

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

**Thursday, April 15, 2004**

Mr. John Workman called the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 PM.

**Present**

**HPC**

Rochelle Rossi  
Sandra Hayes  
Bill Dorman  
Diane Downing  
John Workman  
(Clayton Hopper was excused.)

**Planning Commission**

John Workman  
Diane Downing  
Don Schwendiman  
John Grogan

**Others in Attendance**

Johnson Belford, Zoning Department  
Margaret Manley, Resident (with her father)  
Ken Roberts, Resident  
John R. Tichon

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

**Item 1: Approval of Minutes**

Mrs. Rossi made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 18, 2004 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission. Diane Downing seconded the motion.  
Roll: Yes – 5 Abstains - 1(Clayton Hopper because he was not in attendance.)

## **Public Hearing**

### **Public Hearing on Susan D. Campbell, 307 Cherry St., West, a home occupation sale of Avon products.**

Ms. Campbell was not in attendance. Mr. Dorman asked if it was permissible to operate a home business in a residential area. Mr. Workman stated Ms. Campbell is one residence outside the B-2 on Cherry Street. Mr. Dorman said he thought there was another person who had a card business in Colonial Hills, and they had approved that. Mr. Belford stated Ms. Campbell's real concern was that she wanted it to be legal and that the second concern would be to place a home business sign in her yard.

The issue was tabled until the next meeting.

## **New Business**

### **Margaret Manley, 342 N. Canal St. (Addition of a 4-Seasons Sun Porch)**

Ms. Manley and her father were present. Mr. Belford stated the sun porch will match the existing siding and have a sloping shed roof coming off over the East and have windows all around, but on the North side there would be a solid wall. It would be the shake siding up to the window level, and then the windows, and then basically just the roof up above that. Mr. Workman asked since the roof is going to be a shingle, would they have enough pitch for shake shingle roof, and that'll match the rest of the house, and isn't there a porch on the side now. It was stated that there is a porch on the alley – just a small entry porch. Ms. Manley owns the entire lot. Ms. Manley affirmed there would be doorway out on the alley, a doorway in the backyard, and the siding is going to be the same as what is on there currently. The roof is going to be shingle to match the top, and is going to be the same color as the house is currently. The Manleys stated the siding would continue from the existing house right across the lower end of the addition, all the way around. It was asked if there was a foundation, and Mr. Manley answered that they were looking at the possibility of doing a deck addition, a pole-support structure underneath and then with the tile block, without doing the traditional basement-type foundation. Mr. Dorman was wondering about snow and rain because it looks like they are going to have it down on grade just to get the roof line to fit in there. Mr. Manley stated the floor level would be the same level as the floor inside the house, so that makes it tight to squeeze it and have the headroom clearance inside and still have enough slope on the roof to drain snow and rain. Mr. Dorman asked if this was something the Building Department looks at, as far as the present foundation and stated that it all has to conform to Zoning and Stark County Building; all they are really looking at is if it is architecturally correct. Mr. Manley stated he could get that kind of height with that kind of slope and that he had done quite a bit of measuring, and it can be done. Mr. Workman asked if there was another alternative if it can't be done; and Mr. Manley answered that then you would have to drop the floor level down to grade (or else go with a flatter roof). He stated they would drop the floor to grade level, and then it would be a concrete floor covered with something, before he would go with a flatter roof.

Ms. Rossi made a motion to approve the addition of a four-season porch for 342 North Canal Street, subject to using siding and roofing that conforms to the rest of the house; Mr. Dorman seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Yes - ALL

### **Ken Roberts dba Warehouse on the Canal, 239 N. Canal St. (Signage)**

Mr. Roberts brought examples of signs created by Wacker Signs. Rochelle Rossi had seen some old photographs, and stated the building is 1906, and the “Chew on Honest Scrap” sign is a historical sign. Mr. Roberts is looking into grants to restore historical signs in order to restore the “Chew on Honest Scrap” sign.

Mr. Workman said that HPC only has to approve the design – that has nothing to do with the size of it, and he would entertain a motion to approve the design of this sign. Mrs. Downing made a motion that the Commission approves the concept and design of the sign. Mr. Dorman seconded the motion, but he wanted to make the provision that Mr. Roberts does not cover the “Chew on Honest Scrap” painted on the side of the building. Mr. Roberts wants to try to restore it, and he would like to make the letters for the Tea Garden as large as 18 inches. He stated the other Chamber letter said that it was proportionate for only seven inches, so this is probably only 10 or 12 inches. He wants it to be a little bit smaller than the Warehouse, so there is a contrast, but not too small. Mr. Roberts said people are coming and saying that they don’t even know the name of the restaurant – that they are just saying, “The Tea House,” so that is why they want “The Tea Garden.” Mr. Dorman commented that the letters in “Tea Garden” are about 1/3 the size of the letters in “The Warehouse.” Mr. Roberts said “The Warehouse” is about two-foot, and he would like at least 18 inches; and, of course, “The Tea Pot” has to be bigger too – proportionate to that. Mr. Workman said that if we take away the square footage of one of these signs, it would only give him three, so if Mr. Roberts works with the Commission, the Commission will work with him. So, basically, they have a motion to approve the concept of the sign, the design and the concept of having three individual signs horizontally across the building, leaving the “Chew on Honest Scrap” intact. It was stated that Mr. Roberts did have three across; he could hang two more from each one of them and not hit the “Chew on Honest Scrap” and have more spaces than you do with four fours. Mrs. Downing stated that she was wondering if we did go with the three across, she was assuming that Mr. Roberts would adjust the position of the actual Warehouse sign, so that it is centered a little more – wanting to make sure of same. Mr. Roberts showed original designs – and they liked the one he ended up with for this meeting.

Roll Call: Yes – ALL

### **Downtown Signage and Identifying Local Businesses**

After considerable discussion, Mr. Workman stated HPC would grant conceptual approval for the signage. However, Mr. Roberts will have to come back to the HPC with the final design. He will also have to get permission from Council to install the signs in the downtown.

Ms. Rossi made a motion to accept the basic concept of the sign to be approved at a later date, after they get back with the Commission. Motion was seconded by Mrs. Downing.

Roll Call: Yes – All

***The Historic Preservation Commission portion of the meeting was adjourned.***

### **PLANNING COMMISSION**

Tabled approval of last month's minutes because there is not a quorum for it.

#### **Old Business**

None.

#### **Conditional Use:**

Susan D. Campbell, 307 Cherry St., W (Conditional Zoning Certificate for Home Business, Sale of Avon Product)

Tabled until next month due to applicant was not present.

#### **Shade Tree Business**

John R. Tichon, 224 N. High St. (Removal of Tree in Devil's Strip in Front of Home)

Mr. Tichon stated that he had to have the drain company move out and clear his drain; they said that the roots from the tree has started blocking his line (that is one of the problems). He said if he does get to take it down, he was going to replace it on either side with Bradford flowering pear trees whose root system goes straight down instead of branching outward. It was stated that there was a Maple tree there currently. Mr. Tichon wanted to shave the tree off flat with the ground; Mr. Belford asked that the stump be ground out; Mr. Tichon agreed. He was told to call the gas company to mark their location, so the gas services would not be accidentally cut. Mr. Workman asked how long it would take to get the other trees up and what size the replacement trees would be; Mr. Tichon stated this Spring or early Summer (around 30 days or so), and the trees will be six-foot high or higher. Mr. Workman's concern was of the replacement issue, and wanted assurance to the Board that if they approve the tree removal that Mr. Tichon guarantees replacement of two flowering pear trees within 30 days.

Mr. Workman made a motion to approve removal of tree in Devil's Strip in front of home located at 224 N. High St., subject to Mr. Tichon following through and putting up the trees that

he says he is going to replace the Maple tree with within 30 days of taking down the Maple tree and making sure the stump is ground below ground level, so that grass can be planted on top. Ms. Rossi seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Yes – ALL

Mr. Belford told Mr. Workman he would send him a letter next week outlining the conditions.

### **New Business**

Mr. Belford stated that under the Zoning Code he can order a diseased tree down, and he has been including in the cut-down orders that the stump is to be ground or removed; however, there is nothing in the Code that covers him. He stated he has spoken with Mayor Grogan, and they feel they should make a recommendation to Council to amend that portion of the Zoning Code that when trees are removed that the stumps should be ground.

Ms. Downing made a motion to provide for new language for the Zoning Code to include the grinding of stumps for trees that have been removed from the double strip. Mr. Dorman seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Yes - ALL

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned.

---

John Workman, Acting Chair