

sustainable; as well as ease of attachment of solar panels. He showed an example of a current house under review that has existing solar panels on the asphalt roof material. He explained that the Shaker Village Colors book notes roof and shutter colors for a brick colonial house as a roof that is slate “colored”.

Mr. Neville said a lot of design direction comes from the characteristics of each house. He is concerned with darker color metal roofs and not having a robust coating to keep from fading over time. Any direction should include fundamental criteria like a kynar coating, which is also recyclable. He is concerned with contractors that are not experienced. The thickness of the metal material should be a minimum thickness of 26 mil.

Mr. Feinstein said historically the requirement for asphalt shingles depended on the thickness for building code and aesthetics. The current standard is the warranty of the material in years. Modern asphalt shingles use simulated shadows rather than thickness to appear like thicker original roof shingles. The Board is always concerned with longevity and quality.

Mr. Berlekamp said there are styles of homes that are not acceptable for standing seam metal roofs. Where does metal detract from the architectural quality of the house? They should have a framework to consider options.

Mr. Feinstein said per Architectural Board of Review precedent darker color metal shingles have been approved where shingles are appropriate. Standing seam metal has been limited to modern style houses with typically lower pitched roofs.

Mr. Neville said he is also concerned with reflectivity. If the original material is slate or cedar shake it is matte in appearance. Any consideration for metal roofs should be for matte metal finishes. The thought of categorization of specific styles is difficult due to architectural characteristics for each house.

Mr. Petznick said the standing seam type is being used in different areas of the country and installation look is dependent on quality. The size of the pan/seam can vary significantly. We should consider only the highest quality. An external screw down roof should be prohibited, with no striations in the pan. Standing seam can be an appropriate roof, but not for every style of house. Finish, gauge, and installation are all important.

Mr. Walter said he agrees. The detailing, of ridge conditions, how the seams are done. Edges and trim are important details. The historic character of a metal roof is low profile and crimped edges. Contemporary houses are different. He would struggle to see a standing seam metal roof approved for revival style home like on a Tudor style house. He would agree a modern farmhouse could be approved with a metal roof.

Ms. Beck noted historic metal roofs, defined by the National Preservation Society, were used for a low slope.

Mr. Feinstein summarized the Board’s comments that standing seam metal roofing is most likely not going to be architecturally appropriate for revival style homes in the city.

Mr. Berlekamp noted that from a color standpoint the material should be authentic to the original

material. When he thinks of metal roofs the first thought is standing seam is not imitating the original roof material on most Shaker Heights homes. Metal roofs should be in the darker family of colors. Lighter or off colors should be guarded against. There is a wide range of colors available on metal materials.

Mr. Walter said he agrees. This is explained in the Shaker Village Colors style guide. Muted browns, greys and dark colors are preferred.

Mr. Leskosky said it is one thing to be sympathetic and update the material on a revival style house in an appropriate way. It is another to change the original style of the house as conceived and constructed. There are materials available to mimic original materials.

Mr. Neville said when the Architectural Board of Review began review of solar panels an installer was consulted. There might be an opportunity to do that with a metal roof installer.

* * * *

Mr. Berlekamp and Mr. Leskosky left the meeting.

* * * *

Approval of Minutes from the December 15, 2025 meeting.

Approved

* * * *

ABR25-000181 – 3589 Hildana Road – Resubmission: New House.

Mr. Feinstein described the reviews for this property. This is the same design as 3670 Hildana Road. These houses are one story, smaller, and affordable, with easier entry to the house. This house design was reviewed previously. The shutters were determined to be ornamentation only. There were some concerns about the shutter location on the front façade.

Mr. Neville asked if the windows could be moved toward the door to give more room for the shutters from the corner boards.

Mr. Petznick said he likes the perspective view of the house better than the line drawing.

Mr. Walter said the shutters make the façade look crowded. As ornamentation this makes the house look more congested. He does not think shutters are needed. The window trim could be widened.

Mr. Neville said that was suggested last time. Has the developer investigated this option?

Ishmael Martin, developer, said this has been investigated. These are new windows with trim on them already. Making that trim wider is more expensive.

Mr. Feinstein explained the past conversation regarding window trim and difficulty explained by the

developer.

Mr. Petznick said the shutters are too close to the other elements.

Mr. Feinstein said there are other homes on Hildana Road with similar shutter details. There are many double and triple windows with shutters. There are also shutters that are not half the width of the windows.

Mr. Walter said he is not against ornamentation. He is opposed to the crowding of the façade. This detracts from the clean appearance of the house.

Mr. Martin said he appreciates the comments. He has researched but he could not find a rule regarding shutters.

Mr. Feinstein said there is an Ordinance establishing the Architectural Board of Review. This body reviews all new homes under general design guidelines and appropriate architectural design as registered architects. There are shutters size and installation drawings but no other specific rule regarding shutters.

Mr. Neville suggested the windows could be shifted in toward the entry allowing some space between the shutters and the corner boards.

Approved with the condition that the windows are shifted toward the door opening so that there is a significant gap between the shutters and the corner boards.

Submit revised plans for administrative review.

* * * *

ABR25-000177 – 3662 Hildana Road – Resubmission: New House.

Mr. Feinstein showed the drawings and explained this house has similar issues regarding shutters. The first floor feature window design has been revised and there was discussion regarding shutters as ornamentation on the second floor. The second floor single windows were discussed as needing shutters that are ½ the width of the window size. A comment has already been discussed regarding other houses on the street having the slimmer shutter width. The 12 or 15 inch shutter width is standard. Staff did the research. The price difference for wider shutters is substantial.

Mr. Neville said he could accept the narrower shutters in this case.

Mr. Walter said on this house he accepts these shutters based on the specific context of other homes on the street.

Ishmael Martin, developer, appreciated the review.

Approved.

* * * *

ABR25-000182 – 3550 Hildana Road – Resubmission: New House.

See discussion at 3662 Hildana Road.

Approved.

* * * *

ABR25-000179 – 3670 Hildana Road – Resubmission: New House.

See discussion for 3589 Hildana Road.

Approved with the condition that the windows are shifted toward the door opening so that there is a significant gap between the shutters and the corner boards.

Submit revised plans for administrative review.

* * * *

ABR25-000324 – 18201 North Park Boulevard - Addition.

Ryan Safran, homeowner, explained they plan to remove a small addition and replace it with a larger addition. The new addition will have a shallow pitched roof and azek siding. The details mimic the existing addition at the end of the house. There will be a new casement window and French doors. They will also reposition an entry door to be flush with the masonry wall, about 3 feet away. This will allow interior access to the garage door. Currently you have to exit the house and then enter the garage by the adjacent door. They will be re-using the existing exterior door and adding new trim like the trim over the overhead garage door.

Mr. Neville asked if the new addition can be located so that it is not so close to the shutters of the window with the fan detail above.

Mr. Walter said the shutters on that window could be removed, as it has additional detail with the fan detail.

Approved with the following conditions: 1) the window (with fan detail) adjacent to the new addition has the shutters removed; and 2) dark grey or black color is used for the flat roof material.

Submit revised drawings for administrative approval.

* * * *

ABR25-000291 – 17314 Lomond Boulevard – Resubmission: Window Alteration.

Mr. Feinstein explained the review of the window replacement. The Board approved of the type and color of the new windows at the last meeting. He showed the to-scale drawing.

Mr. Neville said he would like to see the detail of the small window on the south elevation, second

from the right corner have one less horizontal bar.

Mark Polomsky, Empire Window, said this is a ½ bath.

There was discussion about this ½ bath window and the attic windows that are the same size.

Approved with the condition that the small ½ bath window at the rear of the house and third floor windows be a casement window and have 6 lites each.

Submit revised quote for administrative review.

* * * *

ABR25-000229 – 13645 Larchmere Boulevard – Resubmission: Porch Alteration.

Mr. Feinstein noted this porch was reviewed several months ago. He outlined the action items from that previous meeting.

Cory Brown, Payne and Tompkins, explained the materials and column placement in the revised design. The existing front door will be raised along with the landing, allowing direct entry to the first floor level of the house.

There was discussion regarding the details of the fascia and how it aligns with the house trim and roofing.

Approved.

* * * *

ABR25-000323 – 3646 Lindholm Road – New Garage.

Igor Abramovsky, Genesis Construction Group, said they will be tearing down the old garage and building a new one.

The Board discussed the details and explained existing condition photos are required. The drawings are not adequate to review and do not include exterior materials, door or trim details.

Continued in order for the applicant to provide detailed elevation drawings including: color, materials, panelized doors, and trim details.

Submit plans for administrative review.

* * * *

ABR25-000325 – 20040 Van Aken Boulevard – Façade Alteration.

Mr. Feinstein explained this is the location of what was previously 1899 Golf. The proposed doors are in order to access the approved mini golf course.

Lauren Fedor, HSB Architects, said they propose to alter the two westernmost windows on the north façade to have overhead doors. The sconces and detail above the openings will remain.

Mr. Walter asked if there is a programmatic reason for the opaque panel at the bottom edge of the door.

Hayyim Danzig, representing Five Iron Golf, explained a metal panel will be less likely to break due to golf balls.

Mr. Petznick said he would prefer a muntin separation on the bottom panel to look like the window panels.

Approved with the following conditions: 1) the ½ brick side edge window detail is extended down to grade as the opening becomes a door; and 2) the new solid bottom door panel has the grid pattern matching the window panels.

Submit revised detail plans for administrative review.

* * * *

ABR25-000326 – 2723 Dryden Road – Window Alteration.

Nathanael Dunn, Compass Studio, explained the renovations at this house are primarily interior, but there is a window component. They propose to remove two windows and combine them to create one double window that is between the previous openings. They will save as much existing stone to infill and match as best as possible with the new stone they will need to use. The downspout on this side will be relocated.

Mr. Walter said his only concern is matching and salvaging the existing stone, otherwise this is a great plan.

Approved.

* * * *

ABR25-000327 – 19815 Shelburne Road – Window/Door Alteration. Landscape Element.

Nathanael Dunn, Compass Studio, explained there is an existing patio and step that will be removed, along with a mud room. They propose a new patio and piers with lights. There are new steps to the driveway and plans for an exterior kitchen. They will tooth in new brick at the sides of the opening and a structural header for a new door opening. The exterior will be paneled azek which is painted white. The kitchen will have a granite countertop.

Approved.

* * * *

ABR25-000328 – 2879 Fontenay Road - Garage. Exterior Alterations.

Jessica Powell, architect, said the plan is to rework the rear of the house. The interior will be flipping uses. These alterations connect the garage to the mud room. The replacement garage will be larger with a sloped roof. There is a window to be altered in order to raise the sill. This opening will have a triple casement window.

Mr. Neville asked about the roof material.

Ms. Powell said it will be asphalt to match the main house roof.

Mr. Petznick said there does not seem to be enough room for a header above the garage door.

Ms. Powell said the house overhang is deep, and the header is obscured. She said she will make sure everything fits.

Approved the design direction with the condition that the door header and any resulting roof and window conditions are confirmed or revised.

Submit revised plans for Board review.

* * * *

ABR25-000321 – 19801 Van Aken Boulevard, 102 - Window Alteration.

Renewal by Andersen representative, representing Karen Michelson homeowner.

Applicant not present.

A direct match replacement of the casement window could be approved administratively. Any review of an alteration will require photos of the window areas from the exterior and a clear proposal.

* * * *

ABR25-000329 – 15915 Chadbourne Road – Preliminary Review: Window Alteration.

Jared Gaudino, Window Nation, representing Seth Prevnick and Alexandra Prinstein, homeowners.

Applicant not present.

The Board requested a mock-up of a casement window.

* * * *

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m. The next meeting will be January 20, 2026.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Hans Walter', written over a horizontal line.

Hans Walter, Chair
Architectural Board of Review

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Dave Berlekamp', written over a horizontal line.

Dave Berlekamp, Vice Chair
Architectural Board of Review