



Landmark Commission / Architectural Board of Review Minutes
Wednesday, February 22, 2023
7 P.M.
Via Zoom Webinar

Members Present: Nancy Moore, Landmark Commission, Chair
Meghan Hays, Landmark Commission, Member
Crystal Montgomery, Landmark Commission, Member
Stephanie Ryberg-Webster, Landmark Commission, Member
Hans Walter, Architectural Board of Review, Member
Greydon Petznick, Architectural Board of Review, Member

Others Present: Dan Feinstein, Senior Planner
Anna Mates, Planner

The meeting was called to order by Chair Moore at 7:23 p.m.

* * * *

Approval of the October 26, 2022, Meeting Minutes

It was moved by Ms. Hays and seconded by Ms. Montgomery to approve the minutes.

Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion Carried.

* * * *

Approval of the November 7, 2022, Meeting Minutes

It was moved by Ms. Hays and seconded by Ms. Montgomery to approve the minutes.

Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion Carried.

* * * *

CITY OF SHAKER HEIGHTS

Certificate of Appropriateness: 17732 Scottsdale Blvd. – Garage Replacement. Carlos and Mozella Colon, property owners. Represented by John and Amy D’Amico, The Great Garage Company.

Ms. Mates presented the project proposal detailing plans to replace the existing garage at the home. Built in 1928, the house is one of eight Master Model Homes on Scottsdale Boulevard and was designated a local landmark in 1984. As such, the project requires review by both the Landmark Commission and the Architectural Board of Review.

Ms. Mates explained the existing garage was built in 1975 and is not original to the house. The siding has reached the end of its life and the homeowners have decided to rebuild the garage. The existing siding is a fiber composite from the 1970s and repairs have been made to the siding over time. As a result of these repairs, the garage’s sides no longer match one another.

Ms. Mates shared images of the proposed plans and elevations, noting the proposed 24’ x 20’ garage will sit on a new foundation of the same size and will be slightly larger than the existing 20’ x 18’ garage. She also said the proposed garage will be built 3 feet to the left of the existing garage’s location and the project will include a new concrete apron and concrete walk.

Ms. Mates noted the proposed elevations illustrate the new reverse gable roof, the LP Smart Siding that will be an 8-inch primed lap siding painted to match the house, and one course of 8-inch concrete block that will be parged.

Ms. Mates reviewed the full list of proposed materials that included shingles in Williamsburg gray to match the shingles on the house, the LP Smart Siding, the LP Smart Soffit and 4-inch trim, all of which will be painted brown to match the house, and the new overhead door in desert tan.

Ms. Mates presented a rendering of the proposed garage and noted the addition of a side door on the west elevation, the new Carriage House style overhead door, and three new coachlight fixtures on the garage’s exterior.

Ms. Mates reviewed the Landmark Commission design guidelines for consideration and stated there is precedent for garage replacements at both Landmarked properties and within Local Landmark Districts. She noted new garages have been approved, with conditions, at 18716 Scottsdale Boulevard, 18938 Winslow Road, and 18520 Winslow Road.

Ms. Mates summarized the staff recommendation supporting the garage replacement, which included:

- A siding with a smooth finish be considered.
- A thin brick veneer shall be used to wrap the garage foundation.
- The mortar and brick color of the veneer shall match the existing home.
- The applicant provide specifications and a sample of the proposed brick veneer material for staff to review the compatibility with the brick house, prior to issuing a building permit.

Chair Moore asked to begin the discussion with any objections to the recommendations or further specifications for materials.

Mr. D’Amico explained that the foundation will be poured but there is a change of grade and the concrete block is being proposed to address the grade change in the rear of the garage. He also noted thin brick

vener is very hard to come by and they would have to use a full brick for the garage foundation. They may eliminate the block all together to remedy this and instead pour the foundation high enough to address the grade change.

Mr. Feinstein wondered if they pour the foundation higher, could they pull the siding down to cover it on the sides and the grade will then come closer to the siding in the rear.

Mr. Colon added they might be able to pour the foundation high enough so they will not need to use a brick veneer. The suggestion of pulling the siding down further conflicts with the material and product warranty. He believes pouring the foundation high enough is a valid suggestion as long as they do not have to bring the siding down which would defeat the warranty. He added that if the concern is the contrast between the siding and the foundation, they could paint that portion of the foundation to match the siding but the material has to have a gap of at least 5"-6" between the ground and the siding itself.

Mr. Feinstein noted this is common and you do need to keep these materials off grade so they do not sit in contact with the ground. Staff's recommendation was based on precedent because this is a brick house, a landmark property, and that there be some brick to match the house around the foundation. Thin brick was recommended because it was approved before and it is an easier application and less costly. He added that the proposal noted if the foundation needs to come up higher to deal with grade the foundation walls could be painted.

Mr. Colon added this is also his suggestion and he has not had a chance to discuss it further with Mr. D'Amico. Mr. Colon said they did get an estimate for the cost of brick veneer and he believes full brick would have to be reclaimed brick to match the house, which is why he suggested painting the foundation as an alternative.

Ms. Montgomery was opposed to painting the concrete because masonry products are not good materials to paint. The paint does not last and will need to be repainted.

Mr. Petznick asked how much parging on the garage sides and back would be seen from the street, and from the sides and back, relative to the fence line. He asked for clarification that it would be a 6" reveal from the street because it is against a flat apron, but wondered how much parging would be visible based on the grade change in the back and other side. Mr. Petznick wondered if there is room for an additional board below the last board if there is a lot of space.

Mr. Colon noted the only elevation visible from the street is the north elevation, the others sides are not visible from the street. He said the grade change is minimal but the siding will need to be raised compared to what is there now, because the existing siding is closer to the ground. Mr. Colon added the proposed concrete block would only be from the slab up and even if they are able to raise the sides by pouring instead, it would be enough to stay within the boundaries of the warranty.

Mr. Petznick noted that parging can be tinted and Mr. Feinstein asked if it can also stained.

Mr. D'Amico confirmed it can be stained.

Mr. Colon asked for clarification about parging or staining the concrete and the motivation behind using a stain or tinted parging.

Mr. Feinstein clarified that for a Landmark House such as this, that is all brick, and based on the precedent the Landmark Commission has had, they would like to see a foundation in a brick like the house. The proposed concrete will be 4"-5" tall so the siding does not touch the ground and it would be better if the color can be more muted if a full face brick is not used.

Mr. D'Amico noted the first goal is to build the foundation without any block and to maintain 6" of curb above the grade at the back. They might be able to do that because of the apron that will be at the front of the garage and it would allow them to raise the concrete in front of the garage. He added if they can achieve that and the top of the curb is flush with the grade in the back, which is where they will put the block so they can get the 8" off the back. When they bring it around the side by the service door they will stop it at the service door and the regular curb will go around the front of the garage. On the other side of the garage, the block will likely come down the whole length of the side, but it could be stopped sooner if the grade change allows. He added there would be very little block exposed.

Mr. Feinstein summarized that precedent looked at brick or a brick like surface, but there are some difficulties with that and the applicant is proposing another solution.

Ms. Montgomery commented that the brick would be different heights on either side of the service door and she did not feel this would look right on the elevation.

Mr. D'Amico stated they may not need any concrete block on the west elevation because they have a side walk which allows them to pull down the grade, level it out and run the sidewalk all the way down the side using a standard curb.

Ms. Montgomery noted she liked that solution.

Mr. D'Amico added that the concrete will only show by the sidewalk.

Mr. Feinstein noted this would take care of the side of the garage based on what you can see from the yard.

Ms. Ryberg-Webster also agreed with this solution. She noted she is less concerned with the back of the garage, but is concerned with the view from the street and the yard. She agreed with using the apron and sidewalk to level the yard side and provide a more uniform look.

Mr. Petznick also agreed with this solution and said from an ABR perspective, he would like to see a tinted parging if the concrete block is minimized. Mr. Walter agreed.

Ms. Montgomery asked if the parging and tinting comes in darker colors like a brick.

Mr. Petznick said it can be tinted almost any color and as long as it is not gray it will look like stucco. He added they can also use an elastomeric color coating and may notice a difference but it could be an opportunity to use a color that is darker or lighter depending on what the owner likes.

Ms. Montgomery, Ms. Ryberg-Webster, and Mr. Walter noted a darker tint would be best to match the dark brick of the home.

Ms. Ryberg-Webster said there is a steep elevation from the street and she is not sure the bottom of the garage will be visible from the street, but it is still important to have the tinting be appropriate.

Mr. Walter agreed with Mr. Petznick's suggestion of an elastomeric coating because you can get better control of the color and he said a dark color would be best. He agreed it will not be visible from the street because it is on the hill and because of the apron. Mr. Walter asked about the color of the garage and side doors because he would recommend a darker color for both doors.

Ms. Hays agreed and noted the staff recommendations for approving specifications will have to be updated to reflect the final material.

Ms. Montgomery and Ms. Ryberg-Webster agreed with changing the color of the doors.

Ms. Ryberg-Webster asked about the change in the pitch of the roof because it goes from a flat sloping roof with a front overhang to a more steeply pitched roof. She asked if the proposed garage roof can better match the house.

Mr. Feinstein noted the applicant was trying to match the pitch of the house but the garage was too tall and did not meet zoning regulations due to its location. They reduced the pitch and changed the direction of the roof so it would match the house. He added it was reduced to keep it under 15' and allow the garage to remain in a reasonable location within the yard.

Chair Moore asked about the two doors and if the color change should apply to both. All members agreed it should be applied to both.

Mr. Feinstein asked if everyone is okay with staff working with the applicant to find an appropriate color for the garage and the side door can be painted to match it. All members agreed that should be the approach.

Chair Moore asked about the staff recommendation for smooth siding and the precedent that used HardiePanel. She asked if everyone is okay with the proposed paneling. There were no objections to the proposed siding.

Mr. Feinstein summarized the discussion and conditions, which include:

1. The same foundation height should be maintained along the front and yard side of the garage using the apron and the sidewalk.
2. If block is required it should be parged and colored to match and an elastomeric coating would go over the block if needed.
3. The foundation should have a dark colored elastomeric coating applied to it as approved by staff.
4. The garage door should be a darker color and the man door should be painted to match, as approved by staff.

It was moved by Ms. Ryberg-Webster and seconded by Ms. Montgomery to approve the certificate of appropriateness for the new garage with four conditions:

1. The height of the foundation is to be the same along the front of the garage and along the yard side of the garage; the north and west facades, respectively.
2. The concrete foundation shall have a dark, elastomeric coating applied to it and a sample of the proposed color shall be provided to staff for approval.
3. If concrete block is required, it shall also be coated with a dark color, elastomeric coating and a sample of the proposed color shall be provided to staff for approval.

4. The overhead garage door should be a darker color and the side door should be painted to match. A sample of the proposed color shall be provided to staff for approval.

Ayes: All
Nays: All

The motion is unanimously approved.

The Architectural Board of Review approved the application with the same conditions listed above.

* * * *

2023 Work Plan.

Ms. Mates presented the 2023 Work Plan with a focus on moving forward with the Photo Contest in 2023 and alternating between the Photo Contest and Preservation Awards each year. Ms. Mates reviewed the work done to date to roll out the 2023 Photo Contest and the steps that will take place throughout the rest of the year. She concluded by discussing that appointments and reappointments will take place at the end of the year and the 2024 work plan will focus on the Preservation Awards.

Chair Moore explained some of the previous procedures that were used for the Photo Contest and asked if it is possible to include all of the Landmark Commission members in the decision process. Ms. Hays agreed and asked if members can be involved from the beginning.

Staff said they will create a process for Landmark Commission members to view the final photos and be involved in the selection process throughout the Contest.

Commission members agreed that staff can assign the contest categories.

Ms. Hays asked if a list of previous winners can be created so they can highlight new photographers throughout the community.

* * * *

Staff Approvals

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

* * * *

Other Business

Chair Moore inquired about the BP Station on Larchmere Boulevard and led a discussion about the ongoing renovation work taking place at the property.

Chair Moore led a discussion about remote meetings and asked if in-person meetings would helpful to review materials in person.

Ms. Ryberg-Webster shared that remote meetings are better for her.

Mr. Feinstein noted they may be able to conduct hybrid meetings.

Ms. Hays asked if materials can be available in the Planning Department for members to see them in person.

Ms. Montgomery asked if they can also see materials that need to be approved after meetings.

* * * *

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m. The next meeting will be March 22, 2023.



Anna Mates, Secretary
Landmark Commission