



SHAKER HEIGHTS

**Landmark Commission
Wednesday, February 27, 2019
7 P.M.
City Hall, Conference Room B**

Members Present: Nancy Moore, Council Member, Landmark Commission, Chair
Clifford Brown, Landmark Commission, Member
Ron Reed, Landmark Commission, Member
Thomas Starinsky, Landmark Commission, Member
Meghan Hays, Landmark Commission, Member
Kathy Hexter, Landmark Commission, Member

Others Present: Cameron Roberts, Planner
Daniel Feinstein, Senior Planner

The meeting was called to order by Nancy Moore at 7:00 p.m.

Approval of the January 23, 2019 Meeting Minutes

It was moved by Mr. Starinsky and seconded by Mr. Reed to approve the minutes.

Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion Carried

Certificate of Appropriateness: 18716 Scottsdale Boulevard—New Garage. Shannon Kihlstrom, Property Owner; represented by Lafayette Watkins, Platinum Construction.

Mr. Roberts stated the first case is for a new detached, 2-car garage at 18716 Scottsdale Boulevard. This home was constructed in 1928 and is a single residence dwelling designed by the firm Fox, Duthie, and Foose.

Mr. Roberts presented the property's original garage. Like the home, the original 2-car garage was also constructed in 1928. It was located at the end of the driveway and faced the street. The garage had a flat roof with brick siding that matched the brick on the home. The doors and trim were also brown to match the home. At some point, an inappropriate extension was built onto the left-hand overhead door of the garage.

In December 2018, a demolition permit was issued for the garage due to collapsing brick that was determined to be a hazard by the city's Building and Housing Department. The garage and its foundation were subsequently removed.

Mr. Roberts said the property owner would now like to construct a new detached, 2-car garage on the property. He explained that it would be in the same location and nearly the same size as the original garage at 20'x20'.

Mr. Roberts proceeded to discuss the proposed design elements for the garage. The garage will have a gable roof with asphalt shingles. Staff and the applicant reviewed color choices and chose Weather Wood as it best matched the color of shingle on the house.

For siding, Mr. Roberts said the proposed garage will have either wood paneling or Hardie board with a 6" reveal and would be painted brown to match the house. Staff feels that either of those options would be appropriate. If the Hardie board is chosen, staff recommends that the smooth side be exposed on the exterior. A thin brick veneer will also be used to wrap the garage foundation.

Mr. Roberts continued, saying the overhead door will be steel with raised panels and painted brown. The service door will be a six-paneled fiberglass door that is painted brown. All of the finishes on the garage – the trim, gutters, and downspouts – will be painted brown to match the house.

In terms of Landmark Commission Design Guidelines, Mr. Roberts explained that there are several passages on garages. They discuss how the details of a garage often closely match the accompanying home. They also state that new work should be compatible with existing historic materials, but should be differentiated from the old. Looking at the original garage, Staff felt it was not a defining feature of the property and not a significant companion of the home. Because of this, staff felt comfortable with the proposed design of the new garage differentiating from the original.

In terms of precedent, Mr. Roberts explained that the Landmark Commission has previously approved all of the proposed materials for detached garages.

Mr. Robert said that garage meets all zoning requirements in terms of size, location, and setbacks. The Architectural Board of Review will formally review the proposal at their March 4, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Roberts said staff is recommending approval of the garage with three conditions:

1. The mortar and brick color of the proposed thin brick foundation veneer match the color of the house's existing foundation.
2. The applicant provide specifications and a sample of the proposed brick veneer material, to be approved by staff prior to issuing of a building permit.
3. The applicant provide specifications for the proposed siding, either 6" lap cedar or smooth side cement board, to be approved by staff prior to issuing of a building permit.

Mr. Watkins, Platinum Construction, presented material samples for the proposed asphalt shingle and thin brick veneer. He also presented one of the bricks from the original garage for comparison.

Commission members reviewed and discussed the thin brick material.

Mr. Reed stated that he prefers the Peppermill thin brick sample as it has less color variation and best matches the brick color on the house. Commission members agreed.

Ms. Hays asked if the roof material on the house is original.

Mr. Feinstein confirmed that aside from one small portion of 3-tab shingles, the roof is original and has asbestos shingles. He explained that through discussion with the applicant it was agreed upon to not attempt replication of these shingles or its design on the new garage. Not only are the asbestos shingles original to the house, but they are also uniquely shaped and sized. Staff felt it would be best for the applicant to choose a more subtle material that would not take away from this defining detail of the home.

Ms. Moore asked Commission members what they thought about the two proposed siding materials: wood paneling or Hardie board. All agreed that either material is appropriate.

Mr. Starinsky asked about the proposed hardware on the doors.

Mr. Watkins specified that no fake hardware or hinges would be installed.

Mr. Starinsky moved to approve the application with three conditions:

1. The mortar and brick color of the proposed thin brick foundation veneer match the color of the house's existing foundation.
2. The applicant provide specifications and a sample of the proposed brick veneer material, to be approved by staff prior to issuing of a building permit.
3. The applicant provide specifications for the proposed siding, either 6" lap cedar or smooth side cement board, to be approved by staff prior to issuing of a building permit.

Mr. Reed seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: All.
 Nays: None.

Certificate of Appropriateness: 3427 Lee Road—Signage—3-19 Coffee. First Lee Road Group LP, Property Owner; represented by Michael Vehar, tenant.

Mr. Roberts stated the next case is a proposal for signage for 3-19 Coffee, which is a new tenant for the corner space of the Kingsbury Building. The Kingsbury Building was designed by the firm Walker and Weeks and was constructed in 1926.

He explained that 3-19 Coffee has recently moved into the tenant space and is currently finishing interior work. Their sign application includes two wall signs and two windows signs.

Mr. Roberts presented the proposed location for each sign. He explained that the wall signs would be made out of Max Metal, which is an aluminum composite panel. This is the same material that was approved for another tenant in the Kingsbury Building in 2016. The sign will be dark brown with white copy, which matches the design of other signs on the building. The window signs will be white, vinyl decals.

Mr. Roberts explained that the Landmark Commission Design Guidelines do not specifically address signage since they are considered an impermanent alteration that can be easily reverted in most instances. In regards to precedent, the amount of signs and their location are identical to the previous tenant's signage. The design also conforms to the aesthetic of other tenant signs on the building.

Mr. Robert said that the signage meets all zoning requirements. The Architectural Board of Review will formally review the proposal at their March 4, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Roberts said staff is recommending approval of the signage as proposed.

Mr. Starinsky mentioned that he thinks the flat material is unsuccessful and he would recommend finding a way to increase the thickness of the wall sign material. He also expressed a desire to see more creative signage on the Kingsbury Building, especially for the corner tenant. He explained that there are ways to add more life and character to signage while still being respectful of the historic character of a structure.

Ms. Hays agreed that more creative signage would be nice as the existing signs on the building are boring.

Ms. Moore asked Mr. Vehar, tenant, for his thoughts on the discussion.

Mr. Vehar said he is very receptive to doing something more creative. The goal of his proposed signage was to provide something easily approvable since he hopes to be open within a short timeframe. However, he explained that 3-19 Coffee is a creative brand and he would certainly consider bringing back something more innovative in the future.

Mr. Brown also agreed that it would be nice for the tenant space to have a more creative sign. He also recommended that the tenant explore options to increase interior lighting and overall create a more welcoming space. He explained that a lack of lighting and storefront transparency were shortcomings of the previous tenant.

Mr. Reed said he finds the proposed signage to be appropriate, as he prefers minimal signage. He also agreed with Mr. Brown's comments regarding interior work that will make a more welcoming space.

As a consensus, the Commission agreed that the proposed signage is acceptable, but urged the tenant to consider more creative signage for his space at a future time.

Mr. Starinsky moved to approve the application as proposed.

Ms. Hays seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Ayes: All.
 Nays: None.

2019 Landmark Commission Work Plan

Mr. Roberts presented the highlights of the 2019 work plan. This included the following:

- Biennial mailing packets to Landmark property owners.
- 2019 Photo Contest.
- Cleveland Restoration Society's open house for 18520 Winslow Road.
- Future plans for a fall event, such as a lecture, workshop, or walking tour.

Ms. Hays mentioned that the Shaker Historical Society is also working out plans to host their Century House Birth Party in October.

Mr. Roberts said the Planning department has agreed to operate a booth at the Historical Society's event and will provide the Landmark Commission with more information and potential volunteer opportunities once details are finalized.

Staff Approvals and Property Updates

Mr. Roberts said that since the January meeting, one item received staff approval. This was for like-for-like replacement of ten windows at 18938 Winslow, which is the property that suffered from a fire in 2017.

Mr. Roberts provided an update on 3125 Van Aken Boulevard. The property was briefly discussed at the last Commission meeting on January 23, 2019. The Landmark property was on the market and the city had received many calls about requirements to replace or repair the steel casement windows on the home. Staff worked with the listing realtor and prospective buyers to gather a number of quotes for the window work. A contract of sale is currently underway and the quotes were shared with the potential buyer to help them make an informed decision.

Mr. Feinstein provided an update on 2834 Courtland Boulevard. He said the Cleveland Restoration Society recently rehabilitated this landmark property. Sale to a new owner is currently pending. The new owner would like remove the middle brick column from the attached garage in order to create one large garage opening. Staff finds that the brick column is not overly defining and that its absence would not take away from the character of the home. The proposal was shared with the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) and they felt the proposal was appropriate.

The Landmark Commission also agreed that the proposal seemed appropriate. Mr. Feinstein said he would follow-up with the architect to share this information. The proposal will require formal review by the Landmark Commission and ABR.

Other Business

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m. The next meeting will be March 27, 2019.



Cameron R. Roberts, Secretary
Landmark Commission