



Landmark Commission Minutes
Wednesday, October 22, 2025
7 P.M.
Via Zoom Webinar

Members Present: Nancy Moore, Landmark Commission, Chair
Ronald Reed, Landmark Commission, Member
Tom Starinsky, Landmark Commission, Member
Meghan Hays, Landmark Commission, Member
Yuliya Litvak, Landmark Commission, Member
Jason Carroll, Landmark Commission, Member

Others Present: Dan Feinstein, Senior Planner
Anna Mates, Planner
Alan Bass, Grass is Greener Landscaping
Tyler Clauson, LP3 Exteriors
Joe Weber, Homeowner

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

* * * *

Approval of the September 17, 2025, Meeting Minutes

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

Ayes: All
Nays: None

The motion carries.

* * * *

Certificate of Appropriateness: 19419 Winslow Road—Proposed Front Stoop Replacement.

Alan Bass, Grass is Greener Landscaping. Lissette and Mike Piepenburg, property owners.

Ms. Mates presented the proposal for the proposed front stoop replacement. She explained that the home was designed by W.H. Smith, was built in 1930, and is one of 170 two-family homes in the Winslow Road Local Historic District. As such, the proposed front stoop replacement requires review by the Landmark Commission and Architectural Board of Review.

Ms. Mates explained that the applicant is proposing to rebuild the property's front porch and stoop. She presented photos of the existing conditions, noting that the existing front stoops, step, and patio are sandstone, and brick and mortar.

Ms. Mates presented the proposed plan for the new front porch and steps, including 3D views and an elevation of the proposal. She shared images of the proposed materials and explained that the existing bricks are to be replaced with Unilock Cophorne Pavers in the 3 Color Blend, the sandstone treads are to be replaced with Unilock pavers in sandstone, and the patio is to be replaced with Unilock Beacon Hill Flagstone in Bavarian, with a border made of the Cophorne color blend pavers.

Ms. Mates reviewed the Landmark Commission Design guidelines and precedent, noting that a front porch and stoop repair was reviewed and approved for 18520 Winslow Road in August of 2018.

Ms. Mates summarized the Staff recommendation, not recommending approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted, but recommending to rebuild the front stoop, stairs, and patio with brick and mortar, and sandstone to match the existing conditions.

Chair Moore asked Mr. Bass if there is any additional information he would like to share.

Mr. Bass clarified the treads on the front stoop will be sandstone and not Unilock pavers. He added that he can use a mortar with the Cophorne pavers to match the existing mortar.

Ms. Litvak asked if they will reuse any of the existing materials, noting the sandstone looks salvageable. Mr. Bass noted that the homeowners want any materials that are salvageable to be kept for future projects and they might be able to reuse the existing sandstone.

Mr. Reed asked for clarification about what materials will be used to rebuild the stairs because the 3D rendering and elevation appear to show different materials. Mr. Bass clarified that the 3D image with red pavers is the current design and the two-colored design is an old version, submitted only to show dimensions.

Mr. Starinsky asked for clarification on why they are proposing Unilock pavers for the stairs, rather than traditional brick and mortar. Mr. Starinsky also asked if the proposed sandstone will replicate the smaller pieces of sandstone on the existing stoop or be larger pieces. Mr. Bass explained that the size of the sandstone could be one solid piece or smaller pieces, based on the Landmark Commission discussion. He added that they decided to use Unilock pavers because the material is modern, elegant, and has a reputation for longevity, and the homeowners asked for the Unilock product.

Mr. Carroll noted that removing the small step under the door may require brick repair on the house. He added that he agrees with the Staff recommendation to rebuild the steps and patio to match the existing materials and he is not opposed to the patio being larger.

Ms. Litvak and Mr. Carroll discussed the removal of the top step below the door and the addition of a second step up to the landing. They noted the proposed landing appears to be the same height as the existing landing.

Chair Moore asked if the stoop will require a railing, per the building code, because it will have three steps. Mr. Feinstein explained that if it is 30" or has four risers it would need a railing and he does not

believe the new stoop will be required to have a railing. Mr. Feinstein added that Staff supports eliminating the half-step in front of the door, and that the steps below the landing will need to meet the Building Code.

Mr. Starinsky stated his support for the project if the applicant is able to use brick and mortar. He expressed his concern about new brick matching the existing brick of the home. Mr. Feinstein noted they should be able to find a brick that closely matches the house, and they can use a matching mortar.

Mr. Starinsky noted the applicant will need to submit new renderings and drawings, and that they can be reviewed at a Staff level. Chair Moore asked Mr. Starinsky if he recommended using sandstone for the patio. Mr. Starinsky supports the use of sandstone for the patio. Mr. Reed agrees and added that the design should include the additional step to the landing, as proposed.

Members discussed the sandstone landing and whether it should be one large slab, several slabs, or made from small pieces of sandstone, deciding that a landing of two or three slabs would likely be best for the design and overall lifespan of the stoop.

Ms. Mates summarized the discussion of conditions, which included:

1. The proposed design concept is approved, with the new platform on top and two steps down to a patio.
2. The stairs shall be built with brick and mortar to match the house and the platform, steps, and patio shall be sandstone.
3. The sandstone, brick and mortar, and final design dimensions shall be reviewed and approved by Staff.
4. The Landmark Commission recommends that the top slab be done in one, two, or three pieces rather than a variety of smaller pieces.

It was moved by Mr. Starinsky and seconded by Mr. Reed to approve the certificate of appropriateness.

Ayes: All
Nays: None

The motion carries unanimously.

* * * *

Certificate of Appropriateness: 18302 Scottsdale Boulevard—Proposed Roof and Gutter Replacement. Tyler Clauson, LP3 Exteriors. Joe and Raluca Weber, property owners.

Ms. Mates presented the proposal detailing the proposed roof and gutter replacement. She explained that 18302 Scottsdale Boulevard was designed by the firm Fox, Duthie and Foose and was constructed in 1928. She added that the home is one of eight master model homes that were planned for Scottsdale Boulevard, and it was designated as a local landmark in 1984. As such, the proposed roof and gutter replacement requires review by the Landmark Commission and Architectural Board of Review.

Ms. Mates presented photos of the existing asbestos composite shingle roof and the front and rear dormers, noting that the front dormer is sided in the same asbestos shingles and the rear dormer has a square opening on the side.

Ms. Mates explained that the existing roof has reached the end of its life and the applicant is proposing to replace it with asphalt roofing shingles. She added that the applicant intends to replace the shingles on the front dormer with cedar siding, and on the rear dormer, a flat wood panel will be used to fill the opening. Both the shingles and wood panel will be painted brown to match the house.

Ms. Mates presented photos of the existing copper gutters and copper downspouts, the proposed asphalt shingles, and the proposed replacement gutter style. She added that the existing gutters and downspouts are deteriorating and are no longer functioning properly and the new gutters and downspouts will be replaced in a dark brown color to match the home.

Ms. Mates reviewed the Landmark Commission Design guidelines and precedent, noting the Landmark Commission has previously approved changes in roof materials at 2931 Sedgewick Road, 3158 Morley Road, and 3455 Norwood Road, and the replacement of asbestos shingles with asphalt shingles as 18108 Scottsdale Boulevard. She added that gutter replacements have also been reviewed and approved at these addresses in conjunction with the roof replacement projects.

Ms. Mates summarized the Staff recommendation supporting the approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions:

- The style and color of the asphalt shingle should follow the Landmark Commission's preference.
- If replacement gutters are not copper, they should be half round aluminum hung the same way as the existing gutters, in a dark brown color.
- Staff recommends the copper downspouts be retained.

Ms. Mates added that Staff recommends approval of the cedar shake siding for the front dormer and the flat infill wood panel for the rear dormer, if both are painted brown to match the house, as proposed.

Chair Moore asked Mr. Weber if there is any additional information he would like to share.

Mr. Weber clarified that the opening on the rear dormer will be filled with the same cedar shake as the front dormer. He added that some of the existing downspouts are already a brown material and some are copper. He asked if all the downspouts should be replaced or if the copper downspouts should be maintained.

Chair Moore asked Mr. Weber to identify where the copper downspouts and the brown downspouts are located. Mr. Weber noted there are replacement downspouts on both the front and the back of the house. He added that the replacement downspouts were installed before they purchased the house.

Mr. Starinsky asked how the copper gutters and downspouts were failing. Mr. Weber explained that the existing copper gutters and downspouts are too small and with the steep pitch of the roof, they are not catching as much water as they should be. He added that they would like to replace them with something larger and wider to divert more water away from the home.

Mr. Starinsky asked if the new gutters on the back of the house are larger and deeper, if they are half-round or K-style gutters, and if they are sufficiently diverting water. Mr. Weber believes all of the

gutters on the back of the house are half-rounds and added that he has not talked to his contractor about half-round style gutters. Mr. Weber added that water pours over the gutters on the rear of the house.

Ms. Hays noted that in her experience, half-round gutters are usually wider than K-style gutters and is unsure K-style gutters will be able to catch more water. Mr. Reed shared he had a similar experience with half-round gutters that performed poorly and they were replaced with wider half-rounds. He added that the copper gutters and downspouts are almost 100 years old and he would be comfortable with replacing the copper gutters with new, wider half-rounds painted to match the brown downspouts. Ms. Hays agreed, stating that a different gutter style would significantly change the character of the home.

Chair Moore asked if there were any questions about the proposed asphalt shingle type and color.

Mr. Starinsky noted that a darker shingle will blend in with the home's brown trim work and that a lighter brown will be similar to the existing roof color. Mr. Reed agreed, adding that the proposed color is too red and appears to match the brick color rather than the existing shingles. He noted that Barkwood, Golden Harvest, and Fox Hollow Gray would be appropriate alternatives. Mr. Carroll agreed.

Mr. Feinstein noted that Golden Harvest and Fox Hollow Gray are bright and that Appalachian Sky or Barkwood might be options. He added that staff can review samples on site.

Mr. Clauson shared that the sunroom on the back of the house currently has asphalt shingles and they chose Hickory to match the sunroom shingles. He added that the sunroom shingles are most likely Owens Corning Duration Desert Rose, or a similar color. He noted the GAF shingles will look different and the Hickory will look lighter in person. Chair Moore noted that a sample of the proposed shingle color will need to be reviewed. Mr. Carroll agreed.

Chair Moore asked if there are asphalt shingles with a similar profile to the existing asbestos shingles. Mr. Clauson explained that there are shingles in other materials, such as metal, that would provide a similar profile, but they would significantly increase the cost of the project. He added there are no asphalt shingle options that will create the same dimensional irregularity of the asbestos shingles.

Mr. Reed noted his support for the proposed shingle and that Staff should review the samples. He added that because the roofs are already mismatched, it would be best to find a color that is closer to the original roof rather than matching the sunroom.

Ms. Hays asked if they are requiring the homeowner to replace the sunroom shingles. Members discussed whether or not to include the sunroom in the project.

Chair Moore asked if there was consensus on replacing the gutters with larger half-round gutters, and if the size of the downspouts should be increased given the current drainage and foundation issues. Mr. Reed noted that as long as the gutters are sufficient, the size of the downspouts could be determined by the roofing contractor.

Chair Moore asked if there is agreement on a dark brown color for the gutters and downspouts. Mr. Reed agreed that dark brown would be best.

Mr. Carroll noted his concern about continuing a mismatch in roofing colors if the porch roof is not included in the project. Members discussed whether or not the porch roof should be included. Mr. Starinsky asked Mr. Weber how he would feel about spending additional money to redo the whole roof. Mr. Weber explained they want the house to look good, but he would prefer not to spend additional money on the project. Mr. Weber added he likes the color they selected, that matches the sunroom, and it would be hard to match the existing roof because the original color is unknown.

Mr. Reed explained the Commission's obligation is to approve a color that is as close as possible to the existing conditions so the house maintains the character it had when it was constructed. He added that the porch is not original to the house and should not guide the selectin of the shingle color. Mr. Carroll agreed, noting the focus should be on the street-facing façade and finding an appropriate color for the roof of the house.

Ms. Hays shared that the sunroom was built in 1993 based on a set of plans at the library. Mr. Carroll added that the sunroom's roof may be nearing the end of its useful life.

Chair Moore asked if there is a color proposed for the cedar shake on the front dormer. Mr. Weber noted it could be painted to match the dark brown of the door and window trim on the front of the house. Mr. Feinstein added that Staff's opinion was to paint the cedar shake dark brown so that it would blend in with the rest of the house.

Mr. Feinstein noted that asphalt shingles in Estate Gray were previously approved for 18108 Scottsdale. He added that these are dark gray shingles from Owens Corning. Ms. Moore recalled that 18108 Scottsdale had a blue tone to it and added that a gray shingle may not be appropriate for 18302 Scottsdale.

Mr. Carroll recommended that the sunroom roof be included in the scope of the project considering the age of the roof. Mr. Reed disagreed, adding the roof could be replaced to match the house when the sunroom roof reaches the end of its life. Chair Moore suggested that the condition of the sunroom roof be evaluated as part of the project to determine if it requires replacement at this time. Mr. Reed and Mr. Carroll agreed. Ms. Hays added that when the sunroom roof is replaced, it should match the shingle color of the house.

Mr. Starinsky stated that because the downspouts are mismatched, the homeowner should replace existing copper downspouts with new brown aluminum downspouts, if they warrant replacement. Ms. Hays added that all of the downspouts should be round downspouts.

Ms. Mates summarized the discussion of conditions, which included

1. The style of shingle is approved, with the color to be reviewed and approved by Staff after reviewing samples on site.
2. The Landmark Commission recommends the homeowner evaluate the conditions of the roof on the porch, and consider replacement if it has reached the end of its useful life. If it does not need to be replaced at this time, the Landmark Commission requires that when it is replaced it be replaced in the same material and color as the new roof on the house.
3. The gutters shall be half round, aluminum gutters at an appropriate larger size, in a dark brown color.

4. The downspouts should be retained if possible, if they will function properly with the new, larger gutters. If the downspouts are to be replaced, they shall be round aluminum in a dark brown color.
5. Cedar shake shingles painted in a dark brown to match the trim of the house are approved for the front and rear dormers.

It was moved by Mr. Carroll and seconded by Mr. Reed to approve the certificate of appropriateness.

Ayes: All
 Nays: None

The motion carries unanimously.

* * * *

Staff Approvals

Chair Moore asked if there were any questions or objections to the Staff Approval Report. There were none.

* * * *

Other Business

Discussions about the renovation of Woodbury School and grant funding that has been pursued for stabilization of the Lynnfield train station.

Staff provided an update on the removal of the Colonnade and historic preservation grant funds that the First Baptist Church of Greater Cleveland received.

* * * *

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:39 p.m. The next meeting will be December 3, 2025.

Anna Mates, Secretary
 Landmark Commission