

ii. Location as a site of a significant local, state, or national event; **N/A**

iii. Identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the city, state, or nation; **There is no identification with a person(s) who significantly contributed to the development of the City. Joseph Baines originally purchased the property in 1873 and built the house in 1880. Baines was a merchant and council member. The demolition application satisfies this criteria.**

iv. Identification as the work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose individual work has influenced the city, state, or nation; **There is no identification of work of a master builder, designer, or architect with any influence. Baines was a merchant and council member. The demolition application satisfies this criteria.**

v. Value as a building that is recognized for the quality of its architecture and that it retains sufficient elements showing such architectural significance; **There is minimal value of the quality of this architecture. The OHI form references a two-story vernacular frame residence with some Queen Anne Elements. The contributing features referenced include: “interesting gable roof line, irregular massing, decorative trim around windows and doors, angled window in the front, and front entrance doors.” While there is no measurable metric for “interesting gable roof line”, The trim around the windows and doors are significantly deteriorated and many of which are not original to the building. The exterior has been covered in vinyl siding. The only “angled window in the front” is likely due to the structural issues on the norther façade as referenced by Bruns Consulting. The demolition application satisfies this criteria.**

vi. Example of an architectural style or period; **This is a marginal example of Queen Anne architecture, Most defining architectural features of this style are missing. Common architectural features of this style include patterned masonry or textured wall surfaces including half timbering, Single pane windows, some with small decorative panes or stained glass, steeply pitched irregular roof lines, abundance of decorative elements and often a Round or Polygonal corner tower. See below visual examples: The only remaining element is the irregular roof shape and asymmetrical façade. There is no patterned masonry, the windows are not original, there is no stained glass, no abundance of decorative features, and no polygonal corner tower. The demolition application satisfies this criteria.**

vii. Contribution to the historical nature of the overall site; and/or **There is minimal contribution to the historical nature of the overall site. The demolition application satisfies this criteria.**

viii. Character as a contributing element in the Historic Preservation Overlay District. **There is minimal character as a contributing element in the HPO District. See above iv. – vi. The demolition application meets this criteria.**

When using criteria from 1143.22(m) (6) C. It is Staff’s opinion that the structure is not historically significant.

Zoning Code 1143.22 (m)(6) B. states: “For structures that the Planning Commission finds that are not historically significant, the Planning Commission may relax or waive the standards or guidelines found in this Chapter or guidelines”. **Based on the staff analysis in 1143.22(m) (6) C., Staff recommends that the Planning Commission waive the standards found in 1143.22 (n) and approve the demolition.**

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed demolition based on the analysis that the structure is not significate based on the review of 1143.22(m) (6) C. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission waive the standards found in 1143.22 (n) and approve the demolition of 19 S. Cherry Street as submitted.

DISCUSSION OF THE COMMISSION:

-In response to a question, staff and the owner confirmed that the supported re-use plan is green space. Staff noted that any other re-use would have to come back to the Commission.

-Mr. Titterington commented that he wanted to be on the record that he will be voting in favor of this, but he has some concerns that in late October of last year, the president of the THPA attended a meeting and expressed opposition, concerns at a minimum, but opposition to the city allowing the CIC to own this building, with the intent on demolishing it, and that intent was in the staff report. He stated that the THPA indicated they wanted the City or CIC to rehab and not demolish the building. Mr. Titterington stated that he finds it a little bit inconsistent, if not hypocritical, that the THPA is not being consistent with their message as they now support the building demolition. He stated he believes the new owner has the potential to do some good things with that property ultimately.

ACTION OF THE COMMISSION:

A motion was made by Mr. Titterington seconded by Mayor Oda, to approve the Historic District Application for the sign, painting and door replacements as submitted for 6 E. Main Street, based on the exact colors and materials as stated in the application, and based on the findings of staff as stated in the application for each element of the application.

MOTION ADOPTED, UNANIMOUS ROLL CALL VOTE

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:47 p.m. upon motion of Mr. Westmeyer, seconded by Mr. Emerick, followed by unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

_____Chairman

_____Secretary

