

**Landmark Commission  
April 15th, 2020  
Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting called to order:**

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 4:36pm. The following members were present: Mr. Michael Zuilhof, Mr. Jon Lawrence, Mr. Joe Galea, and Dr. Tim Berkey, Mr. Alan Griffiths, Mr. Ryan Nagel, and Commissioner Mike Meinzer. Mr. Thomas Horsman, Mr. Greg Voltz, and Ms. Angela Byington represented the Planning Department. Mr. Trevor Hayberger represented the Law Department.

**Review of minutes from February 19th, 2019:**

Mr. Zuilhof motioned to approve the minutes. Mr. Nagel seconded the motion. With no further discussion, all members were in favor to approve the minutes.

**1<sup>st</sup> application:**

The Chairman stated that the first application on the agenda is for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an outdoor patio seating area for Vita Sandusky located at 256 Columbus Avenue.

Mr. Horsman asked if there could be a motion to postpone the application until the May meeting.

Mr. Lawrence made a motion to postpone the application until the May meeting. Commissioner Meinzer seconded the motion. All voting members were in favor of the motion.

**2<sup>nd</sup> application:**

The Chairman briefly went over the intent statement that was brought up by City Commissioners when the Landmark Commission was organized as well as the process of the Landmark Commission meeting. Dr. Berkey then stated that the second application on the agenda is for a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior renovations, signage, & outdoor patio seating area for Hot Dog Tony's located at 115 West Water Street.

Mr. Horsman stated that staff does support the project but does have some concerns that were conveyed to the applicant and includes the removal of the old doorway on the front façade as well as the replacement of the historic windows, as the historic guidelines call for restoration of windows and keeping window sizes the same. Also the new sign that was proposed would need a zoning variance.

Mr. Griffiths asked if the door on the front of the building is original or if it was added on at some point and if the windows that are proposed to replace the current ones are to be similar in look to the ones that are currently there.

Mr. Horsman stated that he will let the applicant answer the question regarding the windows they are proposing. As far as the door, he was not able to find any evidence on whether or not that was an original door or not.

Mr. Zuilhof stated that according to the guidelines, the windows should not be replaced unless they are beyond repair. He said it is his opinion that they can be repaired. As for the door, it looks modern, so as long as it is replaced according to the guidelines with similar and like materials, that should be fine.

Mr. Nagel stated that he agrees with Mr. Zuilhof regarding the windows and that the windows on the back of the building should also follow those guidelines as well and in the applicant's proposal they do not seem to be. Mr. Zuilhof stated that he would like for staff to explain what they have talked with the applicant and other business owners about in regards to the sidewalk on Shoreline Drive. Given that the sidewalk is 25 feet wide, and they are only leaving five feet of access, seems like that might be a little bit of overreach. However, he just recently learned that was the suggestion of staff.

Mr. Voltz stated that staff did let the applicant know that they would be able to utilize the space that they are proposing on their application, due to the fact that eight and a half of the 25 feet is occupied by the amenity zone, which is a lot of the items in the back of the building that extend out into that 25 feet. The space of the ADA sidewalk that is there is six feet. Remaining is 11 1/2 feet, and staff told the applicant they could use 9 1/2 feet of that 11 1/2 feet. Staff are also working with the liquor license rules.

Mr. Zuilhof stated that the policy he received from staff showed five feet of sidewalk access not six feet. Also, the amenity zone does not exist, only in policy perhaps, and everything that protrudes from the back of that building comes to about six and a half feet give or take, not eight and a half. The concern is that this proposal is not consistent with what has been discussed or approved in the past.

Mr. Voltz stated that block currently does have their amenity zone at six and a half feet. However the block to the east is at eight and a half feet, so that is how the eight and a half feet became a standard. The five feet is correctly shown, however, the ADA sidewalk is six feet. The fencing along the sidewalk will not be permanent, so if 5 feet is too small this year, they could see if they could move to six feet next year. That also depends on liquor control and the amount of space they will require.

Dr. Berkeley stated that regarding signage, the Landmark Commission has raised concerns about the size of signage on buildings and are in the process of looking at the language on that, so the Landmark Commission may not yet be ready to approve any signage at this time.

Mr. Zuilhof stated that he would also like to get clarification from the applicant regarding the awnings because if they are going to remain illuminated, then they need to count as signage.

Applicant Greg Schmid, with Poulin & Schmid Design Group, stated that as far as signage, that is in phase two of their work and can be determined at a later time, and they are still working out the details on that anyways. The vinyl covered awnings on Water Street, they would be replacing the vinyl which is worn and weathered. The awnings, windows, and door on the store front are all part of the future phase also. The deck, dugout bar, retractable awning, are all part of phase one work, as well as the three windows and one door on Shoreline Drive. Since the restaurants are being relocated to the back area, the windows will need to be frosted windows. There are currently two entrance doors in the back. One will be closed off as that is where the restrooms will be, so just the one will be replaced. The design started last summer based on the guidelines given by the city. The five feet given in the sidewalk does meet ADA requirements.

Mr. Galea stated that he has been doing some research while the meeting has been taking place and from what he found, the five foot sidewalk does meet the ADA requirements as well as any other standards he was able to find. Also, given what Mr. Voltz had stated regarding the amenity zone and the sidewalk that will be on the other side of the street, a five foot sidewalk seems reasonable.

Mr. Horsman stated that the changes that were made to the Preservation Design Guidelines last year, state that five feet is the minimum and that a dining area cannot exceed 60% of the sidewalk. The amenity zone is not considered sidewalk in this calculation, and so that is where the dimensions came from for these plans. Also, these plans have yet to be reviewed by the Engineering division.

Mr. Zuilhof stated that he does not agree that these plans conform to the standard because in his interpretation of the standards, the standards would allow 15 feet of use by the business and leave 10 feet for the public.

Mr. Schmid stated that regarding the rectangular windows they are proposing and that some members have concerns with, it is exactly what was done two buildings to the west. Also, the arched windows are double the cost of the rectangular ones.

Dr. Berkeley asked Mr. Schmid if he could clarify what he would like the Landmark Commission to vote on today regarding the components of the application since some items are in a future phase of work to be done.



Mr. Schmid replied that from the list of components on the application, they would like an answer on A) Masonry repairs and gutters, B) Shoreline Drive deck and stairs, and awning over the deck. C) New windows and enter door on Shoreline Drive side first floor, and D) Dugout bar. While they do not want to do the storefront right now, they would like to know if they would be allowed to do the vinyl clad windows, which is on every other single building on that block. The wood jambs would stay, the new windows would just go between those wood jambs. For the storefront windows, everything is wood right now. If they would not be allowed to do the vinyl clad, he would like to know that now. The vinyl clad is a much more energy efficient window. He would also like to know if they awnings will be able to be replaced on the front. He stated that since the owner has no plans of occupying the second and third floors they do not need approval on those today. However, just to let the commission know, those windows are currently single pane windows, and in order to meet the Ohio Energy Code, they cannot use the single pane windows, so that is why they want to replace those with an energy efficient window.

Mr. Nagel asked if the rear retractable awning on Shoreline Drive is going to be a canvas material and on the front, are those awnings going to be replaced again with an illuminated vinyl or canvas.

Mr. Schmid stated that the awnings on Water Street are going to be a sunbrella fabric or web lawn vinyl. The retractable awning is also going to be a sunbrella fabric or web lawn vinyl.

Mr. Zuilhof motioned to approve item A) Masonry repairs and gutters. Mr. Griffiths seconded the motion. All voting members were in favor of the motion.

Mr. Zuilhof motioned to approve item B) Shoreline Drive deck and stairs, and awning over deck. Mr. Galea seconded the motion. All voting members were in favor of the motion.

Mr. Griffiths made a motion to approve item C) New windows and enter door on Shoreline Drive side of first floor with the revisal that all windows conform completely to the shape that they are currently. Mr. Zuilhof seconded the motion. All voting members were in favor of the motion.

Mr. Griffiths made a motion to approve item D) Dugout bar. No second was made to the motion.

Mr. Zuilhof made a motion to deny item D) Dugout bar. No second was made to the motion. All voting members were in favor of the motion.

Mr. Griffiths noted that this would also be subject to any liquor control guidelines.

Mr. Griffiths made a motion to approve item E) Patio fencing on Shoreline Drive subject to any liquor control guidelines. Mr. Galea seconded the motion. All voting members were in favor of the motion except for Mr. Zuilhof.

Mr. Griffiths made a motion to approve item G) Aluminum storefront replacement on Water Street. Mr. Lawrence seconded the motion.

Mr. Zuilhof asked for clarification if this means that the stone that is there will remain and that the windows will be framed with aluminum.

Mr. Schmid stated that was correct.

All voting members were in favor of the motion.

Mr. Schmid asked if this was also approving the other entrance door or is this to just replace what is currently there.

Mr. Horsman stated we should add that to the list as item J) Removal of second entrance door and replacing that with facade.

Mr. Schmid said that they are not yet sure if they want to remove the second entrance door yet or not, so he wasn't sure if it needed to be voted on today or not.

Mr. Griffiths made a motion to table items H) New signage on top of the building on Shoreline Drive facade, I) 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> story window replacement, and J) Removal of second entrance door and replacing with facade. Mr. Zuilhof seconded the motion. All voting members were in favor of the motion.

Mr. Griffiths asked for clarification on whether or not there was still going to be lighting on the vinyl awning replacement on Water Street.

Mr. Schmid stated that they have no plans to change the lighting or anything else on the awning other than the vinyl. It would have the same logo that is currently on there.

Mr. Griffiths motioned to table item F) Vinyl awning replacement on Water Street. Mr. Zuillhof seconded the motion. All voting members were in favor of the motion.

**Meeting adjourned:**

Dr. Berkey motioned to adjourn the meeting and the meeting ended at 6:36pm.

**Approved by:**

Kristen M. Barone

Kristen Barone, Clerk

Timothy J. Berkey

Timothy Berkey, Chairman