Landmark Commission September 29, 2021 Special Meeting Minutes

Meeting called to order:

Chairman Ryan Whaley called the meeting to order at 5:01pm. The following members were present: Mike Meinzer, Alan Griffiths, Louis Schultz, and Robert Truka. Alec Ochs and Arin Blair represented the Community Development Department. Administrative Assistant Kristen Barone was also present.

Review of minutes from August 18, 2021:

Mr. Meinzer made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Schultz seconded. All voting members were in favor of the motion.

Applications:

a. 165 Jackson Street

Mr. Ochs explained that the applicant, Brady Signs, has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 165 Jackson Street to place a set of internally illuminated channel letters affixed to the east facing façade. The building is within the Downtown Sandusky Commercial Historic District but is a noncontributing building. The existing signage on the building reading "The Ashley Group" is internally illuminated and similar to what is proposed. The existing sign was installed before the creation of the Landmark Commission which is why it is allowed. Staff's questions and concerns for the applicant is: will the colored logo be illuminated and is the lighting adjustable? Nathan Glass with Brady Signs stated that the colors will light and the LED illumination will not be adjustable, which is consistent with the existing sign. Staff recognizes that the Sandusky Preservation Design Guidelines state that internally illuminated signs are "inappropriate" for the downtown area. However, due to the fact that the building is a non-contributing structure of historical significance and it is going to replace existing LED signage, staff recommends the granting of the Certificate of Appropriateness if the brightness does not exceed the brightness deemed appropriate by the Landmark Commission and as long as all permits required are obtained through the Building Division, Planning Division, and Engineering Division. Mr. Meinzer said he has never heard of any complaints about the existing sign, but if someone does complain about this sign after it is approved, he would like the chance to be able to revisit it. Mr. Griffiths asked staff if the size of the sign meets the guidelines. Mr. Ochs stated that after the Landmark Commission makes a decision the applicant would then apply for the sign permit and he would look at and approve or deny the permit on certain factors including the sizing provided. Mr. Griffiths then made a motion to approve the application with staff's conditions. Mr. Meinzer seconded the motion. All voting members were in favor of the motion.

b. 319 Lawrence Street

Mr. Ochs reminded the committee that at the last meeting, the committee reviewed an application for a new roof for this address and the committee voted to approve removing the existing roof and getting the roof to the dry, so that the applicant could have contractors come in and look at what is underneath and give them a quote on getting a roof that is similar to what was there before. The applicant submitted a new application since, stating that they would like to put up a ribbed metal roof, including gutters and downspouts. The color will be chosen from the available manufacturing options to most closely match the previous roof's color. Since the time of writing the staff report there has been a different color scheme provided on options available, as the applicant choose who her preferred provider is based on her budget. The product is consistent, just the color scheme is different. Staff does not have any concerns with the product. Staff discussed suggesting the Landmark

Commission choose the color of the product, but a concern there is that a lot of times the color looks a lot different on paper or a screen than what it will look like in person, so maybe the best bet is seeing what the contractor recommends is closest. Bob Zimmerman, the applicant's brother, stated that it is also hard to know what the color really looked like years ago when the roof was put on and if the definition of patina green has changed over the years, so he would like to leave the color choice up to his sister, the owner, who lives in the home. Mr. Whaley stated that he would be comfortable with letting the owner pick the color choice as long as they try to match the color up as closely as possible. Mr. Griffiths asked staff if the guidelines speak to maintaining roof color. Mr. Ochs replied that yes the guidelines state that new materials will match the old in composition, design, color, and texture. Mr. Zimmerman asked if that is the case, wouldn't they have to find out that information from back when the home was registered. Mr. Whaley stated that they do not need to get that specific, but just want to get the colors to match as close as possible. Mr. Griffiths made a motion to approve the application as recommended by staff and under the condition that the applicant will pick a color that is similar to what was there before. Mr. Meinzer seconded the motion. All voting members were in favor of the motion.

Meeting adjourned:

Mr. Griffiths moved to adjourn and the meeting ended at 5:21pm.

Approved by:

Kristen Barone, Clerk

Ryan Whaley, Chairman