

CITY OF AURORA  
OHIO  
**Landmark Commission**  
Meeting Minutes  
February 27, 2020

The Landmark Commission met in a re-scheduled meeting on Thursday, February 27, 2020 in the Council Chambers at City Hall. Jeff Clark called the meeting to order at 7:39 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Present: Jeff Clark  
Jason Coleman, arrived at 7:40 p.m.  
Tim Holder  
John Kudley  
Thomas Shrout  
Also Present: Meredith Davis, Ass't. Director, Planning, Zoning & Building Division  
Ron Lowe, Advisor to Landmark Commission  
Marie Lawrie, Secretary  
Clark Magdych, Representative from Mantua Landmark Commission

**AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA:**

The applicant requested to be postponed, as he is looking into additional window options.

**MOTION: To postpone 108 S. Chillicothe Road, Basement Window Replacement**

Mr. Holder moved, Mr. Kudley seconded, and the motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

**ADOPTION OF MINUTES:**

**MOTION: To adopt the minutes of the January 16, 2020 meeting**

Mr. Kudley moved, Mr. Holder seconded, and the motion carried on a 5-0 roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Kudley, Mr. Holder, Mr. Clark, Mr. Coleman, Mr. Shrout

Nays: None

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**241 S. Chillicothe Road, Staci Reardon – Garage Door for Barn**

The homeowner was not able to attend the meeting. The contractor was also unavailable to attend. Additional information was submitted, as requested at the previous meeting. Mr. Lowe gave an overview of the project, and what has transpired to date. Ms. Davis explained that the Residential Building Official visited the project site and he completed a review of the submission. No additional information was requested for compliance with the Ohio Building Code. It was confirmed that the contractor for this project is not the same one that originally proposed the (2) garage doors in 2015.

Mr. Coleman stated that the single door will look similar to the doors that were originally approved, and he was in favor of issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness. It was discussed and confirmed that the approval from 2015 does not carry over to the current garage door plans. Mr. Kudley was not in favor of issuing the Certificate of Appropriateness, as he stated the drawings submitted do not adequately reflect what the Commission requested. He stated that the materials and colors were not included in the submission. Mr. Lowe stated that the submission states that they will match existing. The sales quote lists a white garage door. Mr. Holder was concerned about the type of drawing that was submitted. He suggested that the Commission not approve the project until the applicant provides the type of drawing that was requested.

Mr. Clark stated that he looked around the district and noticed several other garage doors that were replaced without seeking the approval of the Landmark Commission. He stated that although the drawings were not exactly what the Commission requested, he was not in favor of penalizing a homeowner who followed the correct procedure. He further stated that he did not see the value that this particular door would add to her home, but that this homeowner did see that value. Mr. Clark suggested that the door could be painted green to match the house and that it may look less intrusive. Ms. Davis stated that she could suggest that color to the homeowner. It was determined that the original approval stated that the door would be desert tan, however; the home may have been a different color at that time. Mr. Shrout was in favor of approving the white door, as the resident has requested. Mr. Lowe advised the group not to include a specific color with their approval, as the barn could be painted a new color at any time. He advised the members to concentrate on the architecture of the project, rather than the color.

Mr. Coleman asked what alternative could be offered to the homeowner, if the board could not approve the garage doors. Mr. Holder asked if that was the responsibility of the board to offer an alternative. He further stated that he hoped that the commission bends over backwards to help the homeowner come to the right conclusion. Mr. Shrout stated that the commission should not expect the homeowner to guess what it is that the commission would approve. He was in favor of offering some guidance to a homeowner if the board was not going to approve the application.

Mr. Clark stated that it was discouraging that the commission is having a special meeting and the applicant is not present. Mr. Coleman asked if it was permissible to conduct this business without a representative. Ms. Davis stated that they could. Mr. Coleman asked if this was a frequent occurrence. Mr. Holder and Mr. Clark said it was not done frequently. The applicant requested that her project receive an administrative approval. Mr. Shrout reminded the membership that the meeting was not rescheduled due to a conflict of the applicant.

**MOTION: To issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the garage door replacement, as submitted**

Mr. Shrout moved, Mr. Coleman seconded, and the motion carried on a 3-2 roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Shrout, Mr. Coleman, Mr. Clark

Nays: Mr. Holder, Mr. Kudley

## MISCELLANEOUS:

### Lampposts

Ms. Davis explained that lampposts are to be installed along State Route 306 within the Historic District along the west side of the road from State Route 82 to the triangle. She is awaiting quotes. She had hoped to have that information available for this meeting. It was not ready. It will come back before the commission when all the information is compiled. Mr. Holder asked if there was a budget for this project. Mr. Clark asked if this was part of a bigger plan. He also asked if the sandstone sidewalks would be taken out. He stated that there are some sandstone pieces that could be saved. Mr. Kudley stated that it would be terrible to put a modern sidewalk in place of the historic sidewalks. Ms. Davis will return with the engineered drawings and lamppost cut sheets when available. Mr. Clark stated that he hoped a lot of thought goes into the lampposts because he did not think the project was high on the “want-list” for residents in that area. Ms. Davis stated that it has always been part of the streetscape enhancement plan. Mr. Clark inquired if she was talking about the old streetscape plan from Mayor McGill. He said that was a concept plan and it was never expanded upon. Mr. Kudley requested a 3D rendering of the project. Mr. Kudley suggested that if there was not enough funds for custom lampposts, it may be possible to appropriate additional funds. Mr. Kudley asked if the plan to install sidewalks on the east side of the road was abandoned. Ms. Davis answered that engineering was being done for that phase. Mr. Kudley stated that he did not understand why that project was going forward when the residents of that area did not want it. He further stated that he would like to see a rendering of the complete project, rather than seeing the project in phases. Ms. Davis stated she would bring back more information as it is available.

### Train Station Marker

Mr. Kudley updated the members on the work he is doing for the historic marker. He asked Mr. Lowe to work on the text for one side of the sign. He stated that Norfolk Southern has verbiage for the other side. He explained the application process.

### Letter to Administration

Mr. Clark was preparing a letter to the administration to explain that there are some suggestions in the Master Plan that the commission could act upon. Also, he would like to explore whether property tax monies could be used toward home improvements for landmarked properties. He was also interested in landmarking more properties. He read the draft to the members. Mr. Kudley suggested that the final letter come from the Landmark Commission as a whole.

### Mantua Landmark Commission

Clark Magdych was in attendance to observe the Aurora Landmark Commission. He is part of the Mantua Landmark Commission. There was a discussion describing some of the history of the Aurora Landmark Commission.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**MOTION: To adjourn the meeting.**

Mr. Shrout moved to adjourn at 8:34 p.m. Mr. Coleman seconded, and the motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

---

Jeff Clark - Chairman

---

Marie Lawrie – Clerk