



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

Members Present: Nancy Moore, Landmark Commission, Chair  
Crystal Montgomery, Landmark Commission, Member  
Thomas Starinsky, Landmark Commission, Member  
Ron Reed, Landmark Commission, Member  
Stephanie Ryberg-Webster, Landmark Commission, Member  
Jason Carroll, Landmark Commission, Member  
Hans Walter, Architectural Board of Review, Member  
Greydon Petznick, Architectural Board of Review, Member

Others Present: Daniel Feinstein, Senior Planner  
Anna Mates, Planner  
Elicia Gibbon, Architect, Project Representative  
Phil Koepf, Architect, Project Representative

The meeting was called to order by Chair Moore at 7:01 pm.

\* \* \* \*

Approval of the September 28, 2022, Meeting Minutes

It was moved by Ms. Montgomery and seconded by Ms. Ryberg-Webster to approve the minutes.

Ayes: All  
Nays: None

Motion Carried.

\* \* \* \*

Approval of the February 22, 2023, Meeting Minutes

It was moved by Ms. Montgomery and seconded by Ms. Ryberg-Webster to approve the minutes.

Ayes: All  
Nays: None

Motion Carried.

**CITY OF SHAKER HEIGHTS**

\*

\*

\*

\*

**Certificate of Appropriateness: 13051 Larchmere Blvd. – Façade Renovations.** Louis Jacobs, property owner. Represented by Elicia Gibbon of Gibbon Architecture and Phil Koepf of P.M. Koepf, Inc.

Ms. Mates presented the project proposal detailing the proposed façade renovations. She explained the building was built in 1955 and is one of 106 buildings that make up the Shaker Square Historic District, established in 1980. As such, the project requires review by both the Landmark Commission and Architectural Board of Review.

Ms. Mates shared images and described the existing storefront and signage over the entry door on the south elevation and the brick enclosure on the rear, or north elevation, of the building.

Ms. Mates shared a rendering of the proposed storefront design and reviewed the proposed renovations to the southern façade. These included replacing the existing first floor fixed windows with new triple slider vinyl windows, with a matching frame color. Installing new awnings over each first floor window and the entry door. Adding a 2'-3" logo medallion sign, on a half barrel face, to the awning over the door. Replacing the existing doors with new stained wood doors in a thermally broken storefront system with clear tempered, insulated glass, in a color to match the existing window frame. A black, ornamental fence is proposed for the same place as the existing fence. New brick piers with stone caps are proposed on the front canopy supports and a new monument sign is proposed for the eastern corner of the front façade.

Ms. Mates reviewed the proposed conditions for the west and north elevations. On the west elevation the applicant is proposing to remove the brick infill from the existing opening and to install a new insulated door and frame. She added that on the north elevation the applicant is proposing to replace the existing covered entrance and brick walls with a new canopy and vertical board fence enclosure.

Ms. Mates reviewed the Landmark Commission design guidelines for consideration and stated there is precedent for non-residential building renovations and additions within the Shaker Square Historic District. She noted renovations have been approved with conditions at both 13165 Larchmere Boulevard, the BP Gas Station, and 2500 Kemper Road, the Cleveland Skating Club. Ms. Mates also shared images illustrating existing monument signs in the Larchmere Boulevard Commercial District, explaining there is precedent for a monument sign at this location.

Ms. Mates summarized the staff recommendations supporting the renovations with the following conditions:

- The existing brick base of the rear entry enclosure should be replaced in brick to match the existing, including additional designs submitted for the canopy.
- Additional awning or wall signage should be considered instead, as the proposed monument sign does not meet zoning code setbacks from the building, sidewalk, or driveway.

Chair Moore asked Ms. Gibbon and Mr. Koepf if they would like to add any comments.

Ms. Gibbon noted the triple slider windows are being proposed for the front of the building because the architect and engineers need the windows to open for mechanical ventilation and the tenant would like to use the windows for takeout and pass-through to servers. She noted the upper windows have slider windows. Ms. Gibbon also shared that the proposed entry awning is a nod to the existing awning.

Mr. Koepf added that the existing windows on the lower level and the existing door system are not original and are in poor condition. He noted they are trying to allow for ventilation and keep the windows from projecting in or out. He also noted the doors are glass to allow natural light to enter the building. Mr. Koepf feels the existing Larchmere Tavern sign could be kept if necessary.

Mr. Koepf noted the utility poles and transformers behind the building are being removed to run the utilities underground and into the building. As such, a section of the brick wall has been removed and the remaining wall will be removed to accommodate removal of the utility pole. He noted they can replace the brick wall but the new canopy is being proposed to accommodate a larger cooler.

Chair Moore asked to begin the discussion with the front elevation.

Mr. Reed asked about the material of the sliders.

Ms. Gibbon explained they are Pella 250s that are a vinyl. She noted the sliders are only made in vinyl or fiberglass in this size.

Mr. Petznick confirmed the Pella 250s are a vinyl, three-part slider and asked what the existing upper floor windows are made of.

Ms. Gibbon said they look like Pella 250 sliders as well.

Mr. Starinsky supports installing slider windows but would prefer aluminum windows. He said he would recommend the fiberglass Pella option instead of the vinyl.

Mr. Petznick recommends they can get a better quality fiberglass in the monumental size in a color that will match the color of the upper windows. He also noted they are blocking in the masonry opening.

Ms. Gibbon explained they are blocking in the masonry because they are at the limits of the size for the triple sliders and they want to be able to open them and use them for vents. She pointed out the upper windows are the same and the windows are set within an infill panel.

Mr. Petznick asked what material the blocking will be.

Ms. Gibbon said she would do metal or a Hardie-sheathing or trim so it could be painted to match.

Mr. Petznick and Ms. Gibbon discussed what parts of the windows will be screened and Ms. Gibbon noted they may not be screened to allow food to be passed through.

Mr. Starinsky feels the monument sign is not visible enough and the existing location of the projecting sign is a more appropriate place for a sign. He recommended making it a larger sign with more presence. He also recommended changing the entrance canopy to a more traditional shed awning or retractable awning to make the space more user friendly.

Mr. Carroll asked Mr. Starinsky for clarification that he is suggesting they keep the signage on the building in its existing location. Mr. Starinsky confirmed he is recommending they use the existing sign design or a stacked version in the existing Larchmere Tavern sign location on the building.

Mr. Carroll and Ms. Ryberg-Webster agree with the suggestion to update the existing projecting sign with a new sign and to simplify the awning.

Ms. Gibbon explained they developed another design with a simpler awning for the storefront renovation program, but what is presented was chosen by the client. They tried to balance a larger awning with umbrellas at the tables.

Mr. Koepf presented additional storefront designs that were developed but not submitted for Landmark Commission review.

Mr. Carroll, Mr. Starinsky, and Ms. Ryberg-Webster like design Option 2, which was not submitted, and recommend a projecting perpendicular sign in the same location as the existing sign and incorporating the simple awnings. Mr. Reed agrees but feels the design Option 2 sign would not need any changes.

Ms. Ryberg-Webster asked if the sign would be lit.

Ms. Gibbon explained in design Option 2 the letters above the awning would be up lit with an LED strip light that is concealed behind the awning so the Scorpacciata letters will be up lit.

Ms. Montgomery disagrees and feels design Option 2 is too modern for the building. She feels the green awnings of the submitted design will stand out better, that the sign is too small, and has concerns that the awnings in design Option 2 will damage the brick. Ms. Montgomery prefers design Option 1 that was not submitted. She also asked if research had been done to find historic photos of the building to confirm the original door and window design and material, and to inform their decision.

Mr. Petznick noted the architecture firm did Hampshire House the same year and the building had metal casements in it.

Mr. Petznick likes the projecting sign option and feels it will be more visible. He likes the minimal awning and flat awning of design Options 1 and 2. He also noted it would be nice to know more about the lighting on the building exterior.

Mr. Walter also prefers design Option 2 and agrees it is closer to what is found within the Commercial District. He feels the original projecting building sign would compete with the awnings in design Option 2 and prefers the signage in Option 2 as it is presented.

Mr. Reed asked if the masonry piers on either side of the entry are a running or stacked bond.

Ms. Gibbon explained the ones on either side of the door are a stacked bond.

Mr. Reed noted the stacked bond piers on either side of the door are a modernist attitude and fits well with the awnings in design Option 2.

Chair Moore asked staff if there is anything in the Design Guidelines that would guide the decision toward storefront design Option 2 and how it fits into the Larchmere Commercial District and Shaker Square Historic District.

Mr. Feinstein explained the building does not push the front façade design toward a particular architectural style and the building is more a part of the Commercial District than the Historic District.

Ms. Montgomery noted design Option 2 is too contemporary for the Historic District and would set a precedent for allowing contemporary elements to overshadow the Historic District.

Mr. Carroll argues design Option 2 enhances the historic character of the building by enhancing the existing lines of the building.

Ms. Ryberg-Webster noted the most significant change is the windows which they are in consensus about and the canopies and signage are all removable, reversible interventions. She noted the goal is not a historically accurate restoration but a rehabilitation and said the altered features are compatible, but not necessarily replicating building elements.

Mr. Starinsky feels buildings need to evolve to modern uses to support economic development.

Mr. Starinsky feels the Scorpacciata letters along the canopy edge should be face lit and not spot lit and the sign should be larger.

Ms. Gibbon, Mr. Starinsky, Mr. Feinstein, and Mr. Carroll discussed the primary versus secondary signage and the size requirements for each based on the zoning code, as well as the visibility of the signage from cars passing by.

Members of the Commission and staff discussed the timing of the project and what steps would be necessary to get a new sign design approved if it is larger and requires a variance.

Mr. Starinsky asked for the size of the lettering in the Scorpacciata sign in design Option 2.

Ms. Montgomery asked if it is still possible to get photo documentation of what the original front door material was and recommended contacting the Shaker Heights Library for assistance.

Ms. Montgomery also noted she feels the Commission has abandoned historic preservation, especially within a Historic District.

Chair Moore noted there seemed to be consensus on the front façade including support for design Option 2, though there is not consensus on the signage. She said there is support for large Scorpacciata letters with an ability to come back to Landmark Commission for the medallion sign that will be above and that there is agreement on the canopies consistent with design Option 2.

Mr. Starinsky shared that he is okay with the proposed wood fence on the rear of the building but wants to ensure it looks nice because residents and diners will use the rear entry of the building.

Mr. Koepf shared he is still waiting on the mechanical requirements to find out if they can fit everything behind the fence, or if it will need to be placed on the roof, concealed with a screen. His preference is to keep it as simple as possible and keep the look finished and clean, but they have not proposed a material. Mr. Koepf would prefer metal but is waiting to determine additional details about the enclosure.

Mr. Starinsky questioned the placement of the condensers and other mechanical elements on the rear of the building.

Mr. Koepf noted that once he knows the exact size of all the mechanical equipment that will be concealed at the rear of the building, he can determine exactly where the elements will go.

Mr. Starinsky proposed making a motion for the front elevation of the building and tabling the discussion of the rear elevation due to a lack of available information.

Chair Moore agreed and asked if members were able to make a suggestion for the fence material used at the rear of the building.

Mr. Starinsky said he would support a clean metal fence but not a board on board fence or clapboard.

Chair Moore asked if anyone would object to this suggestion from Mr. Starinsky.

Ms. Montgomery asked about the color of the door on the west elevation. Mr. Koepf noted it will be painted the same color as the brick.

Chair Moore summarized the discussion, which included a recommendation to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the storefront design Option 2 with the windows as specified, which should be Pell Impervia Fiberglass, with two continuances. The first continuance is for the signage options and the second continuance is for the materials and dimensions of the enclosure on the rear façade.

It was moved by Mr. Starinsky and seconded by Mr. Reed to approve the certificate of appropriateness for the front and side façade renovations with the following condition:

1. The storefront design presented in Option 2 with the flat canopies is approved with the condition that the first floor windows be Pell Impervia Fiberglass windows and not vinyl.
2. The Certificate of Appropriateness for storefront signage was continued to allow time for further investigation and for the applicant to address the following suggestions:
  - a. The canopy sign lettering could be larger if possible and an option for a projecting sign should be explored.
  - b. The canopy sign lettering and wall sign could be face lit for better visibility.
3. The Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to the rear façade was continued to allow time for further investigation and for the applicant to address the suggestion below and to provide the following information:
  - a. Study the materials and dimensions of the replacement screen wall.
  - b. Study the materials and design of the proposed canopy.
  - c. Final materials and dimensions shall be provided for additional review.

Ayes: All  
Nays: None

The motion is unanimously approved.

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

\* \* \* \*

### Staff Approvals

There were no staff approvals for the Landmark Commission to review and approve since the February 2023 meeting.

\* \* \* \*

### Other Business

Chair Moore inquired about a summer agenda regarding availability for the July meeting.

Ms. Ryberg-Webster noted she will be available for the July meeting.

Chair Moore shared she is not available for the July meeting and asked staff to check with Ms. Hays regarding her availability.

Chair Moore noted if there is business to conduct in July, the Chair of the meeting will need to be changed in order to conduct business.

Ms. Montgomery asked that the 2500 Kemper Road precedent include that Kalwall was accepted with conditions when it is used again as a precedent.

\* \* \* \*

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:32 pm. The next meeting will be April 26, 2023.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Anna Mates". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping initial "A".

Anna Mates, Secretary  
Landmark Commission