

# City of Canal Fulton

---

## **HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION / PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

**Thursday – November 18, 2004**

### **HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Mr. Clayton Hopper called the November 18, 2004 joint meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and Planning Commission to order at 7:30 PM.

#### **ROLL CALL - PRESENT**

##### **HPC**

Rochelle Rossi  
Sandra Hayes  
Diane Downing  
Clayton Hopper  
John Workman  
Dennis Browne  
Bill Dorman

##### **Planning Commission**

Clayton Hopper  
John Workman  
Diane Downing  
Don Schwendiman  
**Absent:** Mayor John Grogan

**Mr. Hopper called for a Moment of Silence for the former Mayor of Canal Fulton, Shawn Kenney.**

#### **Others in Attendance**

Johnson Belford, Zoning Inspector; Paul Bagdocius, residents;

#### **CORRECTING & ADOPTING THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

Mr. Workman made a motion to accept the October 21, 2004 HPC meeting minutes; seconded by Mr. Browne.  
**Correction: Bill Dorman was in attendance at the October 21, 2004 HPC meeting (not noted on minutes).**  
**ROLL CALL: Yes – ALL**

Mr. Workman made a motion to accept the October 21, 2004 Planning meeting minutes; seconded by Mrs. Downing.  
**ROLL CALL: Yes - ALL**

**PUBLIC HEARING:** No Public Hearing.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

##### **a) Review Proposed Ordinance Change to the Historic Zoning Code**

Mr. Hopper stated Ms. Rossi and Mr. Workman submitted some ideas toward changes. Mr. Hopper stated he liked the last ideas submitted. He questioned Mr. Workman's Item 1 about if the owner was doing something to a portion of the exterior of the building. Mr. Workman stated the spirit of it was if they have the backside of their building along the Canal, and they are willing to put money into it, fixing it up, then HPC should be willing to give them a sign – but not carte blanche - it would be totally up to HPC whether they give them the sign.

Mr. Hopper made a motion to forward the proposed changes to allow the additional signage to the rear of the buildings to the existing Code to the Law Director to review, correct for errors, and put in ordinance form; seconded by Ms. Rossi. **Discussion:** Mr. Workman said if any HPC members want to add anything else, they should do it now. Mr. Dorman asked how do you define a building beautification project, and Mr. Hopper said that's going to left up to the Board. **ROLL CALL: Yes - ALL**

## **PRESERVATION BUSINESS & CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS**

### **Certificate of Appropriateness**

#### **Paul Bagdocius, 451 E. Cherry St.**

This is for a six-foot-high fence along the side of his building - side of his property facing the apartments on Cherry Street. Mr. Bagdocius said the current fence needs replaced and to be professionally installed; it'll be a "shoe-box" fence, and he'd like to buy cedar (brownish color). It would be longer than the current fence, and it would wrap around the corner about 30 feet.

Mr. Workman made a motion to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness to Paul Bagdocius; seconded by Mrs. Hayes. **ROLL CALL: Yes – ALL CERTIFICATE OF APPRIATENESS IS GRANTED.**

### **WAREHOUSE ON THE CANAL FRONT**

Mr. Hopper brought up the front of the Warehouse, and he stated that if the members recalled, Mr. Roberts received a Certificate of Appropriateness for the remodeling of the front of the building. His drawings he submitted for the work indicated that the left, front door was to be recessed back in, which it is. The work that he proposed to do to the garage door section of the building, he wanted to put an entry door in there, but it also was to be recessed back in. Mr. Hopper stated that what Mr. Roberts has really done there – he did recess the left front door, but the garage door he just put right in line with the garage door and did not recess it back in. Mr. Hopper noticed Mr. Roberts did paint everything, so the building did take on a totally different appearance after they painted it. On the other hand, he didn't know how a steel door is called "historic." Mr. Hopper stated the work that he has done does not match the drawings that Mr. Roberts gave the HPC when they granted the certificate, and asked the HPC if they wanted the Zoning Inspector to pursue this or let it go. Someone stated he recollected that the building was supposed to be in keeping with what was already there, and it was supposed to be a man door that was going to look like it was part of the garage door, and it doesn't. Mr. Hopper said the drawings specifically show the door recessed. Mr. Belford stated Mr. Roberts came into his office two weeks ago and told him the carpenters he had employed could not cut the door apart and recess it to the back wall, and he wanted to put a man door in the door. It was stated that it wasn't oriented right, and according to Mr. Roberts' plans, there was going to be an alcove, but the door was going to be completely going in a different direction (90-degree angle to the existing overhead door). Now it's opening onto a public right-away. Mr. Workman stated that's it's an exterior door and you can't have it opening in. If it was recessed, it wouldn't be an issue, and if it was turned the way Mr. Roberts originally showed on his plan, it wouldn't be an issue. Mr. Workman said, "The spirit of the thing is that he submitted one thing, and then did another." It was stated that Mr. Roberts has been before the HPC enough times that he knows what is expected and what he can and shouldn't do. Mr. Belford is going to speak again with Mr. Roberts about this issue and ask him to attend the January meeting.

### **MOTION TO SUSPEND THE DECEMBER MEETING**

Mr. Dorman made a motion to suspend the December HPC meeting; seconded by Ms. Rossi. **ROLL CALL: Yes - ALL**

### **ADJOURNMENT OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

*Mr. Hopper adjourned the HPC portion of the meeting.*

## **PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### **Occupancy Permit Fees**

The Commission received back from Council the Occupancy Permit. Mr. Hopper stated that Council failed to pass this due to a problem with the fee. Mr. Hopper called Patti Schauwecker, Clerk of Council, who checked the minutes of the Council meeting, and she told him the reason it went back to Planning is that the Law Director told Council that it was Planning Commission's job to set the fees. Mr. Hopper stated he doesn't have any information as to what the fee structure should be. He said Council has sets Planning Commission's fees that they charge for site plan review or sign permits, and Council sets the fees for everything the Zoning Inspector does. Mr. Hopper said that the fee should be something to at least cover costs, and he suggested making the Occupancy Permit fee \$25. Mr. Workman made a motion that the Planning Commission amends the Occupancy Permit fee to \$25, with the recommendation that Council adjust them accordingly if they see fit, and to forward it to the Law Director for retyping and presentation to Council for passage, and declaring an emergency; seconded Mr. Schwendiman.

**ROLL CALL: Yes - ALL**

#### **Steve Smith dba Smith Development Corp. (Final Site Plan Approval of Canal Place)**

Mr. Belford advised Bill Dorman that Mr. Smith could not make the meeting, as he is in Columbus. Mr. Dorman stated there were things that needed cleaned up at the last meeting. The first one was the plot that split off the area where Canal Place subdivision will be in Lot 1. They had an issue with a drainage easement that "he couldn't unilaterally vacate part of the easement, which was owned by Schalmo, without Schalmo's permission." Mr. Dorman had a Quick Claim signed by Don Schalmo, Fred Etheridge being a witness, and a notary that now provides that Quick Claim on that drainage issue easement. The second issue is the approval of the subdivision Canal Place was necessary to provide utilities for Outlot 256, where the strip development was going to go ahead. All was good with the site plan, except they needed to add the names of adjacent property owners, add the sidewalk (they've done), and what used to be called Outlot 1, Mr. Dorman has assigned it City Outlot 256. He stated any lot over one acre in the city is an Outlot and gets an Outlot number. Mr. Belford brought up the issue that the sidewalk for Canal Place are five feet in the "B" districts, and Mr. Dorman will look at that and perhaps re-draw it. The third issue is a drainage easement; they had a storm sewer that went across a piece of property owned by Schalmo before it connected to the City storm sewer. They have an executed easement now from Schalmo to the City to enable construction of that storm sewer piece (which is approximately 38-feet-long). The other issue, where Mr. Dorman gave the Commission of the Standard Construction Agreement that CTI asks all developers to execute with the City. They reviewed his \$180,000 estimate for the construction of the infrastructure, as well as a sidewalk and street light bond, and he will go to Mr. Smith with that so the project can move forward. Mr. Hopper made a motion to approve the site plan of Canal Place, based on the City Engineer's recommendations that the sidewalk might possibly need change in dimension; seconded by Mr. Workman. **ROLL CALL: Yes - ALL      The Site Plan for Canal Place is approved.**

**CONDITIONAL USE** - No issues to discuss

**SHADE TREE BUSINESS** - No issues to discuss

**NEW BUSINESS** – Mr. Workman made a motion to suspend the December meeting; seconded by Mrs. Downing.  
**ROLL CALL: Yes - ALL**

### **ADJOURNMENT**

*Mr. Workman made a motion to adjourn; Mr. Hopper adjourned the Planning Commission portion of the meeting.*

---

**Clayton Hopper, Chair**